

THE  
**DIVINE APPOINTMENT**  
OF THE  
**LORD'S DAY,**

PROVED ;

AS A SEPARATED DAY FOR HOLY WORSHIP, ESPECIALLY IN  
THE CHURCH-ASSEMBLIES: AND CONSEQUENTLY THE  
CESSATION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

RECEIVED

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

1917

## PREFACE.

---

READER,

IF thou think this Treatise both superfluous and defective, when so many larger have better done the work already, I shall not at all gainsay the latter, nor much the former. The reason of my writing it, was the necessity and request of some very upright, godly persons, who are lately fallen into doubt or error, in point of the Sabbath-day, conceiving, that because the fourth commandment was written in stone, it is wholly unchangeable, and consequently the Seventh-day Sabbath in force, and that the Lord's-day is not a day separated by God to holy worship. I knew that there was enough written on this subject long ago; But, 1. Much of it is in Latin. 2. Some writings which prove the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, do withal treat so loosely of the Lord's-day, as that they require a confutation in the latter, as well as a commendation for the former. 3. Some are so large, that the persons that I write for, will hardly be brought to read them. 4. Most go upon those grounds, which I take to be less clear; and build so much more than I can do on the fourth commandment and on many passages of the Old Testament, and plead so much for the old sabbatical notion and rest, that I fear this is the chief occasion of many people's errors; who when they find themselves in a wood of difficulties, and nothing plain and convincing that is pleaded with them, do therefore think it safest to stick to the old Jewish Sabbath. The friends and acquaintance of some of these persons importuning me, to take the plainest and nearest way to satisfy such honest doubters, I have here done it according to my judgment: not contending against any that go another way to work, but thinking myself that this is very clear and satisfactory; viz. to prove, 1. That Christ did commission his apostles to teach us all things which he commanded, and to settle orders in his church. 2.

And that he gave them his Spirit to enable them to do all this infallibly, by bringing all his words to their remembrance, and by leading them into all truth. 3. And that his apostles by this Spirit did 'de facto' separate the Lord's-day for holy worship, especially in church-assemblies, and declared the cessation of the Jewish Sabbaths. 4. And that as this change had the very same author as the holy Scriptures (the Holy Ghost in the apostles), so that fact hath the same kind of proof, that we have of the canon and the integrity and uncorruptness of the particular Scripture-books and texts: and that, if so much Scripture as mentioneth the keeping of the Lord's-day, expounded by the consent and practice of the universal church from the days of the apostles, (all keeping this day as holy, without the dissent of any one sect, or single person, that I remember to have read of,) I say, if history will not fully prove the point of fact, that this day was kept in the apostle's times, and consequently by their appointment, then the same proof will not serve to evince that any text of Scripture is canonical, and uncorrupted; nor can we think that any thing in the world, that is past, can have historical proof.

I have been put to say something particularly out of antiquity for this evidence of the fact, because it is that which I lay the greatest stress upon. But I have not done it so largely as might be done. 1. Because I would not lose the unlearned reader in a wood of history, nor overwhelm him instead of edifying him. 2. Because it is done already in Latin by Dr. Young in his "*Dies Dominica*" (under the name of Theophilus Loncardiensis); which I take to be the most moderate, sound, and strong Treatise on this subject that I have seen: though Mr. Cawdry and Palmer (jointly) have done well, and at greater length; and Mr. Eaton, Mr. Shephard, Dr. Bound, Wallæus, Rivet, and my dear friend Mr. George Abbot, against Broad, have said very much: and in their way, Dr. White, Dr. Heylin, Bishop Ironside, Mr. Brierwood, &c. 3. I chose most of the same citations which Dr. Heylin himself produceth, because he being the man that I am most put to defend myself against, his concessions are my advantage. 4. And if I had been willing, I could not have been so full in this as the subject will bespeak, because I have almost eleven years been separated from my library, and long from the neighbourhood of any one's else.



I much pity and wonder at those godly men, who are so much for stretching the words of Scripture, to a sense that other men cannot find in them, as that in the word *Graven Images* in the second commandment, they can find all set forms of prayer, all composed studied sermons, and all things about worship of man's invention to be images or idolatry ; and yet they cannot find the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath in the express words of Col. ii. 16. nor the other texts which I have cited ; nor can they find the institution of the Lord's-day in all the texts and evidences produced for it. But though Satan may somewhat disturb our concord, and tempt some men's charity to remissness, by these differences, he shall never keep them out of heaven, who worship God through Christ, by the Spirit, even in spirit and truth. Nor shall he, I hope, ever draw me to think such holy persons as herein differ from me, to be worse than myself, though I think them in this to be unhappily mistaken : much less to approve of their own separation from others, or of other men's condemning them as heretics, and inflicting severities upon them, for these their opinion's-sake.

[illegible]

THE  
DIVINE APPOINTMENT  
OF  
THE LORD'S-DAY.

---

CHAPTER I.

THOUGH the principal thing desired by the inquirers is, That I would prove to them the cessation of the Seventh-day Sabbath, yet because they cast off the Lord's-day, which I take to be a far greater error and sin than the observation of both days; and because that when I have proved the institution of the Lord's-day, I shall the more easily take them off the other, by proving that there are not two weekly days set apart by God for holy worship; therefore I will begin with the first question, Whether the Lord's-day, or first day of the week, be separated by God's institution for holy worship, especially in public church-conventions? Aff.

And here, for the right stating of the question, let it be noted, 1. That it is not the name of a Sabbath that we now meddle with, or stand upon. Let us agree in the thing, and we shall easily bear a difference about the name. Grant that it is 'a day separated by God's institution for holy assemblies and worship,' and then call it a Sabbath, or the Lord's-day, as you please; though for myself I add, that the 'Lord's-day' is the name that the Holy Ghost hath set upon it, and the name which the first churches principally used; and that they call it also sometimes by the name of the Christian Sabbath; but that is only analogically, as it is resembled to the Jewish Sabbath; and as they used the names Sacrifice and Altar, (I speak only 'de facto' how the ancients used these words,)

at the same time for the Christian's commemoration of Christ's sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Lord's-supper, and for the Table; or, as Dr. Young saith, page 23, 'As in Scripture, Baptism is called Circumcision. And that very rarely too.'

2. That the question of the manner of observing the Lord's-day, and what exercises of worship it must be spent in, and what diversions are lawful or unlawful, as also when the day beginneth, are not to be here meddled with in the beginning, but afterwards, when the Divine institution of the day itself is first sufficiently proved. Which is done as followeth :

*Arg.* 'That day which was separated to holy worship by the Holy Ghost, was separated to holy worship by God the Father and the Son. But the first day of the week was separated to holy worship by the Holy Ghost: therefore the first day of the week was separated to holy worship, by God the Father and the Son.'

The minor only needeth proof among Christians.

'That day which was separated to holy worship by the apostles, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, was separated to holy worship by the Holy Ghost. But the first day of the week was separated to holy worship by the apostles, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Therefore the first day of the week was separated to holy worship by the Holy Ghost.'

The minor which only needeth proof, is thus proved.

'That day which was separated to holy worship by the apostles who had the Holy Ghost promised them by Christ, and given them, to lead them into all truth, and to bring all its doctrines to their remembrance, and to teach the churches to do all his commands, and to feed, and guide, and order them, as his principal commissioned church-ministers, was separated to holy worship by the apostles by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.'

'But such is the first day of the week: Therefore the first day of the week is separated to holy worship by the apostles by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.'

I have five propositions now distinctly to be proved: four for the proof of the major, and one for the proof of the minor.

The first proposition is : ' That Christ commissioned his apostles as his principal church-ministers; to teach the churches all his doctrine, and deliver them all his commands and orders, and so to settle and guide the first churches.'

The second proposition is, ' That Christ promised them his Spirit, to enable them to do what he had commissioned them to do, by leading them into all truth, and bringing his words and deeds to their remembrance, and by guiding them as his churches' guides.'

The third proposition is, ' That Christ performed this promise, and gave his Spirit accordingly to his apostles, to enable them to all their commissioned work.'

The fourth proposition is, ' That the apostles did actually separate or appoint the first day of the week, for holy worship, especially in church-assemblies.'

The fifth proposition is, ' That this act of theirs was done by the guidance or inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which was given them.'

And when I have distinctly proved these five things, no sober understanding Christian can expect that I should prove any more, towards the proof of the question in hand, Whether the first day of the week be separated by God's institution for holy worship, especially in church-assemblies.

---

## CHAPTER II.

**PROP. 1.** *That Christ commissioned his Apostles, or his principal Church-Ministers, to teach the Churches all his Doctrine, and deliver them all his Commands and Orders, and so to settle and guide the first Churches.*

**THIS** I prove, 1. By their commission itself: 2. By their performance with its proper seal: 3. By the consent of all the Christian world.

1. " He called to him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles. (Luke vi. 13.) Their first commission is recited Matt. x. at large.

" All authority is given me both in heaven and in earth : Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the

Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world; Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 18—20.)

"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you; as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you: and when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 21.)

Even of the seventy it is said, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." (Luke x. 16.) And to the twelve, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me," &c. (Matt. x. 40.)

"Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, to whom now I send thee, to open their eyes." (Acts xxvi. 17.)

"For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received," &c. (1 Cor. xv. 3.)

"For I received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you." (1 Cor. xi. 23.)

"Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2.)

"But I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. i. 11, 12.)

"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me—Feed my Lambs." (John xxi. 15—17.)

"I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 19.)

"As thou hast sent me into the world." (John xvii. 18; see John xiii. 16. 20.)

"Shew whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell." (Acts i. 24, 25.)

"Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." (Gal. i. 1.)

"After he through the Holy Ghost, had given command-

ment to the apostles whom he had chosen ; to whom also he presented himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts ii. 2.)

" They continued stedfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship," &c. (Acts ii. 42.)

" He gave some apostles, some prophets," &c. (Eph. iv. 11—16.)

" First apostles, secondarily prophets," &c. " are all apostles?" &c. (1 Cor. xii. 28, 29.)

" Being built upon the foundation of the apostles," &c. (Ephes. ii. 20.)

" That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour." (2 Peter iii. 2.)

" Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, &c. and he shall tell thee," &c. (Acts x. 5.)

They that will not take all this plain evidence of Scripture for a proof of this first proposition, I suppose would not be ever the more moved by it, if I should be so needlessly tedious, as to stay to fetch arguments from each text.

2. The apostles exercised such power as the proposition mentions, and God set to it the seal of miracles. Therefore such a power or office was given them by Christ.

The consequence is undeniable. The antecedent of this enthymeme is so plainly expressed in Scripture, that I am loath to take up much of my own or the reader's time, in proving so known a thing.

They founded the churches; they delivered them the doctrine and commands of Christ; they settled the churches, as to officers, orders, and discipline, according to Christ's commands and the Spirit's determinations: Thus they ordained the new office of deacons, and deaconesses or widows; and they ordained them elders in every church, or city, and they determined of church-controversies: and gave the church decrees, and delivered the will of Christ about the sacrament, church-assemblies, prophecyings, &c. (Acts ii.; xiv. 23; vi. 3, 4, &c.; 1 Tim. iii.; Titus i.; Acts xv.; 1 Cor. xi.; xiv., &c.)

3. That all Christians (save heretics) did acknowledge their power, and acquiesce in their decrees and conduct, being a matter of fact needs no other proof, than the

common history of former ages, and practice of this. Which are so well known, that I will not injure the reader by proving it.

---

### CHAPTER III.

*PROP. 2. Christ promised his Spirit to his Apostles, to enable them to do, what he had commissioned them to do, by leading them into all truth, and bringing his words and deeds to their remembrance, and by guiding them as his Church's Guides.*

In the Old Testament it is prophesied and promised, "And I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." (Jer. iii. 15.)

See all the texts that promise the pouring out of the Spirit, Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 27; xxxvii. 14; xxxix. 29; Joel ii. 28, 29; which were principally fulfilled on the apostles.

"And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 49.)

"But when the Advocate is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." (John xv. 26, 27.)

"It is expedient for you, that I go away; for if I go not away; the Advocate will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you——. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth. For he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he shall shew you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine. Therefore said I that he shall take of mine, and shew it unto you." (John xvi. 7. 12—15.)

"I have given to them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them——. Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I sent them also into the world; and for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." (John xvii. 8. 17, 18.)



“Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.” (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

“And being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.” (Acts i. 4. 8.)

By these texts it is most evident, that Christ promiseth the apostles an extraordinary Spirit, or measure of the Spirit, so to enable them to deliver his commands, and execute their commission, as that he will own what they do by the guidance thereof; and the churches may rest upon it as the infallible Revelation of the Will of God.

#### CHAPTER IV.

*PROP. 3. Christ performed all these Promises to his Apostles, and gave them his Spirit to enable them for all their Commissioned Work.*

THIS is proved both from the fidelity of Christ, and from the express assertions of the Scripture. “He is faithful that hath promised.” (Heb. x. 23.) “God that cannot lie, hath promised.” (Titus i. 2.) “As God is true——” (2 Cor. i. 18.) “How long, O Lord, holy and true——” (Rev. vi. 10.) “He was called Faithful and True——” (Rev. xix. 11.) “Let God be true, and every man a liar——” (Rom. iii. 4.) “He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar.” (1 John v. 10.) “He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” (John xx. 22.)

Acts ii. containeth the narrative of the coming down of the Holy Ghost upon them, at large.

“It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.—” (Acts xv. 28.)

“God also bearing them witness, both with signs and

wonders, and with divers mighty works, and distributions of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." (Heb. ii. 4.)

"The things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the Gospel unto you, by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven——" (1 Peter i. 12.)

"Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ." (Rom. xv. 19.)

Read all the texts in Acts and elsewhere, that speak of all the apostles' miracles, and their giving of the Holy Ghost, &c; and 1 Cor. vii. 40; Acts iv. 8. 31; v. 3; vi. 3; vii. 51. 55; viii. 15. 17—19; ix. 17; x. 44, 45. 47; xi. 15, 16. 24; xiii. 2. 4. 9. 52; xvi. 6; Rom. v. 5; ix. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 1. 14; 1 Cor. xii; Ephes. iv. 7, 8, &c.; and iii. 5. But this proposition is confessed by all Christians.

---

## CHAPTER V.

**PROP. 4.** *The Apostles did actually separate and appoint the First Day of the Week for Holy Worship, especially in Church-Assemblies.*

HERE the reader must remember, that it is mere matter of fact, that is to be proved in the proof of this proposition; and that all till this, is clearly and undeniably proved; so that the whole controversy resteth upon the proof of the fact, That indeed the apostles did set apart this day for ordinary (public) worship.

And in order to the fuller proof of this, I have these subordinate propositions to prove.

*Prop. 1.* 'Matter of past fact is to be known to us by history,' (written, verbal or practical.)

This is evident in the nature of the thing. History is the narration of facts that are past. We speak not of the fact of mere natural agents, but of moral human facts. It may be known without history what eclipses there have been of the sun; what changes of the moon, &c; but not what in particular morals have been done by man.

The necessity of other distinct ways of knowledge, are easily disproved. 1. It need not be known by Divine supernatural revelation. Otherwise no men could know what

is past, but prophets or inspired persons : Nor prophets, but in few things ; for it cannot be proved, that God ever revealed to prophets or inspired persons, the general knowledge of things past ; but only some particulars of special use (the creation to Moses, &c.) ; so that if revelation by inspiration, voice or visions, were necessary, Scripture itself could be understood by none but inspired persons, or that had such revelation.

2. It is not known by natural causes, and by arguing from the natural cause to the effects. It is no more possible to know all things past this way (by knowing the causes), than all things future. Therefore it must be ordinarily known by human report, which we call history or tradition.

*Prop. 2.* ' Scripture history is not the only certain history ; much less the only credible.'

Without Scripture-history we may be certain that there was in 1666 a great fire in London, and a great plague in 1665, and that there were wars in England in 1642, 1643, &c., and that there have been parliaments in England which have made the statutes now in force ; and that there have been such kings of England for many ages, as our records and histories mention, &c.

*Prop. 3.* ' Scripture-history is not the only certain history of the things of the ages in which it was written, or of former ages ; much less the only credible history of them.'

We may know by other history certainly, that there were such persons as Cyrus, Alexander, &c. That the Macedonians had a large extended empire ; that the Romans after by many victories obtained a spacious empire ; that there were such persons as Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, &c.

*Prop. 4.* ' Scripture-history is not the only means appointed by God, to help us to the knowledge of ecclesiastical matters of fact, transacted in Scripture-times.'

1. For if human history be certain or credible in other cases, it is certain or credible in these. There being no reason why these things or much of them, should not be as capable of a certain delivery to us by human history, as other matters. As that there were Christians in those times, may be known by what Tacitus, Suetonius, &c. say. And the ancient writers often appeal in many cases to the heathen's own history. And no man pretendeth, as to the

civil matters mentioned in the Scriptures; that no other history of the same is credible or certain. As of the government of Augustus, Tiberius, Herod, Pilate, Felix, Festus, &c.

2. There are other certain means known to us ; of which I must refer the reader to what I have written in my "Reasons of the Christian Religion," part 2. chap. vii.

3. No man can doubt but that the Christians of that same age, (as till the year one hundred) might easily and certainly know such a matter of public fact; as whether the Lord's-day was constantly set apart and observed by all the Christian churches for holy worship. For 1. It is certain that they did know it by sight and sense, and therefore had no need of history. 2. It is certain that they knew it before the Scriptures were written, which we now speak of ; for it is not possible that for all those years time before any of the New Testament was written, the Christians who assembled to worship God, should not know on what day they used to assemble.

And if they knew it in the year 100, they must needs know it as well in the year 101, and 102, and 103, and so on. For those that were young Christians fifty years after Christ, would be aged at an hundred : and those that were young at an hundred, would be aged at an hundred and fifty, and so on. So that an age of people, not ending at the age of a single person, congregations and societies are like rivers, that keep the same channel, and name, while one part of water followeth another. Nay, some of the same men are there anno 100, who were there anno 50, some anno 150, who were there anno 100, and so on. Ten thousand thousand men, women and children, can tell on what day the congregations of England use to assemble ; whereas if the apostle were among us, and should write on what day we assemble, fewer would know it by that means ; and they that knew it but by his writing, would know it less confidently, than they who knew it by sense and experience.

Yet forget not, that I am far from ascribing a certainty or a credibility to all human history ; much more from equaling any with the credit of Divine history ; but only I say, 1. That sense is more assuring, as to the subject, than any history whatever. 2. And that this instance of the day on which all churches in the world assembled for holy worship,

is one of the most palpable for certainty that possibly could be imagined.

4. And I add, that if some human history or tradition be not certain, there can be no certainty of much of the Divine history, to any but the persons who were themselves inspired, or that saw the visions, or miracles that confirmed them. For as internal sense or intuition must assure the inspired persons themselves, and external sense must assure those that saw the matters of fact; so the rest have no way to know them, but either still by a succession of new revelations from heaven (which God doth not give), or else by report. And I can no otherwise know what was revealed to an apostle, nor what was done in those times. (Of which more anon.)

*Prop. 5.* 'The first institution of church-offices, and orders, and so of the Lord's-day, was not by Scripture.'

The proof is undeniable; because the Old Testament did not contain the institution, (*e. g.*) of particular churches, sacraments, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, and the Lord's-day, &c.; and the New Testament was none of it written till anno 40, at soonest, when some (as Bucholtzer, Bellarmine, &c.) think Matthew's Gospel was written (though others say many years after), and it was not all written till anno 99. Now it is certain that the church was not all these days without the orders now in question, nor without a day to meet on for public worship. Even as baptism and the Lord's-supper were instituted by Christ himself, long before the writing of any part of the New Testament, and the church was in long possession of them, upon the bare verbal declaration of the apostles.

*Prop. 6.* 'Therefore it is certain that no part of the New Testament was written to any such end as to institute sacraments, or church-offices, or standing orders; but to instruct men about those that were already instituted (as to the use of those times).'

For it could not be written to institute that which was instituted before, so many years.

*Prop. 7.* 'No part of the New Testament was written to make known to the churches of those times the said sacraments, offices, stated orders and time of worship.' (Still observe that by a part, I mean any book; and I except the decree, written in a letter of the apostles, elders and brethren, (Acts xv.) concerning circumcision, not to be imposed on

the Gentiles; which yet made no new institution, nor declared any, but only determined of the continued forbearance of some things forbidden before of God, in the precepts called Noah's, and Paul's epistles, which reduce the churches to orders before settled, and urge them to duty, and decide some doubts about particular cases of conscience.)

The proof is visible; 1. In the writings themselves. 2. In that all the churches were in the possession and use of all the things in question, long before: (for mutual orders and circumstances are none of the things in question.) It would be vain to write a history now to tell the Englishmen of this present age, that the Lord's-day is used in England, as a day set apart for public worship; or that persons are baptized, or receive the Lord's-supper in England. For seeing it is the common usage of all the Christians almost of the land, it is needless to tell men among us by writing that it is so (unless it be to infer somewhat else from it).

*Prop. 8.* ' Yet these holy Scriptures which were written to men of those times, were also intended for the instruction of all succeeding ages; and so the four evangelists wrote the history of Christ, and Luke wrote the history of Paul till his coming to Rome, and longer, and of some more of the apostles; and on the by, in the epistles extant, the church's customs of those times are much intimated; and all this together with the subordinate history and the universal tenour and practice of the churches, is that history by which we must know the matter of fact of those times; nor is there any room left for a rational pretence of Rome, or any other church, to produce Divine institutions, which were committed only to them, or entrusted to their particular keeping only, and were not delivered in Scripture, nor in common to the whole church.'

*Prop. 9.* ' Thus according to the use of the writings of the New Testament, the matter of fact in question (of the Lord's-day's separation) is historically touched on, and proved; though but briefly and on the by, as a thing as well known to the church before, as what day goeth over their head.'

The historical hints of the New Testament must be taken together, and not apart only; that they may prove a usage. And 1. That Christ rose on that day, is past doubt among Christians. (John xx. 1; Luke xxiv. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Matt. xxviii. 1.)

2. On that same day he taught the two disciples, (Luke xxiv. 13,) and the same day he appeared to the disciples and instructed them, and did eat with them. (Luke xxiv. 33. 36.) Then the disciples were assembled, and then he blessed them, gave them their commission and the Holy Ghost. (John xix. 20—22.)

3. The next first day of the week Christ chose to appear to them again, when Thomas was with them, and convinced him. (John xx. 26.)

In Acts xx. 7. it is mentioned as the day of their assembling to break bread (which though they did oft on other days, yet no day else was particularly appointed for it). As for the dissenters' cavil about the translation of *Ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*, Beza hath given them reason enough against it; and Grotius and almost all expositors are against them: and most that translate it literally 'una sabbatorum,' take 'una' and 'prima' here to be all one. And Calvin with others noteth, that the same phrase being used of the day of the resurrection, (Matt. xxvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1,) will direct us to expound this; unless you mean also to deny the resurrection to have been on the first day.

And *κατὰ μίαν* (1 Cor. xvi. 1. 2.) must needs have the same signification; and Mark xxvi. 9. compared with the other two evangelists so expounds them as Beza noteth; who also telleth us that in one old copy he found added "the Lord's-day," and citeth Jerome adv. Vigilant, saying "Per unam sabbati; hoc est in die Dominico," &c. And Dr. Hammond well noteth that it plainly relateth to the Christian assemblies, to which they were not to come empty, but to deposit what they brought into the treasury of the church; or if it were in their private repositories, it doth not much difference the case. Calvin's exception against Chrysostom here is groundless, as the reasons before evince. So that by this text the custom of holding church-meetings on the Lord's-day, as a peculiar day, is intimated, though but on the by, as most expositors agree.

And the denomination of the Lord's-day, John i. 10, being the same which the Christian churches ever used of the first day, puts it yet further out of doubt. As for his conjecture, who doubteth whether it may be meant of the anniversary day of Christ's resurrection, when as the constant use of the name by all the churches, sheweth that it

was taken ever since for the weekly day, it deserveth no refutation.

Now though all this set together shew that Scripture is not silent of the matter of fact; yet it is the full and unquestionable expository evidence of the practice of all churches in the world, since the very days of the apostles, which beyond all doubt assureth us that 'de facto' the Lord's-day was by the apostles separated for holy worship, especially in public church-assemblies. But these several intimations being seconded with so full an exposition, tell us that the Scripture is not silent in the case, nor doth pass it by. I was loath to name the day of the sending down of the Holy Ghost as a proof; because that some do controvert it; but it seemeth to me a very considerable thing: 1. That the day (that year) of Pentecost on which the Holy Ghost was given, was indeed the first day of the week, even Dr. Heylin granteth, without any question or stop. And the church's observation of Whitsunday as the day, and that so very early, as Epiphanius and many others say, from the apostles, doth seem a very credible history or tradition of it. 2. It is agreed on that the Passover that year fell on the Sabbath-day, and that Pentecost was fifty days after the Passover: which falleth out on the Lord's-day. And Grotius noteth from Exod. xix. 1, that it was the day the law was given on, and so on which the Spirit was given for a new law. 3. And considering that this great gift of the Holy Ghost, which was to make the apostles infallible, and to enable them for their commission work, and bring all Christ's doctrines and commands to their remembrance, was so memorable a thing, that it was as it were the beginning of the full Gospel-state of the church and kingdom of Christ, (which through all Christ's abode on earth, was as the infant, existent indeed, but in the womb, and on this day was as it were born before the world, and brought into the open light;) the Lord's-day also seemeth to me to be as it were conceived on the day of Christ's resurrection, but born on this day of the Holy Ghost's descent.

But Dr. Heylin hath one poor reason against it, viz. 'Because it was an accidental thing that the day fell out that year on the first day.'

*Ans.* 1. Was it not according to the course of nature?



How then can that be called accidental? 2. But however it was no contingent thing (in his sense) that the Holy Ghost was sent down on that day rather than on another. If a sparrow fall not unto the ground without God's providence, did God choose that day he knew not why? or did it fall out haphazard, or by chance?

I need not insist on the confutation of his cavils about the other texts forecited. Note only, 1. That as to his exception about Christ's travel on his resurrection-day, I have after answered it. 2. That he freely granted that *μία τῶν σαββάτων*, signifieth 'the first day' of the week, both in Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3. That he himself citeth afterward many testimonies that oblations and contributions were in the churches an usual Lord's-day's work. 4. That he confesseth that Rev. i. 10, is meant of the Lord's-day, as by that time grown into reputation. 5. That he thinketh it was in small reputation before, because Paul chose the Sabbath so often to preach on, to the Jews and Hellenists, or Greeks; whereas he himself is forced to confess that it was not for the day's sake, but the assemblies, to do them good. 6. That he vainly conceiteth (that because the Lord's-day was kept on the account of Christ's resurrection,) it implieth that it was not kept by God's command, which needeth no confutation. 7. That his labour to prove that Paul meant the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated, is vain; for we deny it not. That he cannot deny that Christians had all that time of the apostles a stated day (as Pliny himself witnesseth) for solemn worship, above other days. 9. That he vainly snatcheth a little countenance from Calvin and Beza, &c. when as no man, since Cochläus, writeth more detestably of them. 10. That after he confesseth that 'it is no doubt but the religious observation of the day began in the apostles' age, with their approbation and authority, and hath since continued in the same respect.' And what needs he more for confutation?

As to his allegations of the judgment of the Reformed, Lutheran, and Roman church, 1. We take none of them for our rule, (so impartial are we), But, 2. He himself citeth Beza, Mercer, Paræus, Cuchlinus, Simler, Hospinian, Zanchius, &c. as holding that it was an apostolical and truly divine tradition, that the apostles turned the Sabbath into

the Lord's-day, that it was an apostolical custom, or a custom received in the apostles' times, &c.

And whereas afterward he would persuade us that they spent but a little of the day in holy worship, he himself cited Mr. George Sandys's Travels, saying of the Coptics, that 'On Saturday, presently after midnight, they repair unto their churches, where they remain well nigh till Sunday at noon (of the evening he speaketh not, but of their first meeting), during which time they neither sit nor kneel, but support themselves on crutches; and they sing over the most part of David's psalms at every meeting, with divers parcels of the New Testament.' (This is the old way; and such a liturgy we do not contradict or scruple.)

Sandys also informeth us of the Armenian Christians, that 'coming into the place of the assembly on Sunday, in the afternoon (no doubt they had been there in the morning), he found one sitting in the midst of the congregation, in habit not differing from the rest, reading in a Bible in the Chaldæan tongue; that anon after, came the bishop in a hood or vestment of black, with a staff in his hand; that first he prayed, and then sung certain psalms assisted by two or three. After all of them singing jointly, at interims praying to themselves, the bishop all this while with hands erected, and his face towards the altar; that service being ended, they all kissed his hand, and bestowed their alms, he laying his other hand on their heads, and blessing them,' &c.

And of the Abassines he reciteth out of Brierwood (and he from Damianus a Goes), that they honour the Lord's-day as the Christian Sabbath, and the Saturday as the Jews' Sabbath, because they receive the canons called the Apostles, which speak for both.

And king Edgar in England ordained that the Sabbath should begin on Saturday, at three o'clock in the afternoon, and continue till break of day on Monday. These laws for the Sabbath of Alfred, Edgar, &c. were confirmed by Ethelred, and more fully by Canutus.

But of these things I shall say more anon under the proposition following: in the meantime only remembering you, 1. That it is well that we are required after the fourth commandment to pray, 'Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.' And we accept his con-

session, that this includeth all of that commandment which is the law of nature (though I have told you that it reacheth somewhat further). 2. That we approve of the plain doctrine of the English homilies on this point, and stand to the exposition of sober impartiality.

*Prop.* 10. 'It hath been the constant practice of all Christ's churches in the whole world, ever since the days of the apostles to this day, to assemble for public worship on the Lord's-day, as a day set apart thereunto by the apostles. Yea, so universal was this judgment and practice, that there is no one church, no one writer, or one heretic (that I remember to have read of), that can be proved ever to have dissented or gainsaid it, till of late times.'

The proof of this is needless to any one that is versed in the writings of the ancients; and others cannot try what we shall produce. I have been these ten years separated from my library, and am therefore less furnished for this task than is requisite; but I will desire no man to receive more, that the testimonies produced by Dr. Peter Heylin himself, which with pitiful weakness he would pervert. And he being the grand adversary with whom I do now contend, I shall only premise these few observations, as sufficient to confute all his cavils and evasions.

1. When his great work is to prove that the Lord's-day was not called the Sabbath (unless by allusion), we grant it him (as to a Jewish Sabbath), as nothing to the purpose.

2. Whereas he strenuously proveth that the Lord's-day was not taken for a Sabbath, 'de re,' we grant it him also, taking the word in the primitive Jewish sense.

3. When he laboureth to prove that Christians met on other days of the week besides the Lord's-day (though not for the Lord's-supper), we grant it him, as nothing to the purpose. So Calvin preached or lectured daily at Geneva, and yet kept not every day as a holy day separated to God's worship, as they did the Lord's-day, though too remissly. So we do still keep week-day lectures, and the church of England requireth the reading of common-prayer on Wednesdays and Fridays, and holy-day evens; do they therefore keep them holy as the Lord's-day?

4. When he tells us that Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, plead against them that would hear and pray on

that day only, we grant it him; and we are ready to say as they do, that we should not confine God's service to one day only, as if we might be profane and worldly on all other days; but should take all fit opportunities for religious helps, and should all the week keep our minds as near as we can in a holy frame and temper. Of the rest of his objections I shall say more in due place.

5. But I must note in the beginning, that he granteth the main cause which I plead for, acknowledging, (Hist. Sab. l. 2. pag. 30.) it thus; 'So that the religious observation of this day, beginning in the age of the apostles, no doubt but with their approbation and authority, and since continuing in the same respect for so many ages, may be very well accounted among those apostolical traditions, which have been universally received in the church of God.' And what need we more than the religious observation, in the apostles' time, by the apostles' approbation and authority, and this delivered to us by the universal church, as an apostolical tradition.

But yet he saith that the apostles made it not a Sabbath. *Ans.* Give us the religious observation, and call it by what name you please. We are not fond of the name of the Sabbath.

6. And therefore we grant all that he laboriously proveth of the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, and that the ancients commonly consent, that by the abolished Sabbath, (Col. ii. 16.) is meant inclusively the weekly Jewish Sabbath; Epiph. l. 1. Hæres. 33. n. 11; Ambros. in loc. Hieron. Epist. ad Algu. qu. 10; Chrysost. Hom. 13. in Hebr. 7; August. cont. Jud. cap. 2. and cont. Faust. Manich. l. 16. c. 28. I recite the places for them that doubt of it.

Now let us peruse the particular testimonies.

1. I begin with Ignatius, (though Dallæus hath said so much to prove the best copy of him of later date and spurious; because others think otherwise, and that copy is by him thought to be written cent. 3.) who saith, 'Let us not keep the Sabbath in a Jewish manner, in sloth and idleness, but after a spiritual manner; not in bodily ease, but in the study of the law; not eating meat dressed yesterday, or drinking warm drinks, and walking out a limited space, but in the contemplation of the works of God—And after the

Sabbath, let every one that loveth Christ keep the Lord's-day Festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and empress of all days, in which our life was raised again, and death was overcome by our Lord and Saviour.'

Either these epistles of Ignatius (ad Philip. &c.) are genuine or spurious. If genuine, then note how clearly it is asserted that the Lord's-day was to be observed as the queen of all days, by all that were lovers of Christ. And that the Seventh-day Sabbath was kept with it then and there (in Asia so near the apostles' days) no wonder; when it was but the honourable, gradual receding from the Mosai-cal ceremonies, with an avoiding the scandalous hindrance of the Jews' conversion. And Doctor Heylin well noteth, that it was only the Eastern churches next the Jews that for a time kept both days, but not the Western, who rather turned the Sabbath to a fast.

But if Ignatius's epistle be spurious, written cent. 3, then as Dallæus would prove, that they were written by some heretical or heterodox person; and so it will be no wonder that holy days are pleaded for, when (as Doctor Heylin observeth) Cerinthus and his followers in the apostles' times, stood up for the Jewish Sabbath and ceremonies, and so were for both days: but it will be our confirmation that even the heretics held with the universal church for the Lord's-day.

2. The great controversy about the day of Easter, which spread so early through all the churches, is a full confirmation of our matter of fact. For when the Western churches were for the Passover-day (the better to content the Jews, saith Heylin), the Eastern thought it intolerable that it should not be kept on a Lord's-day, because that was the weekly day observed on the same account of the resurrection. The Eastern churches never questioned their supposition of the Lord's-day; and the Western (after Victor's rash excommunicating the Asian bishops) never rested till they brought them to keep it on the Lord's-day: Pius, Anicetus, Victor, &c. prosecuting the cause.

3. The book (though perished) which Melito wrote of the Lord's-day, (Euseb. l. 4. c. 25.) by the title may be well supposed to confirm at least the matter of fact of usage.

4. All those little councils, mentioned by Heylin, p. 48, held at Osroena, Corinth, in Gaul, in Pontus, in Rome,

prove this, 'The canons of them all,' saith Heylin, 'being extant in Eusebius's time, and in all which it was concluded for the Sunday.'

But saith Heylin by this, 'You see that the Sunday and the Sabbath were long in striving for the victory.' p. 49.

*Answ.* I see that some men can outface the clearest light. Here was no striving at all which day should be the weekly day set apart for holy worship, but only whether Easter should follow the time of Passover, or be confined to the Lord's-day.

5. Justin Martyr's testimony is so express, and so commonly cited, that I need not recite the words at large, 'Upon the Sunday all of us assemble in the congregation— Upon the day called Sunday all within the cities, or in the country, do meet together in some place, where,' &c. He proceedeth to shew the worship there performed.

Now, 1. Here being mention of no other day, no man can question but that this day was set apart for these holy assemblies in a peculiar manner, as the other week days were not. 2. This being the writing of one of the most learned and ancient of all the Christian writers. 3. And being purposely written to one of the wisest of all the emperors, as an apology for all the Christians. 4. And being written in Rome, where the matter of fact was easily known, and deserveth as much credit as any Christian history or writing since the apostles can deserve. Nor hath Heylin any thing to say against it:

6. The next remembered by Heylin is Dionysius Corinth, who lived 175, cited out of Eusebius Hist. l. 4. c. 22. 'To day we keep the holy Lord's-day, wherein we read the epistle you wrote to us,' &c. Against this Heylin saith not a word.

7. The next is Clemens Alexandrinus, who expressly asserteth the matter of fact, that the Lord's-day was then kept by Christians. Yea, Heylin derideth him for fetching it as far as Plato, Strom. l. 7. But Heylin thinks he was against keeping any days: but he that will examine his words shall find, that he speaketh only against them that would be ceremonious observers of the day, more than of the work of the day, and would be religious on that day alone. And therefore he saith, 'He that leadeth his life according to the ordinances of the Gospel, doth keep the Lord's-day,

when he casteth away every evil thought; and doing things with knowledge and understanding, doth glorify the Lord in his resurrection.' This is not to speak against the day, but to shew how it ought to be sincerely kept. But if he had been against it, it is all one to my cause, who only prove that 'de facto' all Christian churches kept it.

8. The next witness is Tertullian, who oft asserteth this to be the holy day of the Christians' church-assemblies, and holy worship: his testimony in Apolog. cap. 16, is so commonly known, that I need not recite it. It is the same in sense with Justin Martyr's, and written in an apology for the Christians, purposely describing their custom of meeting and worshipping on the Sunday (as he calls it there), as Justin did. And that it was not an hour's work, he shews in saying, that 'The day was kept as a day of rejoicing,' and then describeth the work. And de Idolol. c. 14. he saith, that every eighth day was the Christians' festival. And de Coron. Mil. c. 3. and oft he calleth it the Lord's-day, and saith it was a crime to fast upon it. And the work of the day described by Justin, and by him, Apolog. c. 39. is just the same that we desire now the day to be spent in: we plead for no other.

But most grossly saith Heylin, page 55, 'But sure it is that their assemblies held no longer than our morning service; that they met only before noon; for Justin saith, that when they met, they used to receive the sacrament, and that the service being done, every man went again to his daily labours.' *Ans.* Is this a proof to conclude a *certainly* from? Most certainly abundance of testimonies might be produced to prove that they came together early in the morning, and stayed till evening, if not till within night. The former, Pliny and many others witness: and the latter many accusations of the heathens, that censured them for night-crimes at their meetings: and all that report it almost tell us of the sacrament administered, and Tertullian and others, of their feasting together (their love-feasts), as a supper before they parted. Now let the time be measured by the work: by that time the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New were read, and all the prayers then made, and all the preaching and exhortations, and then all the prayers and praises at the celebration of the Lord's-supper (especially if they were half as long as the Liturgies ascribed

to Basil, Chrysostom, and the rest of the *Biblioth. Patrum*), and by that time the sacrament itself was administered, with all the action and singing of psalms, and all the oblations and collections made; and besides this, all the church discipline on particular persons exercised, where questions and answers and proofs must take up a great deal of time, sure one day must be at an end, or very near it. And after when the love-feasts were left off, and the church met twice, and made an intermission, they did as we do now. And the very custom of preaching all the morning to the audientes and catechumens, till almost noon, when they were dismissed with a 'missa est,' and spending the rest of the day in teaching the church, and celebrating the sacrament with all the larger eucharistical acts, do fully shew how the day was spent; which I would quickly shew by particular testimonies, but that I am separated from my library; and Dr. Young hath fully done it to my hand. The very context of these testimonies, with what Albaspinæus hath of their catechizing and church order, will soon satisfy the impartial searcher.

As for what he saith out of Justin, of 'returning to their labours,' I can find no such word in him; nor do I believe there is any such to be found, unless of returning to their six days weekly labour, when the religious work was ended with the day: and I imagine that the reader will find no more, if so much.

9. The next proof is universal, even the consent of all the Christian churches, without one contradicting vote that ever I read of, that the Lord's-day worship was to be performed standing, and that it was not allowed them to pray or worship kneeling, upon any Lord's-day in the year (or any week-day between Easter and Whitsuntide): and the difficulty of these stations is expressed (see Albaspinæus of it), which sheweth that it was for a long time. Whatever they did in hearing (it is like they sat, for Justin saith, We rise to pray), but it is certain they stood in worshipping acts, as prayer and praise. This Justin Martyr hath before mentioned: Tertullian hath it expressly, and Heylin himself citeth him, *de Coron. Mil. et Basil l. de Spir. S. c. 27*, and Hieron. *advers. Luciferian: August. Epist. 118*; Hilar. *Præf. in Psal. Ambros. Serm. 62*. To which he may add Epiphanius, and divers councils, especially Nic. 1, and Trul. of



which after. (I once pleaded this ancient custom with them that would have all excluded from the sacrament that kneel not, to prove that kneeling at the sacrament on the Lord's-days could not be in the church of so many hundred years after the apostles, when the universal church condemned kneeling on all Lord's-day worship.) And Dr. Heylin himself saith, 'What time this custom was laid by, I can hardly say; but sure I am, it was not laid aside in long time after; not till the time of Pope Alexander the third, who lived about the year 1160,' &c. Now from all this it is most evident, that the Lord's-day was then observed.

10. In this place, though by anticipation, I add the two general councils now named: The first general council at Nice, (Can. 20.) which reneweth and confirmeth this ancient custom of not kneeling in prayer on the Lord's-days, that there might be an uniformity kept in the churches. And the Canon. Concil. Trul. have the same again; which proveth what we seek, the matter of fact of the day's general observation.

11. The next is Origen, who is not denied to witness to the matter of fact; but Heylin thinks he was against the right of it: but his mistake is the same, as about Clemens Alexandrinus; Origen did but desire that other days might be kept also as profitably as they could; as our lecture-days are.

12. Cyprian is the next, whose testimonies for matter of fact are full, and Heylin hath nothing to say against him, but that it is his private opinion, that the Lord's-day was prefigured in the eighth day destined to circumcision. Which is nothing at all to our business in hand.

13. And he himself cites Pope Fabian's Decretal, anno 237 (a testimony therefore that he is not to refuse), 'for every man and woman on the Lord's-days to bring a quantity of bread and wine to be first offered on the altar, and then distributed in the sacrament.'

The Canon of Clement before mentioned I now pretermitt.

But saith Dr. Heylin, '1. All days between Easter and Whitsunday had adoration by genuflection also prohibited on them. 2. And the church had other festivals also.'

*Ans.* 1. The reason of station was to signify Christ's resurrection and ours; therefore it continued for these days:

but that was for the short occasional meetings of those days, which he himself will not say were separated to worship. 2. And the other festivals of the church make nothing against us. For, 1. Some of them (as Easter and Whitsunday) were but the same Lord's-day. 2. And some of them were but anniversary, and not weekly holidays; as the Nativity, &c. 3. And he confesseth even these were brought in long after the apostles' days, and therefore can lay no claim to apostolical institution. Page 62, he himself saith that 'The feast of Christ's Nativity was ordained or instituted in the second century, and that of his Incarnation in the third.' And besides Easter and Whitsunday (which are the Lord's-day), Christmas is all that he named out of Beda (so long after) as the 'Majora Solennia.' The eves were but hours for preparation.

14. To these (though in the fourth century) I may add Epiphanius, who recorded the station (and adoration to the East) on the Lord's-days, as traditions received by the universal church.

And here I would have it specially noted, that when Tertullian, Epiphanius, and others, note *standing* on the Lord's-days to be an unwritten tradition received by the whole church, they do not say the same of the Lord's-day itself, (though the ancients oft say, that we received it from the apostles): Now by this it is plain, that they took the Lord's-day to be of apostolical institution past all question, and the unwritten, universal traditions to be somewhat lower (which there was no Scripture for at all). (Among which the white garment, and the milk and honey to the baptized, and the adoration toward the East, are numbered.) For he that is appointed to worship on the Lord's-days standing, or towards the East, is supposed to know that on that day he is to worship. If the mode on that day be of universal tradition as a ceremony, the day is supposed to be somewhat more than of unwritten tradition.

15. I add here also (though in the fourth century, because it looks back to the institution) the words of Athanasius, cited by Heylin himself, Homil. de Semente, (though Nannius question it,) 'That our Lord transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's-day.' But saith Dr. Heylin, 'This must be understood, not as if done by his commandment, but on this occasion: the resurrection of our Lord on that day, be-

ing the principal motive which did influence his church to make choice thereof for the assemblies——For otherwise it would cross what formerly had been said by Athanasius in his *πρωμεν*, &c.' *Answ.* It expresseth the common judgment of the church, that Christ himself made the change by these degrees: 1. Fundamentally, and as an exemplar, by his own resurrection on that day; giving the first cause of it, as the creation-rest did of the seventh day: 2. Secretly commanding it to his apostles. 3. Commissioning them to promulgate all his commands. 4. Sending down the Spirit on that very day. 5. And by that Spirit determining them by promulgation to determine publicly of the day, and settle all the churches in long possession of it before their death. That which is thus done, may well be said to be done by Christ. 6. And what show of contradiction hath his *Τιμωμεν*, to this? 'It was commanded first that the Sabbath day should be observed in memory of the accomplishment of the world: so do we celebrate the Lord's-day, as a memorial of the beginning of a new creation.' Had not he a creating head here, that out of these words could gather, that we celebrate the Lord's-day without a command voluntarily? One would think 'so' should signify the contrary.

But *ib.* page 8, he citeth Socrates for the same, saying that 'The design of the apostles was not to busy themselves in prescribing festival-days, but to instruct the people in the ways of godliness.'

*Answ.* Socrates plainly rebuketh the busy ceremonious arrogancy of after-ages for making new holidays; and doth not at all mean the Lord's-day; but saith that to make festivals, that is, other and more, as since they did, was none of the apostles' business. Nor is this any thing at all to the matter of fact, which none denied.

16. I will add that as another testimony which (p. 9.) he citeth against it. The council at Paris, anno 829. c. 50. which, as he speaketh, ascribeth the keeping of the Lord's-day to apostolical tradition, confirmed by the authority of the church. The words are, 'ut creditur apostolorum traditione, immo ecclesiæ autoritate descendit, &c.' Now I have proved that if the apostles did it, they did it by the Holy Ghost, and by authority from Christ.

But he citeth (p. 7, 8.) the words of Athanasius, Maximus, Taurinensis and Augustine, saying that 'We honour the Lord's-day for the resurrection, and because Christ rose,' and (Aug.) 'The Lord's-day was declared to Christians by the resurrection of our Lord, and from that (or from him rather) began to have its festivity.' From whence he gathereth that it was only done by the authority of the church, and not by any precept of our Saviour.

*Ans.* As if Christ's resurrection could not be the fundamental occasion, and yet Christ's law the obliging cause? Would any else have thus argued, 'The Jews observed the Seventh-day-Sabbath, because the Creator rested the seventh day: therefore they had no command from God for it?' Wo to the churches that have such expositors of God's commands! or, as if Christ who both commissioned and inspired the apostles by the Holy Ghost, to teach all his commands, and settle church orders, were not thus the chief Author of what they did by his commission and Spirit. What church can shew the same commission, or the like miraculous and infallible Spirit as they had?

See further August. de Civitat. Dei. l. 22. c. 30. and Serm. 15. de Verb. Apostol.

But saith he, 'Christ and two of his disciples travelled on the day of his resurrection from Jerusalem to Emmaus, seven miles, and back again, which they would not have done, if it had been a Sabbath.'

*Ans.* 1. They would not have done it if it had been a Jewish Sabbath of ceremonial rest; but those which you call too precise, will go as far now in case of need to hear a sermon; and remember that they spent the time in Christ's preaching and their hearing and conferring after of it. 2. But we grant that though the foundation was laid by Christ's resurrection, yet it was not a law fully promulgate to, and understood by the apostles, till the coming down of the Holy Ghost (nor many greater matters neither), who was promised and given to teach them all things, &c.

And it is worth the noting, how Heylin beginneth his Chap. iii. l. 2. 'The Lord's-day taken up by the common consent of the church, not instituted or established by any text of Scripture, or edict of emperor, or decree of council, save that some few councils did reflect upon it. In that

which follows we shall find both emperors and councils very frequent in ordering things about this day and the service of it.'

*Ans.* Note reader, What could possibly, besides Christ and the Holy Ghost in the apostles, be the instituter of a day, which neither emperor nor council instituted, and yet was received by the common consent of all churches in the world, even from, and in the apostles' days? Yea, as this man confesseth, 'by their approbation and authority?'

But henceforward in the fourth century I am prevented from bringing in my most numerous witnesses, by Heylin's confession, that now emperors, councils, and all, were for it. But yet let the reader remember, 1. How few and small records be left of the second century, and not many of the third. 2. And that historical copious testimonies of the fourth century, that is, emperors, councils, and the most pious and learned fathers, attesting that the universal church received it from the apostles, is not vain, or a small evidence; when as the fourth century began but two hundred years after St. John's death, or within less than a year.

And that the first Christian emperor finding all Christians unanimous in the possession of the day, should make a law (as our kings do) for the due observing of it; and that the first General Council should establish uniformity in the very gesture of worship on that day, are strong confirmations of the matter of fact, that the churches unanimously agreed in the holy use of it, as a separated day, even from and in the apostles' days.

*Object.* 'But the Emperor Constantine's edict alloweth husbandmen to labour.'

*Ans.* Only in case of apparent hazard, lest the fruits of the earth be lost; as we allow seamen to work at sea, in case of necessity. And so though by his second edict manumission was allowed to the judge, as an act of charity, yet they were forbidden judging in all other ordinary causes, lest the day be profaned by wrangling.

Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, by their edict forbad public spectacles or shows on the Lord's-day. And afterward Valentinian and Valens made an edict that no 'Christian should on that day be convented by the Exactors or Receivers.'

*Object.* 'But (saith Heylin) for three hundred years there was no law to bind men to that day.'

*Answ.* The apostles' institution was a law of Christ by his Spirit, (Matt. xxviii. 20.) And how should there be a human law, before there was a Christian magistracy?

*Object.* (Saith Heylin, p. 95.) 'The powers which raised it up, may take it lower if they please, yea, take it quite away,' &c.

*Answ.* True; that is, Christ may; and when he doth it by himself, or by new apostles, who confirm their commission by miracles, we will obey; but we expect his presence with the apostolical constitution to the end of the world. (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

Theodosius also enacted that on the Lord's-day, and in the Christmas, and on Easter, and to Whitsuntide, the public cirques and theatres should be shut up. (For we grant that when Christian magistrates took the matter in hand, other holy days were brought in by degrees; whereas before the Christians indeed met (yea, and communicated) as oft as they could, even most of the days in the week; but did not separate the days as holy to God's service, as they did the Lord's-day: only Christmas-day, and the memorials of those martyrs that were near them (to encourage the people to constancy) they honoured somewhat early; but those were anniversary, and not weekly. And the Wednesdays and Fridays, were kept by them but as we keep them now, or as a lecture-day.

I grant also that when Christian magistracy arose, as the holy days multiplied, the manner of the day's observation altered. For whereas from the beginning, the Christians used to stay together from morning till night, (partly through devotion, and partly for fear of persecution, if they were noted to go in and out;) afterward being free, they met twice a day, with intermission, as we do now. Not that their whole day's service was but an hour or two, as Heylin would prove from a perverted word of Chrysostom's, and another of Origen's (or Ruffinus), and from the length of their published homilies; for he perverteth what was spoken of the sermon, as spoken of the length of the service of the whole day; whereas there was much more time spent in the eucharistical and liturgic offices, of prayer, praise, sacra-

ments, and exhortations proper to the church, than was in the sermon. When I was suffered to exercise my ministry myself, having four hundred, or five hundred, if not six hundred, to administer the sacrament to (though twice the number kept themselves away), it took up the time of two sermons usually to administer it, besides all the ordinary readings, prayers and praises, morning and evening.

Heylin noteth by the way, 1. That now officiating in a white garment begun. 2. And kneeling at the sacrament; which last he proveth from two or three words where adoration only is named. But, 1. A late Treatise hath fully proved that the *white garment* was not a religious ceremony then at all, but the ordinary splendid apparel of honourable persons in those times, which were thought meet for the honour of the ministry when Christian princes did advance them. 2. And he quite forgot that adoration on the Lord's-day was ever used standing, and that he had said before, that it was above a thousand years before the custom was altered.

The inclinations to overmuch strictness on the Lord's-day. The destruction of the army of the Goths by the Romans in Africa, because they would not fight on that day, &c. See in Heylin, pp. 112, 113, &c. His translation of the words of the Synod or Council at Mascon, 588, I think worthy the transcribing.

"It is observed that Christian people do very rashly slight and neglect the Lord's-day; giving themselves thereon, as other days, to continual labours, &c. Therefore let every Christian, in case he carry not that name in vain, give ear to our instruction; knowing that we have care that you should do well, as well as the power to bridle you, that you do not ill. It followeth, 'Custodite diem Dominicum qui nos denuo peperit, &c.' Keep the Lord's-day, the day of our new birth, whereupon we were delivered from the snares of sin. Let no man meddle in litigious controversies, or deal in actions or lawsuits; or put himself at all on such an exigent, that needs he must prepare his oxen for their daily work, but exercise yourselves in hymns, and singing praises unto God; being intent thereon both in mind and body. If any have a church at hand, let him go unto it, and there pour forth his soul in tears and prayers; his eyes and hands being all that day lifted up to God. It is the everlasting

day of rest, insinuated to us under the shadow of the Seventh-day or Sabbath, in the law and prophets: And therefore it is very meet that we should celebrate this day with one accord, whereon we have been made what at first we were not. Let us then offer to God our free and voluntary service, by whose great goodness we are freed from the gaol of error: not that the Lord exacts it of us, that we should celebrate this day in a corporeal abstinence or rest from labour, who only looks that we do yield obedience to his holy will, by which contemning earthly things, he may conduct us to the heavens of his infinite mercy. However if any man shall set at nought this our exhortation, be he assured, that God shall punish him as he hath deserved; and that he shall be also subject unto the censures of the church. In case he be a lawyer, he shall lose his cause; if that he be an husbandman, or servant, he shall be corporally punished for it; but if a clergyman or monk, he shall be six months separated from the congregation."

His reproof of Gregorius Tauronensis for his strictness for the Lord's-day, sheweth but his own dissent from him, and from the churches of that age.

King Alfred's laws for the observation of the Lord's-day, and against dicing, drinking, &c. on it, are visible in our constitutions, in Spelman and others. And many more edicts and laws are recited by Heylin himself of other countries.

Two are worthy of observation for the reasons of them. 1. A law of Clotharius king of France, forbidding servile labours on the Lord's-day, 'Because the law forbids it, and the holy Scripture wholly contradicteth it.' 2. A constitution of the emperor Leo Philosophus, to the same purpose, '*Secundum quod Spiritui sancto ab ipsoque institutis apostolis placuit*; as it pleased the Holy Ghost and the apostles instructed by him.' You see that then Christian princes judged the Lord's-day to be of Divine institution. Yea, to these he addeth two more princes of the same mind, confessing that Leo was himself a scholar, and Charles the Great had as learned men about him as the times then bred, and yet were thus persuaded of the day; yea, and that many miracles were pretended in confirmation of it; yet he affirmeth, that the 'Church and the most learned men in it were of another mind.' Let us hear his proofs.



1. Saith he, 'Isidore a bishop of Sevil makes it an apostolical sanction only, no Divine commandment: a day designed by the apostles, for religious exercises in honour of our Saviour's resurrection; and it was called the Lord's-day therefore: to this end and purpose, that resting in the same from all earthly acts, and the temptations of the world, we might intend God's holy worship, giving this day due honour for the hope of the resurrection which we have therein.' The same verbatim is repeated by Beda. 1. de Offic. and by Rabban. Maurus 1. de instit. Chr. 1. c. 2. 24, and by Alcuinus de Div. Offic. c. 24, which plainly shews, that all these took it only for an apostolical usage, &c.

*Answ.* Reader, is not here a strange kind of proof? This is but just the same that we assert, and I am proving; save that he most grossly puts an apostolical usage, and sanction ('sanxerunt') as distinct from, and exclusive of a command, which I have fully proved to be Christ's own act and law to us, by virtue of, 1. Their commission: 2. And the infallible Spirit given them.

And having brought the history to so fair an account by our chief adversary's own citations and confessions, I will not tire myself and the reader any more; but only wish every Christian to consider, whether they that thus distinguish between apostolical sanctions, and Divine institutions as this man doth, do not teach men to deny all the holy Scriptures of the New Testament, as being but apostolical writings; and go far to deny or subvert Christianity itself; by denying the Divine authority of these commissioned inspired men, who are foundations of the church, and sealed their doctrine by miracles, and from whom it is that our Christian faith, and laws, and church-constitutions, which are universal and Divine, are received.

I only remember you of Pliny, a heathen's testimony of the Christian's practice 'stato die.' No man can question Pliny on the account of partiality; and therefore though a heathen, his historical testimony, as joined with all the Christian church-history, hath its credibility. He telleth Trajan, that it was the use of Christians, 'on a stated day, before it was light to meet together, to sing a hymn to Christ as to God 'secum invicem,' among themselves by turns; and to bind themselves by a sacrament, not to do any wickedness, but that they commit not thefts, robberies,

adulteries ; that they break not their word (or trust) ; that they deny not the pledge (or pawn) ; which being ended, they used to depart, and to come again together to take meat, but promiscuous and harmless.' Epist. 79. p. 306, 307.

Where note, 1. That by a stated day, he can mean no other than the Lord's-day, as the consent of all other history will prove. 2. That this is much like the testimonies of Justin and Tertullian (and supposing what they say of the use of reading the Scripture, and instructing the church) it sheweth that their chief work on that day, was the praising of God for our redemption by Christ, and the celebration of the Lord's-supper ; and the disciplinary exercises of covenanters thereto belonging. 3. That they had at that time, where Pliny was, two meetings that day, that is, they went home, and came again to their feast of love, in the evening. (Which, no doubt, was varied, as several times, and places, and occasions required ; sometimes departing and coming again, and sometimes staying together all day.) 4. That this epistle of Pliny was written in Trajan's days, and it is supposed in his second year : and Trajan was emperor in the year that St. John the apostle died, if not a year before ; so that it is the church's custom in the end of the apostles' days, which Pliny here writeth of. 5. That he had the fullest testimony of what he wrote, it being the consent of the Christians whom he, as judge, examined ; even of the timorous that denied their religion, as well as of the rest. And many of them upon his prohibition forbore these meetings. 6. And the number of them he telleth Trajan in city and country was great, of persons of all degrees and ranks.

So that when, 1. Christian History, 2. And Heathen, acquaint us with the matter of fact, that the day was kept in the apostle's time ; 3. Yea, when no heretics or sects of Christians are found contradicting it, but the churches then and after universally practised it without any controversy ; what fuller historical evidence can there be ? And to say, that, 1. The apostles would not have reprov'd this, if it had not been their own doing : 2. Or that it could be done, and they not know it : 3. And that all Christians who acknowledged their authority, would have consented in such a practice superstitiously before their faces, and against their wills, and no testimony be left us of one faithful church

or Christian that contradicted it, and stuck to the apostolical authority, even where the churches received their writings, and publicly read them; all this is such, as is not by sober Christians to be believed.

But the great objection will be, 'That other things were then taken for apostolical traditions, and were customs of the universal church, as well as this; which things we now renounce as superstitious.'

*Ans.* Though I answered this briefly before, I now give you this fuller answer: 1. It is but few things that come under this charge, viz. the unction, white garment, with the taste of milk and honey at baptism, adoration towards the East, and that standing; and not kneeling on the Lord's-days, and the anniversary observation of Easter and Whitsuntide: and the last is but the keeping of one or two Lord's-days in the year with some note of distinction from the rest, so far as there was any agreement in it. 2. That these are not usually by the ancients called apostolical traditions, but customs of the universal church: 3. That when they are called traditions from the apostles, it is not with an assertion that the apostles instituted them, but that they are supposed to be from their times, because their original is not known. 4. That the ancients join not the Lord's-day with these, but take the Lord's-day for an apostolical institution written in Scripture, though the universal practice of all churches more fully deliver the certain history of it: but the rest they take for unwritten customs, as distinct from Scripture ordinances. (As Epiphanius justly sheweth.) 5. That most Christians are agreed, that if these latter could be proved apostolical institutions for the church universal, it would be our duty to use them, though they were not in Scripture. So that we reject them only for want of such proof; but the proof of the Lord's-day's separation being far better (by concurrence of Scripture and all ancient history), it followeth not that we must doubt of that which hath full and certain proof, because we must doubt of that which wants it. 6. And if it were necessary that they stood or fell together (as it is not), it were necessary that we did receive those three or four ceremonies, for the sake of the Lord's-day, which hath so great evidence, rather than that we cast off the Lord's-day, because of these ceremonies.

Not only because there is more good in the Lord's-day than there is evil to be any way suspected by a doubter in these ceremonies; but especially because the evidence for the day is so great, that if the said ceremonies had but the same, they were undoubtedly of Divine authority or institution. In a word, I have shewed you somewhat of the evidence for the Lord's-day; do you shew me the like for them, and then I will prove that both must be received; but if you cannot, do not pretend a parity. 7. And the same churches laying by the customs aforesaid, or most of them, did shew that they took them not indeed for apostolical institutions, as they did the Lord's-day, which they continued to observe; not as a ceremony, but as a necessary thing. 8. And the ancient churches did believe, that even in the apostles' days some things were used as indifferent, which were mutable, and not laws, but temporary customs. And some things were necessary, settled by law for perpetuity. Of the former kind they thought were, the greeting one another with an holy kiss, the women's praying covered with a veil, (of which the apostle saith, that it was then and there so decent, that the contrary would have been unseemly, and the churches of God had no such custom, by which he answereth the contentions), yet in other countries, where custom altereth the signification, it may be otherwise: also that a man wear not long hair; and that they have a love-feast on the Lord's-day, (which yet Paul seemeth to begin to alter in his rebuke of the abusers of it. 1 Cor. 11). And if these ancient churches thought the milk and honey, and the white garment, and the station and adoration Eastwards, to be also such like indifferent mutable customs, as it is apparent they did, this is nothing at all to invalidate our proof, that the Lord's-day was used (and consequently appointed) in the days of the apostles.

*Object.* 'At least it will prove it mutable as they were.'

*Ans.* No such matter: because the very nature of such circumstances, having no stated necessity or uneasiness, sheweth them to be mutable. But the reason of the Lord's-day's use is perpetual; and it is founded partly in the law of nature, which telleth us that some stated days should be set apart for holy things; and partly in the positive part of the fourth commandment; which telleth us, that 'once

God determined of one day in seven,' yea, and this upon the ground of his own cessation of his creation-work, that man on that day might observe a holy rest in the worshipping of the great Creator, which is a reason not belonging to the Jews only, but to the whole world. Yea, and that reason (whatever Dr. Heylin says to the contrary, from the mere silence of the former history in Genesis) doth seem plainly to intimate that this is but the repetition of that law of the Sabbath which was given to Adam; for why should God begin two thousand years after to give men a Sabbath upon the reason of his rest from the creation of it, if he had never called man to that commemoration before.

And it is certain that the Sabbath was observed at the falling of manna before the giving of the law; and let any considering Christian judge between Dr. Heylin and us in this: 1. Whether the not falling of manna, on the rest of God after the creation, was like to be the original reason of the Sabbath. 2. And whether, if it had been the first, it would not have been said, "Remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day;" for on six days manna fell, and not on the seventh, rather than "for in six days God created heaven and earth, &c. and rested the seventh day." And it is causally added, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Nay, consider whether this annexed reason intimate not, that the day on this ground being hallowed before, therefore it was that God sent not down the manna on that day, and that he prohibited the people from seeking it.

And he that considereth the brevity of the history in Genesis, will think he is very bold, that obtrudeth on the world his negative argument: 'The Sabbath is not there mentioned; therefore it was not then kept.'

And if it was a positive law given to Adam on the reason of the creation-rest, it was then such a positive, as must be next to a law of nature, and was given to all mankind in Adam, and Adam must needs be obliged to deliver it down to the world.

So that though the Mosaical law (even as given in stone) be ceased, yea, and Adam's positives too, formally as such; yet this is sure, that once God himself determined by a law, that one stated day in seven, was the fittest proportion of time to be separated to holy worship. And if it was so

once, yea, to all the world from the creation, it is so still : because there is still the same reason for it ; and we are bound to judge God's determination of the proportion, to be wiser than any that we can make. And so by parity of reason consequentially even those abrogated laws do thus far bind us still ; not so far as abrogated ; but because the record and reason of them, is still a signification of the due proportion of time, and consequently of our duty.

Now the Lord's-day, supposing one weekly day to be due, and being but that day determined of, and this upon the reason of the resurrection, and for the commemoration of our redemption, and that by such inspired and authorised persons, it followeth clearly, that this is no such mutable ceremony, as a love-feast, or the kiss of love, or the veil, or the washing of feet, or the anointing of the sick, which were mostly occasional actions and customs taken up upon reasons proper to those times and places.

*Object.* ' But by the reason aforesaid, you will prove the continuance of the Seventh-day Sabbath ; as grounded on the creation-rest.'

*Answ.* This is anon to be answered in another place. I only prove that it continued, till a successive dispensation, and God's own change did put an end to it ; but no longer.

*Object.* ' But to commemorate the creation, and praise the Creator, is a moral work, and therefore ceaseth not.'

*Answ.* True, but that it be done on the seventh day, is that which ceaseth. For the same work is transferred to the Lord's-day ; and the Creator and Redeemer to be honoured together in our commemoration. For the Son is the only way to the Father ; who hath restored us to peace with our Creator ; and as no man cometh to the Father but by the Son, and as we must not now worship God, as a Creator and Father never offended, but as a Creator and Father reconciled by Christ, so is it the appointment of Christ by the Holy Ghost, that we commemorate the work of creation now, as repaired and restored by the work of redemption, on the Lord's-day, which is now separated to these works.

That the Sabbath was appointed to Adam, Wallæus on the Fourth Commandment, cap. 3. ; and Rivet dissert. de sab. c. 1. have most copiously proved. And Clem. Alexandr. Strom. l. 5. out of Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus and others, proveth that the heathens knew of it.

We may therefore sum up the prerogatives of the Lord's-day, as Leo did, (Ep. 81. cap. 1.) 'On this day the world began; on this day by Christ's resurrection, death did receive death, and life its beginning; on this day the apostles take the trumpet of the Gospel to be preached to all nations; on this day the Holy Ghost came from the Lord to the apostles, &c.' See more in Athanas. de Sab. et Circ. and August. Serm. 154. de Tempore. Therefore saith Isychius in Levit. l. 2. c. 9. 'The church setteth apart the Lord's-day for holy assemblies.' And in the times of heathenish persecution, when men were asked, whether they were Christians, and kept the Lord's-days; they answered that they were, and kept the Lord's-day; which Christians must not omit: as you may see Act. Martyr. apud. Baron. an. 303. n. 37—39. They would die rather than not keep the holy assemblies on the Lord's-days: For, saith Ignatius, 'After the Sabbath, every lover of Christ celebrateth the Lord's-day, consecrated to (or by) the Lord's resurrection, the queen and chief of all days' (as is aforecited). For saith Austin, 'The Lord's resurrection hath promised us an eternal day, and consecrated to us the Lord's-day, which is called the Lord's-day, and properly belongeth to the Lord,' Serm. 15. de Verb. Apost. And saith Hilary, Proleg. in Psalm, 'Though the name and observance of a Sabbath was placed to the seventh day, yet is it the eighth day, which is also the first, on which we rejoice with the perfect festivity of the Sabbath.'

Of the full keeping of the whole day, and of the several exercises in which it was spent, and of the more numerous testimonies of antiquity hereupon, Dr. Young in his "Dies Dominica" hath said so much, with so much evidence and judgment, that I purposely omit abundance of such testimonies, because I will not do that which he hath already done; the learned reader may there find unanswerable proof of the matter of fact, that the Lord's-day was kept in the apostles' days, and ever since, as by their appointment; and for the unlearned reader, I fear lest I have too much interrupted him with citations already. I only tell him the conclusion, that, if Scripture-history interpreted and seconded by fullest practice and history of all the churches of Christ, and by the consent of heathens and heretics, and not contradicted by any sect in the world, be to be believed, then

we must say, that the Lord's-day was commonly kept by the Christians in and from the apostles' times.

*Prop. 11.* ' This evidence of the church's universal constant usage, is a full and sufficient proof of the matter of fact, that it was a day set apart by the apostles for holy worship, especially in the public church-assemblies.'

1. It is a full proof, that such assemblies were held on that day above others, as a separated day. For if it was the usage in anno 100, (in which the apostle John died,) it must needs be the usage in the year 99, in which he wrote his Revelations, where he calleth it the Lord's-day : For all the churches could not silently agree on a sudden to take up a new day, without debate and public notice, which could not be concealed. And if it was the universal usage in the days of Ignatius or Justin Martyr, it was so also in the days of St. John (and so before). For the churches were then so far dispersed over the world, that it would have taken up much time to have had councils and meetings or any other means for agreement on such things.

And it is utterly improbable that there would have been no dissenters ; for, 1. Did no Christians in the world so near to the apostles' days make any scruple of superstition, or of such an addition to Divine institutions ? 2. Was there no country, nor no persons whose interest would not better suit with another day, or an uncertain day, or at least their opinions ? when we find it now so hard a matter to bring men in one country, to be all of one opinion. 3. And there was then no magistrates to force them to such an union ; and therefore it must be voluntary. 4. And they had in the second age such pastors as the apostles themselves had ordained, and as had conversed with them, and been trained up by them, and knew their mind, and cannot soberly be thought likely to consent all on a sudden to such a new institution, without and contrary to the apostles' sense and practice. 5. Yea, they had yet ministers that had that extraordinary spirit which was given by the laying on of the apostles' hands : For if the aged apostles ordained young men, it is to be supposed that most of those young men (such as Timothy), overlived them. 6. Yea, and the ordinary Christians in those times had those extraordinary gifts by the laying on of the apostles' hands, as appeareth evi-



dently in the case of Samaria, (Acts viii,) and of the Corinthians, (1 Cor. xii. and xiv,) and of the Galatians. (Gal. iii. 1—3.) And it is not to be suspected that all these inspired ministers and people would consent to a superstitious innovation, without and against the apostles' minds.

2. Therefore this history is a full proof, that these things were done by the consent and appointment of the apostles. For, 1. As is said, the inspired persons and churches could not so suddenly be brought to forsake them universally in such a case. 2. The churches had all so high an esteem of the apostles, that they took their authority for the highest, and their judgment for infallible, and therefore received their writings as canonical and Divine. 3. The churches professed to observe the Lord's-day as an apostolical ordinance, and they cannot be all supposed to have conspired in a lie, yea, to have belied the Holy Ghost. 4. The apostles themselves would have controlled this course, if it had not been by their own appointment. For I have proved that the usage was in their own days. And they were not so careless of the preservation of Christ's ordinances and churches, as to let such things be done, without contradiction; when it is known how Paul strove to resist and retrench all the corruptions of church-order in the churches to which he wrote. If the apostles silently connived at such corruptions, how could we rest on their authority? Especially the apostle John in an. 99, would rather have written against it as the superstition of usurpers (as he checked Diotrephes for contempt of him), than have said that he was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day when he saw Christ, and received his revelation and message to the churches. 5. And if the churches had taken up this practice universally without the apostles, it is utterly improbable that no church writer would have committed to memory either that one church that begun the custom, or the council or means used for a sudden confederacy therein. If it had begun with some one church, it would have been long before the rest would have been brought to an agreeing consent. It was many hundred years before they all agreed of the time of Easter; and it was not till the middle of Chrysostom's time (for he saith it was but ten years ago, when he wrote it) that they agreed of the time of Christ's nativity.

But if it had been done by confederacy at once, the motion,

the council called about it, the debates, and the dissenters, and resistances would all have been matter of fact, so notable, as would have found a place in some author or church-history; whereas there is not a syllable of any such thing; either of council, letter, messenger, debate, resistance, &c. Therefore it is evident, that the thing was done by the apostles.

*Prop. 12.* 'They that will deny the validity of this historical evidence, do by consequence betray the Christian faith, or give away or deny the necessary means of proving the truth of it, and of many great particulars of religion.'

I suppose that in my book, called, "The Reasons of the Christian Religion," I have proved that Christianity is proved true, by the SPIRIT, as the great witness of Christ, and of the Christian verity; but I have proved withal, the necessity and certainty of historical means, to bring the matters of fact to our notice, as sense itself did bring them to the notice of the first receivers. For instance:

I. Without such historical evidence and certainty, we cannot be certain what books of Scripture are truly canonical and of Divine authority, and what not. This Protestants grant to Papists in the controversy of tradition. Though the canon be itself complete, and tradition is no supplement to make up the Scriptures, as if they were, 'in suo genere,' imperfect; yet it is commonly granted that our fathers' and teachers' tradition is the hand to deliver us this perfect rule, and to tell us what parts make up the canon.

If any say that the books do prove themselves to be canonical or Divine, I answer, 1. What man alive could tell without historical proof that the Canticles, or Esther, are canonical? yea, or Ecclesiastes, or the Proverbs, and not the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus?

2. How can any man know that the Scripture-histories are canonical? The suitableness of them to a holy soul, will do much to confirm one that is already holy, of the truth of the doctrines. But if the Spirit within us assure us immediately of the truth of the history, it must be by inspiration and revelation, which no Christians have, that ever I was yet acquainted with. For instance, that the books of Chronicles are canonical, or the book of Esther, or the books of the Kings, or Samuel, or Judges. And how much doth the doctrine of Christianity depend on the history? As of the

creation, of the Israelites' bondage and deliverance, and the giving of the law, and Moses' miracles, and of chronology, and Christ's genealogy; and of the history of Christ's own nativity, miracles and life; and the history of the apostles afterwards? To say, that the very history so far proveth its own truth, as that without subsequent history we can be sure of it, and must be, is to reduce all Christ's church of right believers into a narrow room; when I never knew the man (as far as I could perceive) did know the history to be Divine by its proper evidence, without tradition, and subsequent history.

3. And how can any man know the ceremonial law to be Divine, by its proper evidence alone? Who is he that readeth over Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, that will say that without knowing by history that this is a Divine record, he could have certainly perceived by the book itself, that all these were indeed Divine institutions or laws?

4. And how can any mere positive institutions of the New Testament be known '*proprio lumine*,' by their own evidence to be Divine? As the institution of sacraments, officers, orders, &c. What is there in them that can infallibly prove it to us?

5. And how can any prophecies be known by their own evidence to be Divine (till they are fulfilled, and that shall prove it)?

I know that the whole frame together of the Christian religion hath its sufficient evidence, but we must not be guilty of a peevish rejecting it. The moral part hath its witness within us, in that state of holiness which it imprinteth on the soul; and the rest are witnessed to, or proved partly by that and partly by miracles, and those and the records by historical evidence. But when God hath made many things necessary to the full evidence, and wranglers through partiality and contention against each other, will some throw away one part, and some another, they will all prove destroyers of the faith (as all dividers be). If the Papist will say, it is tradition, and not inherent evidence; or if others will say, that it is inherent evidence alone, and not history or tradition, where God hath made both needful hereunto, both will be found injurious to the faith.

II. Without this historical evidence, we cannot prove

that any of the books of Scripture are not maimed or depraved. That they come to our hands as the apostles and evangelists wrote them, uncorrupted. It is certain by history, that many heretics did deprave and corrupt them, and would have obtruded those copies or corruptions on the churches. And how we shall certainly prove that they did not prevail, or that their copies are false, and ours are true, I know not without the help of history. Mahomet and his followers (more numerous than the Christians) pretend that Mahomet's name was in the Gospel of John as the Paraclete or Comforter promised by Christ, and that the Christians have blotted it out, and altered the writings of the Gospel. And how shall we disprove them but by historical evidence? As the Arians and Socinians pretend that we have added, 1 John v. 7, for the Trinity, so others say of other texts; and how shall we confute them without historical evidence?

III. Therefore we cannot make good the authority of any one single verse or text of Scripture which we shall allege, without historical evidence. Because we are not certain of that particular text, (or words,) whether it have been altered, or added, or corrupted, by the fraud of heretics, or the partiality of some Christians, or the oversight of scribes; for if a custom of setting apart one day weekly, even the first, for public worship, might creep into all the churches in the world, and no man know how, nor when; much more might one, or a few corrupt copies, become the exemplar of those that follow. For, what day all the churches meet, men, women, and children know; learned and unlearned know; the orthodox and heretics know; and they so know, as that they cannot choose but know. But the alterations of a text, may be unknown to all save the learned, and the observing, diligent part of the learned only, and those that they tell it to. And besides Origen (called a heretic) and Jerome, alas! how few of the fathers were able and diligent examiners of such things? Therefore in the case of various readings (such as Ludovicus Capellus treats of in his "*Critica Sacra*," contradicted in many things by bishop Usher and others,) who are those divines that have hitherto appealed either to the Spirit, or to the proper light of the words, for a decision? Who is it that doth not presently fly to historical evidence? And what that cannot determine, we all confess to be uncer-

tain. And if copies and history had delivered to us as various readings of every text, as they have done of some, every text would have remained uncertain to us.

Let none say, that this leaveth the Christian religion or the Scriptures uncertain: 1. Christian religion, that is, the material parts of the Scripture, on which our salvation lieth, hath much fuller evidence, than each particular text or canonical book hath; and we need not regard the perverse zeal for the Scriptures of those men that would make all our Christianity as uncertain, as the authority of a particular text or book is. And therefore God in mercy hath so ordered it, that a thousand texts may be uncertain to us, or not understood (no not by any or many divines,) and yet the Christian faith be not at all shaken, or ever the more uncertain for this: When as he that understandeth not, or believeth not every essential article of the faith, is no Christian. 2. And those books and texts of Scripture, are fully certain by the subservient help of history and usage, which would be uncertain without them. Therefore it is the act of an enemy of the Scriptures, to cast away and dispute against that history which is necessary to our knowledge of its certainty, and afterwards to plead, that they who take in those necessary helps, do make it uncertain: even as if they should go about to prove that all writings are uncertain, and therefore that they make Christ's doctrine uncertain, who rest upon the credit of writings, that is, the Sacred Scriptures.

IV. Without historical notice, how should we know that these books were written by any of the same men that bear their names; as Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, &c. Especially when the heretics did put forth the Gospel of Thomas, Nicodemus, the Itinerary of Peter, and many books under venerable names? Or, when the name of the author is not notified to all Christians certainly, either by the Spirit within us, or by the matter? And though our salvation depend not on the notice of the penman, yet it is of great moment in the matter of faith.

V. And how should we be certain that no other sacred books are lost, the knowledge of which would tell us of that which these contain not, and would help us to the better understanding of these? I know that a 'p priori' we may argue from God's goodness, that he will not so forsake his

church; as a Jew might have done before Christ's incarnation, that the Gospel should be written, because it is best for the world or church. But when we consider how much of the world and church, God hath forsaken, since the creation, and how dark we are in such prognostics, and how little we know what the church's sins may provoke God to, we should be less confident of such reasonings, than we are of historical evidence, which tells us 'de facto,' what God hath done. So much of the use of the history, as to the cause of the Scriptures themselves.

Next you may observe that the denial of the certainty of human history, and usage, doth disadvantage Christianity in many great particular concernments. As, I. Without it we should not fully know whether 'de facto' the church and ministry died, or almost died with the apostles? And whether there have been any true churches since then, till our own days? Christ's promise indeed tells us much; but if we had no history of the performance of it we should be ready to doubt that it might be yet unperformed; as far as the promise to Adam, (Gen. iii. 15,) and to Abraham, ("In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,") were till the coming of Christ. Nor could we easily confute the Roman or any heretical usurpation, which would pretend possession since the apostles' days, and that all that are since gone to heaven, have gone thither by their way, and not by ours.

II. Nor could we much better tell 'de facto,' whether baptism have been administered in the form appointed by Christ, "In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?" Indeed we may well and truly argue a 'priori,' Christ commanded it, ergo the apostles obeyed him: But, 1. That argument would hold good as to none or few but the apostles: And, 2. It would as to them be, though true, yet much more dark than now it is; because, 1. We read that Peter disobeyed his command, in Gal. ii. And, 2. That after he had commanded them to preach the Gospel to every creature, and all the world, Peter scrupled still going to the Gentiles. (Acts x.) And, 3. That when he said to them, "Pray thus, Our Father," &c. yet we never read that they after used that form of words; so when he said to them, "Baptize in the name of the Father," &c. yet the Scrip-

ture never mentioneth that they or any other person, ever used that form of words. But yet usage and history assureth us that they did.

III. Nor have we any fuller Scripture-proof, that the apostles used to require of those that were to be baptized any more than a general profession of the substance of the Christian faith, in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; or of the ancient use of the Christian creed, either in the words now used, or any of the same importance. From whence many would infer, that any one is to be baptized, who will but say that, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," with the eunuch, (Acts viii. 37,) or that Christ is come in the flesh. (1 John iv. 2, 3.)

But historical evidence assureth us, that it was usual in those times, to require of men a more explicit understanding profession of the Christian faith before they were admitted to baptism; and that they had a summary or symbol, fitted to that use, commonly called the Apostles' Creed; at least as to the constant tenor of the matter, though some words might be left to the speaker's will, and some little subordinate articles may be since added. And that it was long after usual to keep men in the state of catechised persons, till they understood that creed. And it is in itself exceeding probable, that though among the intelligent Jews, who had long expected the Messiah, the apostles did baptize thousands in a day; (Acts ii;) yet where the miraculous communication of the Spirit did not antecede (as it did Acts x,) they would make poor heathens who had been bred in ignorance, to understand what they did first, and would require of them an understanding profession of their belief in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which could not possibly contain much less than the 'Symbolum fidei,' the apostles' creed.

IV. Nor have we any Scripture-proof, (except by inferring obedience from the precept) that ever the Lord's-prayer was used in words, after Christ commanded or delivered it: whence some infer, that it should not be so used. But church history putteth that past doubt. Other such instances I pretermitt.

I think now that I have fully proved to sober, considerate Christians, that the matter of fact (that the Lord's-day was

appointed by the apostles peculiarly for church worship) is certain to us by historical evidence, added to the historical intimations in Scripture, as a full exposition and confirmation of it: and that this is a proof, that no Christian can deny without insufferable injury to the Scriptures and the Christian cause.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

*PROP. 5. This Act of the Apostles' appointing the Lord's-day for Christian Worship, was done by the special Inspiration or Guidance of the Holy Ghost.*

THIS is proved, 1. Because it is one of those acts or works of their office, for which the Holy Ghost was promised them.

2. Because that such-like or smaller things are by them ascribed to the Holy Ghost, (Acts xv. 28,) "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us," when they did but declare an antecedent duty, and decide a controversy thereabout. See also, Acts iv. 8; v. 3; vi. 3; vii. 55; xiii. 2. 4; xvi. 6, 7; xx. 23. 28; xxi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 14; Jud. xx; Acts xi. 12. 28: xix. 21; xx. 22; 1 Cor. v. 3, 4; xiv. 2. 15, 16; and vii. 40. When Paul doth but counsel to a single life, he ascribeth it to the Spirit of God.

3. And if any will presume to say, that men properly endued with the Spirit, for the works of their commission, did notwithstanding do such great things as this, without the conduct of that Spirit, they may by the same way of proceeding pretend it to be as uncertain, of every particular book and chapter in the New Testament, whether or no they wrote it by the Spirit: For if it be a sound inference 'They had the promise and gift of the Spirit, that they might infallibly leave in writing to the churches, the doctrines and precepts of Christ: ergo, whatever they have left in writing to the churches, as the doctrine and precepts of Christ, is infallibly done by the guidance of that Spirit.' Then it will be as good an inference 'They had the promise and gift of the Spirit, that they might infallibly settle church-orders for all the churches universally: ergo, What-



ever church-orders they settled for all the churches universally, they settled them by the infallible guidance of that Spirit.'

But this few Christians will deny, except some Papists, who would bring down apostolical constitutions to a lower rank and rate, that the Pope and General Council may be capable of laying claim to the like themselves; and so may make as many more laws for the church as they please, and pretend such an authority for it as the apostles did for theirs. By which pretence many would make too little distinction between God's laws given by his Spirit, and the laws of a pope and popish council, and call them all but 'The laws of the church.' Whereas there is no universal head of the church but Christ, who hath reserved universal legislation to himself alone, to be performed by himself personally, and by his advocate, the Holy Ghost, in his authorised and infallibly inspired apostles, who were the promulgators and recorders of them; all following pastors, being but (as the Jewish priests were to Moses and the prophets) the preservers, the expositors, and the appliers of the law.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

QUEST. 2. *Whether the Seventh-day-Sabbath should be still kept by Christians, as of Divine Obligation?* Neg.

I SHALL here premise, That as some superstition is less dangerous than profaneness (though it be troublesome, and have ill consequents), so the error of them who keep both days, as of Divine appointment, is much less dangerous than theirs that keep none: yea, and less dangerous, I think, than theirs who reject the Lord's-day, and keep the seventh day only. Because these latter are guilty of two sins, the rejecting of the right day, and the keeping of the wrong; but the other are guilty but of one, the keeping of the wrong day. Besides, that if it were not done, with a superstitious conceit (that it is God's law) in some cases a day may be voluntarily set apart for holy duties, as days of thanksgiving and humiliation now are.

But yet, though the rejecting of the Lord's-day be the

greater fault (and I have no uncharitable censures of them that through weakness keep both days), I must conclude it as the truth, that We are not obliged to the observation of the Saturday, or Seventh-day as a Sabbath, or separated day of holy worship.

*Arg.* I. That day's observations which we are not obliged to, either by the law of nature, the positive law given to Adam, the positive law given to Noah, the law of Moses, or the law of Christ incarnate, we are not obliged to by any law of God (as distinct from human laws); but such is the observation of the Seventh-day-Sabbath; therefore we are not obliged to the observation of it by any law of God.

The minor I must prove by parts (for I think none will deny the sufficient enumeration in the minor).

And, I. That the law of nature bindeth us not to the Seventh day, or any one day of the seven more than other, appeareth, 1. In the nature and reason of the thing; there is nothing in nature to evidence it to us to be God's will. 2. By every Christian's experience: no man findeth himself convinced of any such thing by mere nature. 3. By all the world's experience: no man can say that a man of that opinion can bring any cogent evidence or argument from nature alone to convince another, that the Seventh day must be the Sabbath. Nor is it any where received as a law of nature, but only as a tradition among some few heathens, and as a law positive by the Jews, and some few Christians. I am not solicitous to prosecute this argument any further; because I can consent that all they take the Seventh day for the Sabbath, who can prove it to be so by mere natural evidence, which will not be done.

II. That the positive law made to Adam (before or after the fall), or to Noah, bindeth not us to keep the Seventh day as a Sabbath, is proved.

1. Because we are under a more perfect subsequent law; which being in force, the former more imperfect ceaseth. As the force of the promise of the incarnation of Christ is ceased by his incarnation, and so is the precept which bound men to believe that he should '*de futuro*' be incarnate; and the law of sacrificing (which Abel doubtless received from Adam, though one of late would make it to be but *will worship*); so also is the Sabbath-day, as giving place to the day in which our redemption is primarily com-

memorated, as the imperfect is done away when that which is more perfect cometh.

2. Because that the law of Christ containeth an express revocation of the Seventh-day Sabbath, as shall be shewn anon.

3. Because God never required two days in the seven to be kept as holy; therefore the first day being proved to be of Divine institution, the cessation of the seventh is thereby proved: for to keep two days is contrary to the command which they themselves do build upon, which obligeth us to sanctify a Sabbath, and labour six days.

4. And when it is not probable that most or many infidels are bound to Adam's day, for want of notice (at least); for no law can bind without promulgation (though I now pass by the question, how far a promulgation of a positive law to our first parents may be said to bind their posterity, that have no intermediate notice). It seemeth less probable that Christians should be bound by it, who have a more perfect law promulgated to them.

5. Nor is it probable that Christ and his apostles, and all the following pastors of the churches, would have passed by this positive law to Adam without any mention of it, if our universal obligation had been thence to be collected. Nay, I never yet heard a Sabbatarian plead this law, any otherwise than as supposed to be implied or exemplified in the fourth commandment.

III. And that the fourth commandment of Moses's law bindeth us not to the Seventh-day Sabbath is proved.

1. Because that Moses's law never bound any to it but the Jews, and those proselytes that made themselves inhabitants of their land, or voluntarily subjected themselves to their policy. For Moses was ruler of none but the Jews, nor a legislator or deputed officer from God to any other nation. The decalogue was but part of the Jewish law, if you consider it not as it is written in nature, but in tables of stone: and the Jewish law was given as a law to no other people but to them. It was a national law, as they were a peculiar people and holy nation. So that even in Moses's days it bound no other nations of the world. Therefore it needed not any abrogation to the Gentiles, but a declaration that it did not bind them.

2. The whole law of Moses, formally as such, is ceased or abrogated by Christ. I say, As such; because, materially, the same things that are in that law, may be the matter of the law of nature, and of the law of Christ: of which more anon. That the whole law of Moses as such is abrogated, is most clearly proved, 1. By the frequent arguings of Paul, who ever speaketh of that law as ceased, without excepting any part; and Christ saith, Luke xvi. 16: The law and the prophets were until John, that is, were the chief doctrine of the church till then. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth cometh by Jesus Christ." (John i. 17.) No Jew would have understood this, if the word *law* had not contained the decalogue. So John vii. 19. 23; Acts xv. 5. 24. It was the whole law of Moses, as such, which by circumcision they would have bound men to. (Gal. v. 3.) The Gentiles are said to "sin without law," even when they broke the law of nature, meaning, without the law of Moses. (Rom. ii. 12, 14—16.) In all these following places it is not part but the whole law of Moses, which Paul excludeth (which I ever acknowledged to the Antinomians, though they take me for their too great adversary). Rom. iii. 19—21. 27, 28. 31; iv. 13—16; v. 13, 20; vii. 4—8. 16; ix. 4. 31, 32; x. 5: Gal. ii. 16. 19. 21; iii. 2. 10—13. 19. 21. 24; iv. 21; v. 3, 4. 14. 23; vi. 13: Eph. ii. 15: Phil. iii. 6. 9: Heb. vii. 11, 12. 19; ix. 19; x. 28: 1 Cor. ix. 21.

2. More particularly there are some texts which express the cessation of the decalogue as it was in Moses's law. "Not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart—— But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which was to be done away (or is done away)." (2 Cor. iii. 7.) They that say the glory, and not the law, is here said to be done away, speak against the plain scope of the text; for the glory of Moses's face, and the glorious manner of deliverance ceased in a few days, which is not the cessation here intended, but as Dr. Hammond speaketh it, 'That glory and that law so gloriously delivered, is done away.' And this the eleventh verse more fully expresseth, "For if that which is done away was glorious (or, by glory), much more that which remaineth is glorious (or, in

glory)," so that as it is not only the glory, but the glorious Law, Gospel, or Testament which is said to remain, so it is not only the glory, but the law which was delivered by glory, which is expressly said to be done away: and this is the law which was written in stone.—Nothing but partial violence can evade the force of this text.

"Under it (the Levitical priesthood) the people received the law—And the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope—. But so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." (Heb. vii. 11, 12. 18. 22.) In all this it is plain that it is the whole frame of the Mosaical law that is changed, and the New Testament set up in its stead.

"Neither was the first dedicated without blood; for when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law," &c. (Heb. ix. 18, 19.) Here the law, which is before said to be changed, is said to contain every precept.

And Eph. ii. 15. "It is the law of commandments contained in ordinances," which Christ abolished in his flesh; which cannot be exclusive of the chief part of that law.

*Object.* 'This is the doctrine of the Antinomians, that the law is abrogated, even the moral law.'

*Answ.* It is the doctrine of the true Antinomians that we are under no Divine law, neither of nature nor of Christ; but it is the doctrine of Paul and all Christians, that the Jewish Mosaical law, as such, is abolished.

*Object.* 'But do not all divines say that the moral law is of perpetual obligation?'

*Answ.* Yes; because it is God's law of nature, and also the law of Christ.

*Object.* 'But do not most say that the decalogue written in stone, is the moral law, and of perpetual obligation?'

*Answ.* Yes; for by the word *moral* they mean *natural*, and so take *moral*, not in the large sense as it signifieth a law 'de moribus,' as all laws are whatsoever, but in a narrower sense, as signifying, that which by nature is of universal and perpetual obligation. So that they mean not that it is perpetual as it is Moses's law, and written in stone formally,

but as it is moral, that is natural ; and they mean that materially the decalogue containeth the same law which is the law of nature, and therefore is materially still in force : but they still except certain points and circumstances in it, as the prefatory reason, “ I am the Lord that brought thee out of the land of Egypt,” &c. And especially this of the Seventh-day Sabbath.

*Quest.* 1. ‘How far then are we bound by the decalogue?’

*Answ.* 1. As it is the law of nature: 2. As it is owned by Christ, and made part of his law. Therefore no more of it bindeth directly, than we can prove to be either the law of nature, or the law of Christ. 3. As it was once a law of God to the Jews, and was given them upon a reason common to them with us, or all mankind, we must still judge that it was once a Divine determination of what is most meet, and an exposition of a law of nature, and therefore consequentially, and as that which intimateth by what God once commanded, what we should take for his will, and is most meet, it obligeth still. And so when the law of nature forbiddeth incest, or too near marriages, and God once told the Jews what degrees were to be accounted too near, this being once a law to them directly, is a doctrine and exposition of the law of nature still to us ; and so is consequently a law, by parity of reason. And so we shall shew anon that it is by the fourth commandment.

IV. The law of Christ bindeth us not to the observation of the Seventh-day Sabbath. Proved.

1. Because it is proved that Christ abrogated Moses’s law, as such, and it is no where proved that he reassumed this, as a part of his own law. For it is no part of the law of nature (as is proved) which we confess now to be part of his law.

*Object.* ‘Christ saith, that he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them, and that a jot or tittle shall not pass till all be fulfilled.’

*Answ.* “He is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” (Rom. x. 4.) “The law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.” (Gal. iii. 24.) He hath therefore fulfilled the law according to his word, by his incarnation, life, death, and resurrection. It is passed away, but not unfulfilled : and fulfilling it, is not destroying it.

The ends of it are all attained by him : 2. And though having attained its end, it ceaseth formally, as Moses's law ; yet materially, all that is of natural obligation continueth under another form ; that is, as part of his perfect law. Therefore as our childish knowledge is said, as knowledge, to be increased, and not done away, when we come to maturity ; but as childish, to be done away ; so the Mosaical Jewish law, as God's law in general, is perfected by the cessation of the parts which were fitted to the state of bondage, and by addition of more perfect parts (the natural part of it is made a part of a better covenant or frame) : but yet as Mosaical and imperfect, it is abolished.

Briefly this much sufficeth for the answer of all the allegations, by which any would prove the continuation of Moses's law, or any part of it formally as such. I only add, That all Moses's law, even in the decalogue was political, even God's law for the government of that particular theocratical policy, as a political body. Therefore when the kingdom or policy ceased, the law as political could not continue.

2. It is proved that Christ by his Spirit in his apostles did institute another day. And seeing the Spirit was given them to bring his words to remembrance, and to enable them to teach the churches all things whatsoever he commanded them, it is most probable that this was at first one of Christ's own personal precepts.

3. And to put all out of doubt, that neither the law of nature, nor any positive law, to Adam, Noah, or Moses, or by Christ, doth oblige us to the Seventh-day Sabbath, it is expressly repealed by the Holy Ghost, " Let no man therefore judge you in meats or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day (or feast), or of the new moon, or of the Sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come ; but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 16.) I know many of late say, that by Sabbath here, is not meant the weekly Sabbath, but only other holy days, as monthly or jubilee rests : But, 1. This is to limit without any proof from the word of God. When God speaks of Sabbaths in general, without exception, what is man that he should put in exceptions without any proof of authority from God ? By such boldness we may pervert all his laws. Read Dr. Young upon this text. 2.

Yea, when it was the weekly Sabbath, which then was principally known by the name of a Sabbath, above all other festivals whatsoever, it is yet greater boldness without proof to exclude the principal part, from whence the rest did receive the name. 3. Besides the feasts and new moons being here named as distinct from the Sabbath, are like to include so much of the other separated days, as will leave it still more unmeet to exclude the weekly Sabbath in the explication of that word *Sabbaths* when so many feasts are first distinguished: *ἑορταὶ* 'inquit Grotius, hic sunt Azyrna, dies omer, scenopegia, dies ἡλασμός.

*Object.* 'But the Sabbath mentioned in the decalogue could not be included.'

*Ans.* This is spoken without proof, and the contrary is before proved.

*Object.* 'By this you will make the Christian Sabbath also to be excluded. Is not the Lord's-day a Sabbath?'

*Ans.* I am here to speak but of the name; of which I say, that the common sense of the word Sabbath was, a day so appointed to rest, as that the bodily rest of it, was a primary part of its observation, to be kept for itself; and such the Jewish Sabbaths were. Though spiritual worship was then also commanded, yet the corporal rest was more expressly or frequently urged in the law, and this not only subordinately as an advantage to the spiritual worship, but for itself, as an immediate and most visible and notable part of sabbatizing. Even as other ceremonies under the law were commanded, not only as doctrinal types of things spiritual, but as external acts of ceremonious operous obedience suited to the Jews' minority, which is after called the "yoke which they and their fathers were unable to bear." (Acts 15.) Whereas the Lord's-day is appointed but as a seasonable time subservient to the spiritual work of the day; and the bodily rest, not required as primary obedience for itself, but only for the spiritual work sake: and therefore no bodily labour is now unlawful, but such as is a hindrance to the spiritual work of the day (or accidentally a scandal and temptation to others), whereas the breach of the outward rest of the Jews' Sabbath, was a sin directly of itself, without hindrance of, or respect to the spiritual worship. So that the first notion and sense of a Sabbath



in those days being (in common use) a day of such ceremonial corporal rest, as the Jewish Sabbath was, the Lord's-day is never in Scripture called by that name; but the proper name is, *The Lord's-day*. And the ancient churches called it constantly by that name, and never called it the Sabbath, but when they spake analogically by allusion to the Jews' Sabbath; even as they called the holy table, *the altar*, and the bread and wine, *the sacrifice*. Therefore it is plain, that Paul is to be understood of all proper Sabbaths, and not of the Lord's-day, which was then, and long after, distinguished from the Sabbaths.

And this ceremonial sabbatizing of the Jews, was so strict, that the ceremoniousness made them the scorn of the heathens, as appeareth by the derisions of Horat. lib. i. sat. 9; Persius, sat. 5; Juvenal. sat. 6; Martial, lib. iv., and others: whereas they derided not the Christians for the ceremonious rest, but for their worship on that day. The Lord's-day being not called a Sabbath in the old sense, then only in use, but distinguished from the Sabbath, cannot be meant by the apostle in his exclusion of the Sabbath.

*Object.* 'But the apostles then met in the synagogue with the Jews on the Sabbaths; therefore it is not those days that he meaneth here.' (Col. ii. 16.)

*Ans.* 1. You might as well say, That therefore he is not for the cessation of the Jewish manner of worship, or communion with them in it, because he met with them.

2. And you may as well say, that he was for the continuance of circumcision and purification, because he purified himself and circumcised Timothy.

3. Or that he was for the continuance of their other feasts, in which also he refused not to join with them.

4. But Paul did not keep their Sabbaths formally as Sabbaths, but only took the advantage of their assemblies, to teach them and convince them; and to keep an interest in them: and not scandalize them by an unseasonable violation and contradiction.

5. And you must note also, that the text saith not, 'Observe not Sabbath-days,' but "Let no man judge you;" that is, let none take it for your sin, that you observe them not; nor do you receive any such doctrine of the necessity of keeping the law of Moses. The case seemeth like that of "things strangled and blood," which were to be forborne

among the Jews while they were offensive, and the use of them hindered their conversion.

*Object.* 'But the ancient Christians did observe both days.'

*Answ.* 1. In the first ages they did as the apostles did; that is, 1. They observed no day strictly as a Sabbath in the notion then in use. 2. They observed the Lord's-day, as a day set apart by the Holy Ghost for Christian worship. 3. They so far observed the Jews' Sabbath materially, as to avoid their scandal, and to take opportunity to win them.

2. But those that lived far from all Jews, and those that lived after the law, was sufficiently taken down, did keep but one day, even the Lord's-day as separated to holy uses: except some Christians, who differed from the rest, as the followers of Papias did in the Millenary point.

3. And note that even these dissenters, did still make no question of keeping the Lord's-day, which sheweth that it was on foot from the times of the apostles. So Ignatius (whoever it was, and whenever he wrote) saith that 'After the Sabbath we keep the Lord's-day.' And Pseudo Clements, Can. 33, saith, 'Servants work five days, but on the Sabbath and Lord's-day, they keep holy day in the church, for the doctrine (or learning) of godliness.'

The text of Gal. iv. 10. is of the same sense with Col. ii. 16. against the Jews' Sabbath, and therefore needeth no other defence.

And I would have you consider, whether as Christ's resurrection was the foundation of the Lord's-day, so Christ's lying dead and buried in a grave on the Seventh-day Sabbath, was not a fundamental abrogation of it: I say, not the actual and plenary abrogation; for it was the command of Christ by his word, Spirit, or both, to the apostles before proved, which fully made the change: But as the resurrection was the ground of the new day, so his burial seemeth to intimate, that the day with all the Jewish law, which it was the symbolical profession of, lay dead and buried with him. Sure I am that he saith, 'when the Bridegroom is taken from them, then shall they fast and mourn; but he was most notably taken from them, when he lay dead in the grave: and if they must fast and mourn that day, they could not keep it as a Sabbath, which was a day of joy. Therefore as by death he overcame him that had the power of death, (Heb. ii. 14,) and as he nailed the hand-writing of

ordinances to his cross ; so he buried the Sabbath in his grave, by lying buried on that day.

And therefore the Western churches, who had fewer Jews among them, did fast on the Sabbath-day, to shew the change that Christ's burial intimated : though the Eastern churches did not, lest they should offend the Jews.

And that the ancient Christians were not for sabbatizing on the Seventh day, is visible in the writings of most, save the Eastern ones before mentioned. Tertull. Cont. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 20, and Chrysost. Theodoret, Primasius, &c. on Gal. iv. expound that text, as that by days is meant the Jewish Sabbath, and by months, the new moons, &c.

Cyprian 59. Epist. ad Hidum saith, that the Eighth day is to Christians, what the Sabbath was to the Jews, and called the Sabbath, the Image of the Lord's-day. Athanasius de Sab. et Circumcis. is full and plain on it. See Tertullian Advers. Judæ. cap. 4 ; Ambros. in Eph. 2 ; August. Ep. 118 ; Chrysost. in Gal. 1 ; and Hom. 12. ad pop. Hilary, before cited ; Prolog. in Psalm ; Origen Hom. 23. in Num ; Item Tertull. de Idol. cap. 14 ; Epiphan. lib. i. Num. 30 ; noting the Nazaræi and Ebionæi heretics, that they kept the Jews' Sabbath. In a word, the Council of Loadicæa doth anathematize them that did Judaize by forbearing their labours on the Sabbath or Seventh day. And as Sozomen tells us, That at Alexandria and Rome they used no assemblies on the Sabbath, so where they did, in most churches they communicated not in the sacrament.

Yea, that Ignatius himself (true or false), who saith as aforecited, 'After the Sabbath let every lover of Christ celebrate the Lord's-day,' doth yet in the same epistle (ad Magnes.) before say, 'Old things are passed away, behold all things are made new : for if we live after the Jewish law, and the circumcision of the flesh, we deny that we have received grace——Let us not therefore keep the Sabbath (or sabbatize) Jewishly, as delighting in idleness (or rest from labour). For he that will not labour, let him not eat. In the sweat of thy brows thou shalt eat thy bread.' I confess I take the cited texts to have been added since the body of the epistle was written ; but though the writer savour of the Eastern custom, yet he sheweth they did not sabbatize on the account of the fourth commandment, or supposed continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, as a Sabbath : for

bodily labour was strictly forbidden in the fourth commandment.

Dionysius Alexandr. hath an epistle to Basilides, a bishop, on the question, When the Sabbath-fast must end, and the observation of the Lord's-day begin. (Biblioth Patr. Græc. Lat. vol. i. p. 306.) In which he is against them that end their fast too soon. And plainly intimateth that the Seventh day was to be kept, but as a preparatory fast (being the day that Christ lay in the grave), and not as a Sabbath, or as the Lord's-day.

I cite not any of these, as a human authority to be set against the authority of the fourth commandment; but as the certain history of the change of the day which the apostles made.

*Quest.* 'How far then is the fourth commandment moral? You seem to subvert the old foundation, which most others build the Lord's-day upon.

*Answ.* Let us not entangle ourselves with the ambiguities of the word *moral*, which most properly signifieth ethical, as distinct from physical, &c. By moral here is meant that which is (on what ground soever) of perpetual or continual obligation: and so it is all one as to ask how far it is still obligatory or in force; to which I answer,

1. It is a part of the law of nature, that God be solemnly worshipped, in families and in holy assemblies.

2. It is a part of the law of nature, that where greater things do not forbid it, a stated time be appointed for his service, and that it be not left at random to every man's will.

3. It is of the law of nature, that where greater matters do not hinder it, this day be one and the same in the same countries; yea, if it may be, through the world.

4. It is of the law of nature, that this day be not so rarely as to hinder the ends of the day, nor yet so frequently as to deprive us of opportunity for our necessary corporal labour.

5. It is of the law of nature, that the holy duties of this day be not hindered by any corporal work, or fleshly pleasure, or any unnecessary thing which contradicteth the holy ends of the day.

6. It is of the law of nature, that rulers, and in special masters of families, do take care that their inferiors thus observe it.

In all these points the fourth commandment being but a

transcript of the law of nature, which we can yet prove from the nature or the reason of the thing, the matter of it continueth (not as Jewish, but) as natural.

7. Besides all this, when no man of himself could tell, whether one day in six, or seven, or eight, were his duty to observe, God hath come in, and, 1. By doctrine or history told us, that he "made the world in six days, and rested the seventh." 2. By law; and hath commanded one day in seven to the Jews; by which he hath made known consequently to all men, that one day in seven is the fittest proportion of time. And the case being thus determined by God, by a law to others, doth consequently become a law to us, because it is the determination of Divine Wisdom; unless it were done upon some reasons in which their condition differeth from ours. And thus the doctrine and reasons of an abrogated law, continuing, may induce on us an obligation to duty. And in this sense the fourth commandment may be said still to bind us to one day in seven.

But in two points the obligation (even as to the matter) ceaseth: 1. We are not bound to the Seventh day, because God our Redeemer, who is the Lord of the Sabbath, hath made a change. 2. We are not bound to a Sabbath in the old notion, that is, to a day of ceremonial rest for itself required; but to a day to be spent in evangelical worship.

And though I am not of their mind who say, that the Seventh day is not commanded in the fourth commandment, but a Sabbath-day only; yet, I think that it is evident in the words, that the 'Ratio Sabbati,' and the 'Ratio diei septimi' are distinguishable: and that the Sabbath, as a Sabbath, is first in the precept, and the particular day is there but secondarily, and so mutably; as if God had said, 'I will have a particular day set apart for a holy rest, and for my worship; and that day shall be one in seven, and the seventh also on which I rested from my works.'

And thus I have said as much as I think needful to satisfy the considerate about the day: Again professing, 1. That I believe that he is in the right that maketh conscience of the Lord's-day only. 2. But yet I will not break charity with any brother, that shall in tenderness of conscience keep both days; especially in times of profaneness, when few will be brought to the true observation of one. 3. But I think him that keepeth the Seventh day only, and neg-

lecteth the Lord's-day, to sin against very evident light, with many aggravations. 4. But I think him that keepeth no day (whether professedly, or practising contrary to his profession; whether on pretence of avoiding superstition, or on pretence of keeping every day as a Sabbath) to be far the worst of all. I shall now add somewhat to some appendant questions.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### *Of the Beginning of the Day.*

*Quest.* 1. 'WHEN doth the Lord's-day begin?'

*Answ.* 1. If we can tell when any day beginneth, we may know when that beginneth. If we cannot, the necessity of our ignorance, will shorten the trouble of our scruples by excusing us.

2. Because the Lord's-day is not to be kept as a Jewish Sabbath ceremoniously, but the time and the rest are here commanded subserviently for the work sake, therefore we have not so much reason to be scrupulous about the hours of beginning and ending, as the Jews had about their Sabbath.

3. I think he that judgeth of the beginning and ending of the day according to the common estimation of the country where he liveth, will best answer the ends of the institution. For he will keep still the same proportion of time; and so much as is ordinarily allowed on other days for work, he will spend this day in holy works; and so much in rest as is used to be spent in rest on other days; (which may ordinarily satisfy a well informed conscience.) And if any extraordinary occasions (as journeying or the like,) require him to doubt of any hours of the night, whether they be part of the Lord's-day or not; 1. It will be but his sleeping-time, and not his worshipping-time, which he will be in doubt of: And, 2. He will avoid all scandal and tempting others to break the day, if he measure the day by the common estimate: Whereas, if the country where he liveth do esteem the day to begin at sunset, and he suppose it to begin at midnight, he may be scandalous by doing that which in the common opinion is a violation of the day. If I thought

that this short kind of solution, were not the fittest to afford just quietness to the minds of sober Christians in this point, I would take the pains to scan the controversy about the true beginning of days : but lest it more puzzle and perplex, than edify or resolve and quiet the conscience, I save myself and the reader that trouble.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

*Quest. 2.* ' How should the Lord's-day be kept or used ?'

*Ans.* The practical directions I have given in another treatise. I shall now give you but these generals.

I. The day being separated, or set apart for holy worship, must accordingly be spent therein. To sanctify it, is to spend it in holy exercises : how else should it be used as a holy day ? " I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day," saith St. John, Rev. i. 10.

II. The principal work of the day is, the communion of Christians in the public exercise of God's worship. It is principally to be spent in holy assemblies. And this is the use that the Scripture expressly mentioneth, Acts xx. 7, and intimateth, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 ; and as most expositors think, John xxi, when the disciples were gathered together with the door shut, for fear of the Jews. And all church-history assureth us, that in these holy assemblies principally, the day was spent by the ancient Christians. They spent almost all the day together.

III. It is not only to be spent in holy exercises, but also in such special holy exercises as are suitable to the purposes of the day. That is, it is a day of commemorating the whole work of our redemption ; but especially the resurrection of Christ. Therefore it is a day of thanksgiving and praise ; and the special services of it must be laudatory and joyful exercises.

IV. But yet because it is sinners that are called to this work, who are not yet fully delivered from their sin and misery, these praises must be mixed with penitent confessions, and with earnest petitions, and with diligent learning the will of God.

More particularly, the public exercises of the day are,  
1. Humble and penitent confessions of sin. 2. The faith-

ful and fervent prayers of the church. 3. The reading, preaching and hearing of the word of God. 4. The communion of the church in the Lord's-supper. 5. The laudatory exhortations which attend it; and the singing and speaking of the praises of our Creator, and Redeemer, and Sanctifier; with joyful thanksgiving for his wonderful benefits. 6. The seasonable exercise of holy discipline on particular persons, for comforting the weak, reforming the scandalous, casting out the obstinately impenitent, and absolving and receiving the penitent. 7. The pastor's blessing the people in the name of the Lord. 8. And as an appurtenance in due season, oblations or contributions for holy and charitable uses, even for the church and poor, which yet may be put off to other days, when it is more convenient so to do.

*Quest.* 'But who is it that must be present in all these exercises?'

*Ans.* Where there is no church yet called, the whole day may be spent in preaching to, and teaching the unconverted infidels: but where there is a church, and no other persons mixed, the whole exercise of the day must be such as are fitted to the state of the church. But where there is a church and other persons (infidels and impenitent ones) with them, the day must be spent proportionably in exercises suitable to the good of both; yet so that church-exercises should be the principal work of the day. And the ancient laudable practice of the churches was, to preach to the infidel auditors and catechumens in the morning, on such subjects as were most suitable to them, and then to dismiss them, and retain the faithful (or baptized) only; and to teach them all the commands of Christ; to stir them up to the joyful commemoration of Christ and his resurrection, and to sing God's praises, and celebrate the Lord's-supper with the eucharistical acknowledgments and joy. And they never kept a Lord's-day in the church, without the Lord's-supper; in which the bare administration of the signs was not their whole work; but all their thanksgiving and praising exercises, were principally then used, and connected to the Lord's-supper: which the liturgies yet extant do at large express.

And I know no reason but thus it should be still; or at least but that this course should be the ordinary celebration of the day.



*Quest.* 'But seeing the Sabbath was instituted in the beginning to commemorate the work of the creation, must that be laid by now, because of our commemoration of the work of our redemption?'

*Ans.* No: Our Redeemer's work is to restore us to the acknowledgment and love of our Creator. And the commemoration of our redemption fitteth us to a holy acknowledgment of the Almighty Creator in his works: these therefore are still to go together; according to their several proper places; even as the Son is the way to the Father, and we must never separate them in the exercise of our faith, obedience, or love. A Christian is a sanctified philosopher: and no man knoweth or acknowledgeth God's works of creation or providence aright, in their true sense, but he that seeth God the Creator and Redeemer, the Beginning, the Governor and the End of all. Other philosophers are but as those children, that play with the book and the letters, but understand not the matter contained in it; or like one that teacheth boys 'nitide literas pingere,' to write a curious hand, while he understands not what he writeth.

*Object.* 'But to spend so much of the day in public as you speak of, will tire out the minister by speaking so long: few men are able to endure it.'

*Ans.* How did the Christians in the primitive churches? They met in the morning, and often (as far as I can gather) parted not till night, and when they did go home between the morning and evening service, it was but for a little time.

*Object.* 'Then they made it a fast and not a festival.'

*Ans.* It was not the use then to eat dinners in those hot countries; much less three meals a-day, as we do now. And they accounted it a sufficient feasting, to eat once, at supper; which they did at the first altogether at their church-meeting, with the sacrament; but afterward finding the inconvenience of that, they feasted at home, and used only the sacrament in the church: which change was not made without the allowance of the apostles; Paul saying, "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God?" (1 Cor. xi. 22.)

I further answer, that the work of the day being done according to the primitive use, it will be no excessive labour to the ministers, because, in the celebration of the Lord's-supper, he is not still in one continued speech, but hath the

intermission of action, and useth shorter speeches, which do not so much spend him. And the people bear a considerable part, to wit, in God's praises, which were spoken then in their laudatory tone, and are now uttered by their singing of psalms (which should not be the least part of the work). And though their manner of singing was not like ours, in rhymes and tunes melodiously, (as neither were the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin poems so sung;) but as most think, more like to our cathedral singing, or saying; yet it followeth not that this is the best way for us, seeing use hath made our tunes and metre, and way of singing, more meet for the ends to which we use them, that is, for the cheerful consent of all the church; neither should any think that it is a human, unlawful invention, and a sinful change, to turn the old way of singing (used in Scripture-times and long after) into ours; for the old way of singing was not a Divine institution, but a use; and several countries had their several uses herein: and God commandeth us but to praise him, and sing psalms, but doth not tell us what metre or tunes we shall use, or manner of singing, but leaveth this to the use and convenience of every country: and if our way and tunes be to us by custom more convenient than those of other nations in Scripture-times, we have no reason to forsake them, and return to the old (though yet the old way is not to be judged a thing forbidden). And we see that custom hath so far prevailed with us, that many thousand religious people, do cheerfully sing psalms in the church in our tunes and way, who cannot endure to sing in the cathedral, or the ancient Scripture or primitive way, nor to use so much as the laudatory responses.

3. And I further answer, That every church should have more ministers than one, as the ancient churches had, besides their readers; and then one may in speaking ease another.

4. But lastly I answer, That these circumstances being alterable according to the state of countries and conveniences, I do not discommend the custom of our country, and of most Christian churches in our times, in making an intermission, and going home to dinner, as being fittest to our condition. And then there remaineth the less force in the objection, as to the weakness of the ministers or the people.

I forbear to say more of the public church-performances, having described them all in a small book called "Universal Concord," and having exemplified all except preaching, in our "Reformed Liturgy" given in to the bishops at the Savoy.

Only here I will answer them who object much that 'the ancient churches spent not the whole day in exercises of religion, nor forbade other exercises out of the time of public worship, because we read of little other observation of it by them, but what was done by them in the public assemblies.'

*Answ.* 1. We find that they took it to be a sanctified or separated day; and they never distinguish, and say, that part of the day only was separated and sanctified to such uses. If they did, which part is the sanctified part of the day? What hours were they which they thought thus separated? But there is no such distinction or limitation in the writings of the ancient doctors. 2. What need you find much mention what they did out of the time of public worship, when they spent all the day frequently at first, and almost all the day in after-times (with small intermission) in public worship? Do you stay but as long at church as they did, even almost from morning till night, and then you will find but little time to dance or play in. But yet 3. There want not testimonies that they thought it unlawful to spend any part of the day in unnecessary diversions from holy things, as Dr. Young hath shewed.

III. So much of the day as can be spared from public church-worship (and diversions of necessity) should be next spent most in holy family-exercises. And in those unhappy places where the public worship is slenderly and negligently performed (on some small part only of the day), or not at all, or not so as it is lawful to join in it, (as in idolatrous worship, &c.) there family worship must take up the most of the day: and in better places, it must take up so much as the public worship spareth.

And here the sum of holy exercises in families is this, (which having elsewhere directed you in, I must but briefly name:)

1. To see that the family rise as early on this day as on others, and make it not a day of sleep and idleness. And not to suffer them to violate, profane or neglect the day by any of the sins hereafter named.

2. To call them together before they go to the solemn assembly, and to pray with them and praise God, and if there be time, to read the Scripture, and tell them what they have to do in public.

3. To see that dinner, and other common employments, make no longer an intermission than is needful; and to advise them that at their meat and necessary business, they shew by their holy speeches, that their minds do not forget the day, and the employments of it.

4. To sing God's praises with them, if there be time, and bring them again together to the church-assembly.

5. When they return, either to take some account of them what they have learned, or call them together to pray for a blessing on what they have heard, and to sing praises to God, and to urge the things which they have heard, upon them.

6. At supper to behave themselves soberly and piously: and after supper to shut up the day in prayer and praise; and either then or before, either to examine or exhort inferiors, according as the case of the persons and families shall require (for in some families it will be best on the same day to take an account of their profitting, and to catechise them: and in other families that have leisure, other days may be more convenient for catechising and examinations), that the greater works of the Lord's-day may not be shortened.

IV. So much of the day as can be spared from public and family worship, must be spent in secret, holy duties: such as are, 1. Secret prayer. 2. Reading of the Scriptures and good books. 3. Holy meditation. 4. And the secret conference of bosom friends. Of which I further add,

1. That where public or family-worship cannot be had (as in impious places), there secret duties must be the chief, and make up the defect of others. And it is a great happiness of good Christians who have willing minds, that they have such secret substitutes and supplies; that they have bibles, and so many good books to read; that they have a friend to talk with, of holy things; but much more that they have a God to go to, and a heaven to meditate on, besides so many sacred verities.

2. That my judgment is, that in those places where the public worship taketh up almost all the day, it is no sin to attend upon it to the utmost, and to omit all family and se-

cret exercises, as cannot be done without omission of the public. And that where the public exercises allow but a little time at home, the family-duty should take up all that little time, except what some shorter, secret prayers or meditations may have, which will not hinder family-duties. And that it is a sinful disorder to do otherwise : because the Lord's-day is principally set apart for public worship ; and the more private or secret, is as it were included in the public. Your families are at church with you ; the same prayers which you would put up in secret, you may (usually) put up in public, and in families : and it is a turning God's worship into ceremony and superstition, to think that you must necessarily put up the same prayers in a closet, which you put up in the family or church, when you have not time for both. (Though when you have time, secret prayer hath its proper advantages, which are not to be neglected.) And also, what secret or family duty you have not time for on that day, you may do on another day, when you cannot come to church-assemblies. And therefore it is an error to think that the day must be divided in equal proportions, between public, family, and secret duties : though yet I think it not amiss that some convenient time for family and secret duties be left on that day ; but not so much as is spent in public, nor nothing near it.

If any shall now object, 'I do not believe that we are bound to all this ado, nor so to tire out ourselves in religious exercises. Where is all this ado commanded us ?'

I answer, 1. I have proved to you that in nature and scripture set together, as great a proportion of time as this for holy exercises is required.

2. But O ! what a carnal heart doth this objection signify ! What, do you count your love to God, and the commemoration of his love in Christ, a toil ? What if God had only given you leave to lay by your worldly business, and idle talk and childish play, for one day's time, and to learn how to be like Christ and angels, and how to make sure of a heavenly glory, should you not gladly have accepted it as an unspeakable benefit ? O ! what hearts have these wretched men, that must be constrained by fear to all that is good, and holy, and spiritual ; and will have none of God's greatest mercies, unless it be for fear of hell : (and they shall never have them indeed till they love them !)

What hearts have those men, that had rather be in an alehouse, or a playhouse, or asleep, than to be in heart with God? That can find so much pleasure in jesting, and idle talking, and foolery, that they can better endure it, than to peruse a map of heaven, and to read and hear the sacred oracles! Who think it a toil to praise their Maker and Redeemer, and a pleasure to game, and dance, and drink! Who turn the glass upon the preacher, and grudge if he exceed his hour; and can sit in a tavern or alehouse, or hold on in any thing that is vain, many hours, and never complain of weariness! Do they not tell the world what enemies they are to God, who love a pair of cards, or dice, or wanton dalliance, better than his word and worship? Who think six days together little enough for their worldly work and profit, and one day in seven too much to spend in the thoughts of God and life eternal? Who love the dung of this present world, so much better than all the joys above, as that they are weary to hear of heaven above an hour at a time, and long to be wallowing in the dirt again? Is it not made by the Holy Ghost, a mark not only of wicked men, but of men notoriously wicked, to be "lovers of pleasures more than of God?" 2 Tim. iii. 4.

O sinner, that in these workings of the wickedness and malignity of your hearts, you would at last but know yourselves! Is it not the "carnal mind that is thus at enmity with God, and neither is nor can be subject to his law?" (Rom. viii. 6—8.) Which will you take to be your friend, him that loveth your company, or him that is weary of it, and is glad when he hath done with you, and is got away? What would you think of wife, or child, or friend, if they should reason as you do, and say, What law doth bind me to so many hours in the house, or company, or service of my husband, my father, or my friend? You do not use, if you have a feast, or a cup of wine before you, to ask, Where doth God command me to eat or drink it? You can do this without a command. If you hear but of a gainful market; you ask not, Where doth God make it my duty to go to it? If one would give you money or land, you would scarcely ask, How prove you that I am bound to take it? You would be glad of leave, without commands. If the king should say to you, Ask what you will, and I will give it you, you would not say, Where am I bound of God to ask? And

when God saith, Ask and it shall be given you, you say, How prove you that I am bound to ask? You can sing ribald songs, and dance without a command; you can feast, and play, and prate, and sleep, and loiter in idleness without a command; but you cannot learn how to be saved, nor praise your Redeemer without a command. A thief can steal, a fornicator can play the brute, a drunkard can be drunk, an oppressor can make himself hateful to the oppressed, not only without law, but against it! But you cannot rejoice in God, nor live one day together in his love and service, without a law, no nor with it neither. For because you had rather not love him, it is certain that you do not love him: and because you had rather play than pray, and serve the flesh than serve your Maker; it is a certain sign that you do not serve him, with any thing which he will accept as service. For while he hath not your hearts, he hath nothing which he accepteth. Your knee and tongue only is forced against your will, to that which you call serving him: but your hearts or wills cannot be forced. When you had rather be elsewhere, and say, When will the sermon and prayer be done, that I may be at my work or play! God taketh it as if you were there where you had rather be.

I pray you deal openly, and tell me, you that thiuk a day too long for God, and are weary of all holy work, what would you be doing that while, if you had your choice? Is it any thing which you dare say is better? Dare you say, that playing is better than praying, or a piper or dancing better than praising God with psalms? Or that your sleep, or games, or chat, or worldly business is better than the contemplation of God and glory! And will those deceivers of the people also say this, who teach them that it is a tedious, uncommanded thing to serve God so long? I think they dare not speak it out. If they dare, let them not grudge that they must for ever be shut out of heaven, where there will be nothing else but holiness. But if you dare not say so, why will you be weary of well-doing, that you may do ill? Why are you not more weary of every thing than of holiness, unless you think every thing better than holiness?

Especially those men, 1. Whose judgment is for will-worship, should not ask, Where is there a command, for any good which they are willing of. But doth not this shew that you had rather there were no command for it? Be

judges yourselves. 2. And they that are for making the churches a great deal more work than God hath made them, (O what abundance hath Popery made, and what a multitude of new religious particles !) methinks should not for shame say that God hath tired them out, and made them too much work already ? Do you cry out, What a weariness is this one day, when you would add of your own such a multitude of more days and more work ?

Yet though I talk of doing it willingly, if you had no forcing law of God, but bare leave to receive such benefits, my meaning is not that God hath left any such thing indifferent, or made them only the matter of counsels and not commands ; for he hath made it our duty to receive our own benefits, and to do that which tendeth to our own good and salvation. But if it had been so, that we had only leave to receive so great mercies without any other penalty for refusing, than the loss of them, it should be enough to men that love themselves, and know what is for their good. Much more when commands concur.

---

## CHAPTER X.

*How the Lord's-day should not be spent : or what is unlawful on it.*

As to the resolving this question also, I would wish for no greater advantage on him that I dispute with, but that he be a man that loveth God and holiness, and knoweth somewhat of the difference between things temporal and things eternal ; and knoweth what is for the good of his soul, and preferreth it before his body ; and hath an appetite to relish the delights of wisdom, and of things most excellent and divine. And that he be one that knoweth his own necessities, and repenteth of his former loss of time ; and liveth in a daily preparation for death ; that is, that he be a real Christian ; and then by all this it will appear, how the Lord's-day must not be spent ; or what things are unlawful to be done thereon.

I. Undoubtedly it must not be spent in wickedness ; in gluttony or drunkenness, chambering or wantonness, strife or envying, or any of those works of the flesh, which are at



all times sinful. An evil work is most unsuitable to a holy day : and yet, alas, what day hath more rioting and excess of meat, and drink, and wantonness, and sloth, and lust, than it?

II. It ought not to be spent in our worldly businesses, which are the labours allowed us on the six days ; unless necessity or mercy make them at any time become such duties of the law of nature, as positives must for that time give place to. For how is it a day separated to holy employments, if we spend it in the common business of the world ? It is the great advantage that we have by such a separated day, that we may wholly cast off our minds from this world, and set them on the world to come, and exercise them in holy communion with God and his church, without the interruptions and distractions of any earthly cogitations. A divided mind doth never perform any holy work with that integrity and life, as the nature of it requireth. Heavenly contemplations are never well managed with the intermixture of diverting, worldly thoughts : so great a work as to converse in heaven, to be wrapped up in the admirations of the Divine perfections, to kindle a fervent love to God, by the contemplation of his love and goodness, to triumph over sin and Satan with our triumphing, glorified Head, to commemorate his resurrection, and the whole work of our redemption with a lively, working faith, doth require the whole heart, and will not consist with alien thoughts, and the diversion of fleshly employments or delights. Nay, had we no higher work to do than to search our hearts, and lament our sins, and beg for mercy, and learn God's word, and treat with our Redeemer about the saving of our souls, and to prepare for death and judgment, surely it should challenge all our faculties, and tell us that voluntary diversions do too much savour of impiety and contempt. It is the great mercy of God that we have leave to lay by these clogs and impediments of the soul, and to seek his face with greater freedom than the incumbrances of our week-day labours will allow us. No slave can be so glad of a Sabbath's ease from his sorest toil and basest drudgery, as a believer should be to be released from his earthly thoughts and business, that he may freely, entirely, and delightfully converse with God.

III. The Lord's-day must not be spent in tempting, diverting, unnecessary recreations, or pleasures of the flesh.

1. For these are as great an impediment to the holy employment of the soul, as worldly labours, if not much more. It is easier for a man to be exercised in heavenly meditations at the plough or cart, or other such labours of his place and calling, than at bowls, or hunting, or cards, or dice, or stage-plays, or races, or dancing, or bear-baitings, or cock-fights, or any such sensual sports. I need no proof of this to any man that hath himself any experience of the holy employments of a believing soul, or that ever knew what it was to spend one day of the Lord aright; and no proof will suffice them that have no experience, because they know not effectually what it is that they talk of.

2. We find that even on other days, the worst men are most addicted to these sports, and are the greatest pleaders for them, and that the more they use them, the worse they grow; yea, that the times of using them are frequently the times of the eruption of many heinous sins. I have lived in my youth in many places where sometimes shows or uncouth spectacles have been their sports at certain seasons of the year, and sometimes morrice-dancings, and sometimes stage-plays, and sometimes wakes and revels; and all men observed that these were the times of the most flagitious crimes; and that there was then more drunkenness, more fighting, more horrid oaths and curses uttered, than in many weeks at other times. Then it was that the enraged sensualists did act the part of furious devils, in scorning and reviling all that were more sober and better than themselves, and railing at those that minded God and their everlasting state, as precisians, puritans, and hypocrites; then it was that they were ready in their fury, if they durst, to assault the very persons and houses of them that would not do as they did. Whatever is done in such crowds and tumults, is done with the impetuosity of rage and passion, and with the greatest audacity, and the violation of all laws and regulating restraints. As many waters make a furious stream, and great fires where much fuel is conjunct do disdain restraint and quickly devour all before them, so is it with the raging folly of youth, when voluptuous persons once get together, and their lusts take fire, and they fall into a torrent of profuse sensuality. Yea, those that at other times are sober, and when they come home do seem of another mind, yet do as the rest when they are among them, and seem as

bad and furious as they. As we see among the London apprentices on the day called Good-tides Tuesday, or May-day, when they once get out together and are in motion, they seem all alike, and those that are most sober and timorous alone, in the rout are heightened to the audacity of the rest; and as in an army the sight of the multitude, and the noise of drums and guns, put valour into the fearful, and they will go on with others, that else would run away from a proportionable single combat and danger; and as boys at school that fear to offend singly, yet fear not to bar out their master in a combination when all concur; so all seem wicked in a crowd and rout of wicked persons; and sensuality and licentiousness is not the smallest part of the wickedness.

O how unfit is youth in such a crowd to think of God, or eternity, or death; or to hear the sober warnings of the preacher, in comparison of what the same persons be, when they are at church, and congregated purposely to hear God's word! Go among them and try them then, with any grave and wholesome counsel: ask them whether they are penitent converts, and whether they are prepared for another world. Try what answer they will give you, and whether they will not deride you more than at another time. I would those that write and plead for this, under the name of *harmless recreations*, would go amongst them sometimes with sober counsel, and learn to be wise by their own experience, that their errors might not be of such pernicious consequence to men's souls as they have been. Reason itself hath no place or audience in the noise of youthful, furious lusts. They will laugh at reason as well as at Scripture; and scorn sobriety as well (though not so much) as holiness. If even in the meetings of grave persons it have ever been observed that individual persons are apt to be carried by the stream, and otherwise than their talk importeth at other times when they are single, what wonder if it be so in evil with unbridled youth?

If you say that 'the law forbiddeth routs and riots, and it is no such unruly places that we defend:'

*Ans.* Disclaim not the name only while you defend the thing. Be not like them that say, We persuade men to voluntary untruths, but not to lying; to break their vows and oaths in lawful matters, but not to perjury; to kill those that anger them, but not to murder; to take other men's goods by force, but not to robbery, &c. Are not wakes,

and revels, and morrice-dances, and dancing-assemblies, and spectacles, stage-plays, and the like, such a concourse as I am speaking of? Do you limit dancers and players to any numbers? I speak not of the laws; I am too much unacquainted with them. If they say, that above four meeting to dance or drink on the Lord's-day shall be accounted a conventicle or unlawful assembly, it is more than I ever heard of. But I am speaking of the common practice of the country, and of those that ordinarily defend it, and labour to bring both godly ministers and sober people under the scorn of foolish preciseness and superstition, because they would hinder the sin and ruin of the people. If you will allow them to assemble for their dancings, shows, and sports, you will encourage them to break the laws both of God and man, though you pretend never so much care that they be observed. You may as well allow them to be drunk, and when you have done, forbid them to break God's laws and the king's in their drunkenness. There are few in such sportful assemblies that are not drunk with concupiscence, and whose reason is not drowned in voluptuous and vain imaginations. Let those divines (if I may so call the advocates of sensuality and sin) which are otherwise minded, give us leave to oppose against all their cavils, and the false names of *harmless recreations*, but, 1. Our own experience, who in our youth have always found such sports and reveling assemblies to be corrupters of our minds, and temptations to evils, and quenchers of holy motions, and enemies of all that is good. 2. The experience of the visibly corrupted, undone sensual youth that are round about us, in all countries where we have lived. 3. And the judgment of Solomon, (who saith as much for pleasure as any sacred writer;) "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men, and the living will lay it to his heart: Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth;" (I pray you do not say I rail at you by the reciting of these words, nor that I diminish the honour of the reverend advocates for wakes and Lord's-day sports and dancings.) "It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise, than for a man to hear the

song of fools ; for as the sound of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of fools." (Eccles. vii. 2—6.)

3. Moreover, these sports, and pleasures, and riotings, are worse than ploughing and labouring on the Lord's-day, because (as they are more adverse to spiritual and heavenly joys, so) they do less good to recompense hurt. A carpenter, a mason, a ploughman, &c. may do some good by his unlawful, unseasonable labour, some one may be the better for it : but dancing, and sports, and gaming, do no good, but hurt. They corrupt the fancy ; they imprint upon the thinking faculty, so strong an inclination to run out after such things ; and upon the appetite so strong a list and longing for them, that carnality is much increased by them ; mortification hindered ; concupiscence gratified ; the flesh prevaieth ; the Spirit is quenched ; and the soul made as unfit for heavenly things, as a schoolboy is for his book, whose heart is set upon his play ; yea, abundance more ; as nature by corruption is more averse to spiritual things, than to the things of art or nature.

4. These dancings, and plays, and wakes, and other sports, are a strong temptation also to them that are not of the riotous societies, but have convictions on their hearts that they should have greater and better things in their mind. Without accusing others, I may say that I know this by sad experience. I cannot forget, when my conscience was against their courses, and called me to better things, how hardly when I was young, I passed by the dancing, and the playing congregations, and especially when in the passage I must bear their scorn. And I was one year a schoolmaster, and found how hard it was for the poor children to avoid such snares, even when they were sure to be whipped the next day for their pleasures.

5. And those riots and plays are injurious to the pious and sober persons who dislike them. For it is they that shall be made the rabble's scorn, and the drunkard's song ; besides that the noise oftentimes annoyeth them when they should be calmly serving God. And they are hindered from governing and instructing their families, while their children and servants are thus tempted to be gone, and their hearts are all the while in the playing-place. Never did a hungry dog more grudge at his restraint from meat, than

children and young servants usually grudge to be catechised or kept to holy exercises, when they hear the pipe, or the noise of the licentious multitude in the streets. I cannot forget that in my youth in those late times, when we lost the labours of some of our conformable godly teachers for not reading publicly the Book of Sports and Dancing on the Lord's-days, one of my father's own tenants was the town-piper, hired by the year (for many years together), and the place of the dancing-assembly was not an hundred yards from our door, and we could not on the Lord's-day either read a chapter, or pray, or sing a psalm, or catechise, or instruct a servant, but with the noise of the pipe and tabor, and the shoutings in the street, continually in our ears; and even among a tractable people, we were the common scorn of all the rabble in the streets, and called Puritans, Precisians, and Hypocrites, because we rather chose to read the Scriptures than to do as they did; (though there was no savour of Nonconformity in our family.) And when the people by the book were allowed to play and dance out of public service-time, they could so hardly break off their sports, that many a time the reader was fain to stay till the piper and players would give over; and sometimes the morrice-dancers would come into the church in all the linen and scarfs, and antic-dresses, with morrice-bells jingling at their legs. And as soon as common-prayer was read, did haste out presently to their play again. Was this a heavenly conversation? Was this a help to holiness and devotion; or to the mortification of fleshly lusts? Was this the way to train up youth in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? And were such assemblies like to the primitive churches; or such families governed christianly and in the fear of God? O Lord, set wise and holy pastors over thy poor flocks, that have learned themselves the doctrine which they preach, and who love, (or at least abhor not) the service and imitation of a crucified Christ, and the practice of that religion which they themselves profess.

*Object.* 'But poor labouring people must have some recreation, and they cannot through their poverty have leisure any other day.'

*Answ.* 1. A sad argument to be used by them that by racking of rents do keep them in poverty. They that can-

not live without all those superfluities, which requireth many hundred pounds a year to maintain them, must for this gratifying pride and fleshly lusts, set such bargains to their poor tenants, as that they confess they cannot live, without taking the Lord's-day to recreate them from the toil and weariness of their excessive labours: and will not God judge such self-condemning oppressions as these are?

2. But is this an argument fit for the mount of a minister or any Christian, who knoweth how much the soul is more worth than the body? and eternity more valuable than the pleasures of this little time? If poverty deny the people liberty to play on the week-days, doth it not as much deny them liberty to pray, and to read the Scriptures, and to learn their catechisms, and the word of God? Surely it better beseemeth any man that believeth another life, a heaven and a hell, to say, poor labourers have so little time to learn, to meditate, to read, to pray, on the week-days, that if they do not follow it close upon the Lord's-day, they are like to perish in their ignorance; ("For if the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost," 2 Cor. iv. 3.) which do you think it better to leave undone, if one of them must be left undone? Whether the learning of God's word, or the pleasures and recreations of the flesh?

3. Is it their bodies or their minds that need recreation? When the body is tired with toilsome labour, it is ease, rather than toilsome dancings or plays, that are fit to recreate it. Or else God will be charged with mistake in the reasons of the ancient Sabbath. But if it be the mind that needeth recreation, why should not the learning of heavenly truth, and the joyful commemoration of our redemption, and the foresight of heaven, and the praises of God, be more delightful than the noise of thorns under a pot; even than the laughter and sport of fools, or than the dancings and games that now you plead for? But the truth is, it is not the minds of poor labouring men, that are over-worked and tired on the week-days, but it is their bodies; and therefore there is no recreation so suitable to them as the ease of the body, and the holy and joyful exercise of the mind, upon their Creator, their Redeemer, and their everlasting rest.

4. But if you will needs have days of temptation and sinful sports and pleasures for them, let landlords abate

their tenants as much rent, as one day's vacancy from labour in a month or a fortnight will amount to, or let the common Saints'-days, which of the two are more at man's disposal, be made their sporting-days, and rob not their souls of that one weekly-day, which God had separated for his worship.

*Object.* 'But there are students, and lawyers, and ministers, and gentlemen, whose labour is most that of the brain, and not the ploughman's bodily toil; and these have need of bodily recreation.'

*Ans.* And there are few of these so poor but they can take their bodily recreation on the week-days: and many of them need as much the whole Lord's-day for their soul's edification as any others; and no one that knoweth himself will say that he needs it not. If any men need remission of studies, and bodily exercise, it is ministers themselves; And is it themselves that they plead for sports and dancing for? Would they be companions for the vain in such like vanities?

*Object.* 'But the mind of man is not able to endure a constant intention and elevation of devotion all the day long without recreation and intermission; and putting men upon more than they can do, will but hinder them; when a little recreation will make them more fresh and fervent when they return to God.'

*Ans.* O what an advantage is it to know by experience what one talketh of! and what an inconvenience to talk of holiness and heavenliness by hearsay only! 1. To poor people that have but one day in seven, that one day should not seem too long. 2. If it be from a carnal enmity to God and spiritual things, shortness and seldomness will be no cure. But they have need rather to be provoked to diligence till they are cured, than to be indulged in that averiness and sloth, which till it is cured will prevail, when you have done your best against it. 3. But if it be a weariness of the flesh, as the disciples, when they slept while Christ was praying, or a weariness through such imperfection of grace and remnant of carnality, which the sincere are liable to, then giving way to it will increase it, and resisting it is the way to overcome it. 4. How many necessary intermissions are there, which confute this pretence of weakness? Some time is taken up in dressing; and some with poor ser-



vants in waiting on their masters and mistresses, and preparing meat and drink ; some in going to church and coming home ; some in eating, usually more than once ; some in preparing again for sleep ; besides what cattle and by-occasions will require. And is the remainder of one day in a week, yet too much for the business which we are created, preserved, and redeemed for, and on which our endless life dependeth ? O that we knew what the love of God is ! and what it is to regard our souls according to their worth ! Would not a soul that loveth God rather say, Alas ! how short is the Lord's-day ! How quickly is it gone ! How many interruptions hinder my delight !' Shall I think a week short enough for my worldly labour, and one day (thus parcelled) too long to seek the face of God ? I see blind worldlings and sensualists can be longer unwearied at market, in their shops and fields, especially when their gain comes in ; and at cards and dice, and bowling, and idle prating, &c. And shall I be weary so soon of the most noble and necessary work, and of the sweetest pleasures upon earth ?

A hypocrite that draweth near to God but with the lips, while his heart is far from him, as he never truly seeketh God, so he never truly findeth him, and hath none of the true spiritual delights of holiness, nor ever feeleth the delights of exercising his love to God by the help of faith, in the hopes of heaven : and therefore no wonder if he be weary of such unprofitable, sapless and unpleasant work, as his dead formalities and affections are. But it is not so with the sincere experienced Christian, who serving God in spirit and in truth, hath true and spiritual recreation, pleasure and benefit in and by his service. And therefore we see that the holy experienced believers are still averse to these sensual diversions, and do not think the Lord's-day or his service too long. And, O Christian ! what a happy advantage in such controversies have you, in your holy sincerity and sweet experience !

5. But yet I am not such a stranger to a man, to myself or others, as to deny that our naughty hearts are inclined to be weary of well-doing ; but mark what a cure God in wisdom and mercy hath provided for us ; as it is but one day in seven which is thus to be wholly employed with God, and as much of this day is taken up with the bodily necessities

aforesaid ; so for the rest, God appointeth us variety of exercises, that when we are weary of one, another may be our recreation. When we have heard, we must pray ; and when we have prayed, we must hear again : we must read, we must sing and speak God's praises ; we must celebrate the memorial of Christ's death in the sacrament ; we must meditate ; we must confer, we must instruct our families : and we have variety of subjects for each of these. As a student that is weary hath a variety of books and studies to recreate his mind ; so hath every Christian variety of holy employment on the Lord's-day. And all of it excellent, profitable, and delightful !

Christian, believe not that minister or man whatever he be, that telleth thee that Christ's yoke is heavy, or that his commandments are grievous. Hath he done so much to deliver us from the straight yoke, the heavy burden, and the grievous commandments ? And now shall we accuse him of bringing us under a toilsome task ? Is it a toil to love or count your money ? to love and look upon your corn and cattle ? to love and converse with your friend ? to feast your body on the pleasantest food ? If not, why should it be a toil to any but a wicked heart, to spend a day in loving God, and hearing the messages of his love to us, and in the foresight and foretastes of everlasting love ?

Caviller, come but unto Christ, and cast off the wearisome, toilsome burden of thy sin, and Satan's drudgery, and take Christ's yoke and burden on thee, and learn of him, and try then whether his ways and work be grievous. Come and spend but a day in loving God, as thou dost in talking of him, and try whether love, and the holiest love, be a wearisome work. But if thou wilt make a religion of all shell and no kernel, all carcase and no life, like that which the Jansenists charge the Jesuits with, that say, ' We are bound to love God but once in four or five years, or once in all our lives,' no wonder if thou be weary of such a religion.

But I will tell them that are the teachers of the people, an honest way to cure the people's weariness, than to send them to a piper or to a play to cure it. Preach with such life and awakening seriousness, preach with such grateful, holy eloquence, and with such easy method, and with such variety of wholesome matter, that the people may never be weary of you. Pour out the rehearsal of the love

and benefits of God; open so to them the privileges of faith, and the joys of hope, that they may never be angry. How oft have I heard the people say of such as these, 'I could hear him all day and never be weary!' They are troubled at the shortness of such sermons, and wish they had been longer. Pray with that heavenly life and fervour as may wrap up the souls of those that join with you, and try then whether they will be weary. Praise God with that joyful alacrity which beseemeth one that is ready to pass into glory, and try whether this will not cure the people's weariness.

Misunderstand me not. I am now speaking to none but guilty hypocrites, and not to any faithful, holy ministers. And to such I say, when you have done nothing but coldly read over the public prayers, or as coldly and crudely added your own, and tired the hearers, with a dry, a sapless, lifeless, unexperienced discourse, and then send them as a wearied people, to dancing and sports for a needless recreation; is this like the work of a pastor of souls? When you have cried down other men's praying and preaching, and tell the people that the praying and preaching which you recommend to them as better, will not digest well, without a dance or recreation after it, to expel the people's weariness; is not this to disgrace your own prayers and preaching which you before commended to them? And when you have done, if after this you speak against others for their long praying, and for so much preaching and hearing, as if they never had enough, is not this to commend what you discommend? and to tell the people that those men's praying and preaching whom you revile, is such as doth not weary their auditors; when yours is such as will tire men, if it be long, or if they be not recreated after it with a piper, a fidler, or a dance? O that the Ithacian bishops of the world, and all the clergy of their mind, would at least hear Hooker in the preface to his "Ecclesiastical Polity," how little their cause is beholden to such patrons, and how well it might spare them!

For my own part, as my flesh is weak, so my heart is too bad, too backward to these divine and heavenly works! and yet I never have time to spare. God knoweth that it is my daily groans, 'How great is the work, yea, and how

sweet! and how short is the day, the week, the year! How quickly is it night! How fast do weeks and years roll away! And shall any man that is called a minister of Christ, persuade poor labourers and servants who have but one day for retirement from the world, to converse with God without distraction, that this one day is too long, and that their work must be eased by carnal sports? Nay, shall a man that would be called a minister or a Christian, persuade men against all the experience of the world, that the diversions and interruptions of a dance or May-game, or a race, or a comedy, will dispose their minds to return to God with more heavenly alacrity and purity than before, or than variety of holy exercises will do? Or rather, are we constrained to say (though it displease) that hypocrites are all for imaginary and hypocritical religion; and that whether he be at church or at home, in praying, or in drinking, and sensuality, and voluptuousness; a worldling is every where a worldling still, and an hypocrite is an hypocrite still; and it is not his book or pulpit that maketh him another man. And that as the man is, such will be his work. '*Operari sequitur esse.*' And that the Jesuits are not the only men in the world that would make a religion to suit men's lusts, and would serve Satan and the flesh, in the livery of Christ. But I fear I have been too long on this objection.

IV. The Lord's-day must not be spent in idleness; not in unnecessary sleep, or in vain walking, or long dressings, or too long feasting, or any thing unnecessary which diverteth our souls from their sacred seasonable work. It is not a Jewish ceremonious Sabbath of bodily rest which we are to keep; but it is a day of holy and spiritual works; of the needfullest work in all the world; to do that which is ten thousand times more necessary and excellent, than all our labours and provisions for the flesh. And if no man hath time to spare on the week-day, but he that knoweth not aright what it is to be a Christian, or a man, or why God maintaineth and upholdeth him in the world; what shall we think of them that can find time to spare on the Lord's-day, and can walk and idle away the most precious of all their time? If it be folly to cast away your silver, it is not wisdom to cast away your gold. O that God would but open men's eyes, to see what is before them, and how

near to eternity they stand, and awaken men's sleepy, sensual souls, to live as men that do not dream of another world, but unfeignedly believe it; and then a little reasoning would serve turn to convince them, that the Lord's-day should be spent in the duties of serious holiness, and not in idleness, or unnecessary works, or sports.

*Object.* 'But by all this you seem to cast a great reproach on Calvin, Beza, and most of the great divines of the foreign churches, who have not been so strict for the observation of the Lord's-day.'

*Ans.* Let these things be observed by the impartial reader: 1. It cannot be proved to be most of them, that were so faulty herein as the objection intimateth. 2. Many of them have written much for the holy spending of the day in spiritual exercises. 3. And you must remember that they came newly out of popery, and had seen the Lord's-day, and a superabundance of other human holy days imposed on the churches to be ceremoniously observed, and they did not all of them, so clearly as they ought, discern the difference between the Lord's-day and those holy days, or church-festivals, and so did too promiscuously conjoin them in their reproofs of the burdens imposed on the church. And it being the Papists' ceremoniousness, and their multitude of festivals that stood altogether in their eye, it tempted them to too undistinguishing and inaccurate a reformation. 4. And for Calvin you must know that he spent every day so like to a Lord's-day, in hard study, and prayer, and numerous writings, and public preaching, or lecturing and disputings, either every day in the week, or very near it, scarce allowing himself time for his one only spare meal a day, that he might the more easier be tempted, to make the less difference in his judgment between the Lord's-day and the other days, than he should have done, and to plead for more recreation on that day for others, than he took on any day himself. 5. And then his followers having also many of the same temptations, were apt to tread in his steps, through the deserved estimation of his worth and judgment, and lest they should seem to be of different minds. But as England hath been the happiest in this piece of reformation, so all men are inexcusable that encourage idleness, sensuality, or neglect of the important duties of the day.

## CHAPTER XI.

*What Things should not be scrupled as unlawful on the Lord's-day.*

As I have told you the Lord's-day is not a Sabbath in the Jewish sense, or a day of ceremonial rest, but a day of worshipping our Creator and Redeemer with thankful commemorations and with holy joy, &c. And a day of vacancy from such earthly things as may be any hindrance to this holy work; so now I must resolve the question first in the general, that nothing lawful at another time, is unlawful on this day, which hath not the nature of an impediment to the holy duties of the day; unless it be accidentally on the account of scandal or ill example unto others, or disobeying the laws of magistrates, or crossing the concord of the churches, or such like. Therefore hence I deduce these particular resolutions following.

I. It is not unlawful to be at such bodily or mental labours as is needful to the spiritual duties of the day. If the "priests in the temple (saith Christ) did break the Sabbath and were blameless," (that is, not the command of God to them for keeping the Sabbath, but the external rest of the Sabbath, which was commanded to others, with an exception to their case,) we may well say that it is no sin for a minister now to spend his strength in laborious preaching and praying; or for the people to travel as far as is needful, to the church-assemblies: Nor do we need to tie ourselves to a Sabbath-day's journey, (that is, according to the scribes, 2000 cubits, which is 3000 feet, and 'quinque stadia):' It is lawful to go many miles when it is necessary to the work of the day.

II. It is not unlawful to be at the labour of dressing ourselves somewhat more ornately or comely than on another day. Because it is suitable to the rejoicing of a festival. But to waste time needlessly in curiosity, and proud attiring, to the hindrance of greater things, is detestable.

III. It is not unlawful to dress meat, even in some fuller and better manner than on other days; because it is a festival, or day of thanksgiving. And it is a vain self-contradiction of some men, who think that another day of thanks-

giving is not well kept, if there be not two feasting meals at least, and yet think it unlawful to dress one on the Lord's-day : but yet to make it a day of gluttony, or to waste more of the day in eating or dressing meat than is agreeable to the spiritual work of the day, which is our end ; or to make ourselves sleepy by fulness ; or to use our servants like beasts, to provide for our bellies, with the neglect of their own souls ; or to pamper the flesh to the satisfaction and irritation of its lusts ; all this is to be detested.

IV. It is not unlawful to do the necessary works of mercy to ourselves or others, to man or beast ; those which must be done, and cannot be delayed without more hurt than the doing of them will procure (for that is the description of a necessary work). As to eat and drink and clothe ourselves, and our children ; to carry meat to the poor that are in present necessity ; to give or take physic ; and to go for advice to the physician or surgeon : to travel upon a business of importance and necessity ; to quench a fire ; or prop a house that is about to fall ; to march or fight in a necessary case of war ; to sail or labour at sea in cases of necessity ; to boat men over a river, that go to church ; to pursue a robber, or defend him that is assaulted ; to pull a man out of fire or water ; to dress a man's sores, or give physic to the sick ; to pull an ox or horse or other cattle out of a pit or water ; to drive or lead them to water, and to give them meat ; to save cattle, corn or hay, from the sudden inundations of the sea, or of rivers, or from floods ; to drive cattle or swine out of the grounds where they break in to spoil ; such necessary actions are not unlawful, but a duty ; it being a moral or natural precept, which Christ twice bid the ceremonious Pharisees learn, " I will have mercy and not sacrifice."

And it is not only works of necessity to a man's life, that are here meant by necessary works ; but such also as are necessary to a smaller and lower end or use.

And yet it is not all such necessity neither, that will allow us to do the thing. Otherwise a tradesman or ploughman might say that his labour is necessary to the getting or saving of this or that small commodity ; I shall be a loser if I do not work. And on the other side, if it were only a necessity for life, limbs, or livelihood that would allow us labour, then it would be unlawful to dress meat, and to drive

cattle out of the corn, and many such things before-mentioned; and then it would be lawful to give meat only to oxen or horses of great price, and not to hens, ducks, geese, dogs and other animals of little value.

Therefore there is a great deal of prudent discretion necessary to the avoiding of extremes. God hath not enumerated all the particulars which are allowed or forbidden in their generals. What then shall we do? Shall we violate the outward rest of the day for the worth of a groat or two-pence, (as the feeding of hens or such-like may be?) Or shall we suffer the loss of many pounds rather than stir to save them? As for instance, is it lawful to open, or turn, or carry in corn or hay, which in all probability (though not certainly) is like to be lost or very much spoiled, if it be let alone till the next day? The corn or hay may be of many pounds value, when the feeding of swine, or hens, may be little: the corn or hay is like to be lost; when the swine, or hens, or horses, or oxen, may easily recover the hunger or abstinence of a day? What must be done in such cases as these?

I answer, 1. It is necessary to know that where God hath not made particular determinations, yet general laws do still oblige us.

2. And that Christian prudence is necessary to the right discerning how far our actions fall under those general laws of God.

3. That he that will discern these things must be a man that truly understandeth, valueth and loveth the true ends and work of the Lord's-day, and not a man that bateth it, or careth not for it; and a man that hath a right estimation also of those outward things, which stand in question to be meddled with. And he must be one that hath no superstitious Jewish conceits of the external rest of the day: and he must be one that looketh, not only to one thing or a few, but to all things, how numerous soever, which the determination of his case dependeth on.

4. And because very few are such, it is needful that those few that are such, be casuists and advisers to the rest, and that the more ignorant consult with them (especially if they be their proper pastors) as they do with physicians and lawyers for their health and their estates.

5. It must be known that oftentimes the laws of the land do



interpose in such cases; and if they do determine so strictly, as to forbid that which else would to some be lawful, they must be obeyed; because bad men cannot be kept from doing ill by excesses, unless some good men be hindered by the same laws from some things that are to them indifferent, nay, possibly, eligible, if there were no such law.

6. And accordingly the case of scandal or temptation to others, that will turn our example to their sin, must be considered in our practice. Yea, it is not only things merely indifferent that we must deny our liberty in, to prevent another's fall, but oftentimes that which would else be a duty may become a sin, when it will scandalize another, or tempt him to a far greater and more dangerous sin. As it may be my duty to speak some word, or do some action, as most useful and beneficial, when there is nothing against it; and yet if I may foresee that another will turn that speech or action to his ruin, to the hatred of piety, or to take occasion from it to exercise cruelty upon other Christians, &c. it may become my heinous sin. So it must here be considered, who will know of the action which you do; and what use they are like to make of it?

7. And a little public hurt must be more regarded, than more private benefit; and the hurt of man's soul cannot be countervailed by your corporal commodities.

8. These things being premised, I suppose that the great rule to guide you in such undetermined circumstances is the interest of the end; all things must be done to the glory of God, and to edification. A truly impartial, prudent man can discern by comparing all the circumstances, whether his action (as if it were carrying endangered corn) were likely to do more good or harm. On one side you must put in the balance the value of the thing to be saved; your own necessity of it; the poor's necessity of it; and Christ's command, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost:" On the other side, you must consider, how far it will hinder your spiritual benefit and duty; and how far the example may be like to encourage such as will do such things without just cause; and so try which is the way of God's honour and your own and your neighbour's good; and that is the way which you must take (as in the disciple's rubbing the ears of corn, &c.); for the rule is, that your labour is then lawful and a duty, when in the judgment of a truly ju-

dition person, it is like to do more good than hurt ; and it is then sinful, when it is like to do more hurt than good. Though all cannot discern this, yet (as far as I know) this is the true rule, to judge such actions. As for them that suppose our Lord's-day to be under the laws of rest with the Jewish Sabbath, and so think that they have a readier way to decide these doubts, I will not contend with them, but I have told you why I am not of their mind.

V. From hence I further conclude, that whereas there are such actions which bring some little benefit, but yet are no apparent hindrances of any of the work of the day, it seemeth to me too much ceremoniousness, and too ungospel-like, to trouble our own or other men's consciences, by concluding such things to be unlawful. If one have a word to speak of some considerable worldly business, which may be forgotten if it be not presently spoken ; or if I meet one with whom I must speak the next day about some worldly business, and if I then wish him to come speak with me, I must send a great way to him afterwards, I will not say that it is a sin to speak such a word. I will first look at a man's positive duties on the Lord's-day, how he heareth, and readeth, and prayeth, and spendeth his time, and how he instructeth and helpeth his family ; and if he be diligent in seeking God, (Heb. xi. 6,) and ply his heavenly business, I shall be very backward to judge him for a word or action about worldly things that falls in on the by, without any hindrance to his spiritual work. And if another speak not a word of any common thing, and yet do little in spiritual things, for his own or other's edification, I shall think him a great abuser or neglecter of the Lord's-day. A few words about a common thing that falleth in the way, may be spoken without any hindrance of any holy duty : but still we must see that it be not a scandalous temptation to others. If I see a man that unexpectedly findeth some uncomely hole or rent in his clothes, either pin it up or sew it up, before he goeth abroad, I will not blame him : but if he do it so as to embolden another who useth needlessly to mend his clothes on the Lord's-day, it will be a sin of scandal. If I see one cut some indecent straggling hairs before he go forth, I will not blame him ; but if he do it before one who will be encouraged by it to be barbered needlessly on that day, he will offend. And so in other cases.

VI. By these same rules also we may judge of recreations on the Lord's-day. The recreations of the mind must be the various holy employments of the day. No bodily recreations are lawful which needlessly waste time, or hinder our duty, or divert our minds from holy things, or are a snare to others. Unless it be some weak persons whose health requireth bodily motion, few persons need any other than holy recreations on that day. I know no one man that so much needeth it as myself, who these twenty years cannot digest one day's meat, unless I walk, or run, or exercise my body before it, till I am hot, or sweat; and therefore necessity requireth me to walk or fast; but I do it privately on that day, lest I tempt others to sin. But I will not censure one whom I see walking at fit hours, when for ought I know he may be taken up in some fruitful meditation. But if persons will walk in the streets or fields in idleness, or for vain delight, or discourse, as if the day were too long for them, and they had no business to do for their souls, this is not only a sin, but a very ill sign of one that is senseless of his soul's necessity and his duty.

VII. To read history, philosophy, or common things, unnecessarily on the Lord's-day, is a sinful diversion from the more spiritual work of it; and unsuitable to the appointed uses of the day (much more romances, play-books, or idle stories): yea, or those parts of divinity itself, which are less practical and useful to the raising of thankful and heavenly affections. But yet sometimes such other matter may fall in, at a sermon, or conference, or in meditation, which will require a present satisfaction in some point of history, philosophy, or controversial divinity, which may be subserviently used to edification, without sin. Here therefore we must judge prudently.

VIII. A thing that may be lawful singly in itself, unless it be of great necessity is unlawful when he that serveth us in it is drawn or encouraged to make a trade of it. As to use a barber to cut your hair; or a tailor to mend your clothes, or a cobbler to mend your shoes. Because if you may use him, so may others as well as you, and so he will follow his calling on the Lord's-day. And yet I dare not say, if when you are to travel to church, you find your shoes or boots by breaking something, to make you incapable of going out, but you may get them mended privately, where

it may be done without this inconvenience. And though cooks and barbers should not be unnecessarily used in their trade, yet it is not always unlawful, but sometimes very well. Because as one servant in the kitchen may be used to dress meat for all the family, so one baker or cook may serve many families, and save ten times as many persons the labour which else they must be at; and perhaps with easier and quicker dispatch than others. The trade of the apothecary, surgeon, and physician, is ordinarily used, but for necessity.

IX. There is no sufficient avoidance of such abuses, but by careful foresight, and prevention, and preparation the week before; which therefore must be conscionably done.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

*Of what Importance the due Observation of the Lord's-day is.*

THE singular benefits of keeping the Lord's-day aright, should make all that love God, or holiness, or the church, or their own or other men's souls, take heed how they grow into a neglect of it: much more that they plead not for such negligence or abuse.

I. The due observation of the Lord's-day is needful to keep up the solemn worship of God, and public owning and honouring him in the world: If all men were left to themselves, what time they should bestow in the worshipping of God, the greatest part would cast off all, and grow into atheism or utter profaneness; and the rest would grow into confusion. And if all princes and rulers, or churches in the world were left to their own wills, to appoint the people on what days to meet, some kingdoms and churches would have one day in eight, or nine, or ten, or twenty, and some only now and then an hour, and some one day, and some another, and some next to none at all. For there is no one universal monarch on earth to make laws for them all (whatever the pope or his nominal general councils may pretend to): and they would never all come to any reasonable agreement voluntarily among themselves. Therefore the light of nature telleth us, that as a day is meet and needful to be stated; so it is meet that God himself, the true Universal Monarch, should determine of it; which accordingly he hath done.

And this is the very hedge and defensative of God's public worship. When he hath made a law that one whole day in seven shall be spent in it, men are engaged to attend it.

O what a happy acknowledgment of God and our Creator and Redeemer is it, and an honouring of his blessed name, when all the churches throughout all the world are at once praising the same God, with the same praises, and hearing and learning the same Gospel, and professing the same faith, and thankfully commemorating the same benefits: the church is then indeed, like an army with banners. And were it not for this day's observation, alas! how different would the case be! And what greater thing can man be bound to, than thus to keep up the solemn acknowledgment and worship of God and our Redeemer in the world?

II. The due sanctification of the Lord's-day, doth tend to make religion universal, as to countries and individual persons, which else would be of narrower extent. When all the world are under a divine obligation, to spend one day every week in the exercises of religion, (and superiors see to the performance of their subject's obedience to this law,) it will make men to be in some sort religious whether they will or not: though they cannot be truly religious against their will, it will make them visibly religious. Yea, God's own law, if man's did nothing, would lay an awe on the consciences of most, who believe that there is a God that made that law. And the weekly assemblies keep up the knowledge and profession of the Christian faith, and keep God and heaven in the people's remembrance, and keep sin under constant rebukes and disgrace. And were it not for this, heathenism, infidelity and profaneness would quickly overspread the world. The Lord's-day keepeth up the Christian religion in the world.

III. The lamentable ignorance of the generality in the world, doth require the strict and diligent observation of the whole Lord's-day. Children and servants, and ordinary country people, yea and too many of higher quality, are so exceeding ignorant of the things of God and their salvation, that all the constant diligence that can be used with them, in preaching, exhorting, catechising, &c. will not overcome it with the most. The most diligent masters of families lament it; how ignorant their families are when they have done the best they can. Let those that plead for dancing and

sporting away much of the day, but do like men that do not secretly scorn Christianity, nor despise their servants' souls, and let them but try what measure of knowledge the bare hearing of common prayer; yea, and a sermon or two with it, will beget in their servants, if the rest of the day be spent in sports; and let them judge according to experience. If ever knowledge be propagated to such, and families made fit to live like Christians, it is likeliest to be by the holy improvement of this day, in the diligent teaching and learning the substance of religion, and in the sacred exercises thereof.

IV. The great carnality, worldliness and carelessness of the most, and their great averseness to the things of God, doth require that they be called and kept to a close and diligent improvement of the Lord's-day. Whatever unexperienced or carnal persons may pretend, that such constant duty so long together will make them worse and more averse, reason, experience and Scripture all are against them. If there be some backwardness at the first, it is not sports and idleness that will cure it; but resisting of the slothful humour, and keeping to the work. For there is that in religion that tendeth to overcome men's averseness to religion; and it must be overcome by religion, and not by playing or idleness, if ever it be overcome. It is want of knowledge and experience of it, which maketh them loathe it, or be weary of it: when they have tried it more, and know it better, they will (if ever) be reconciled to it. Six days in a week are a sufficient diversion. Apprentices, and pupils, and schoolboys will hold on in learning, though they be averse; and you think not all the six days too much to hold them to it. A schoolboy must learn daily eight hours in a day; and yet some wretched men (yea, teachers) would persuade poor souls that must learn how to be saved or perish for ever, that less than eight hours one day in seven, is too much to be spent in the needfullest, excellentest and pleasantest matters in all the world.

If you say that the sublimity or difficulty maketh it wearisome; I answer, that philosophers do much longer hold on in harder speculations.

If you say divinity being unsuitable to carnal minds, their sick stomachs must take no more than they can digest. I answer, 1. Cannot a carnal preacher for his gain, and honour, and fancy, hold on all the year in the study even of

divinity, perhaps eight or ten hours every day in the week? And may not ignorant people be brought one day to endure to be taught as long? 2. That which you call digesting, is but understanding, and believing, and receiving it: and one truth tendeth to introduce another; and he that cannot learn with an hour's labour, may learn more in two. 3. And it is hearing and exercise that must cure their want of appetite. Experience telleth us, that when people take the liberty of plays, and sports, and idleness for a recreation, they come back with much more want of love to holy exercises, than they that continue longer at them. Gratifying sloth and sensuality increaseth it, and increaseth an averseness to all that is good; for who are more averse than they that are most voluptuous? If ever people be made seriously holy, it is a due observation of the whole Lord's-day, that is like to bring them to it (I mean, observing it in such learning and seeking duties as they are capable of, till they can do better). For when the mind long dwelleth on the truth, it will sink in and work; and many strokes will drive the nail to the head.

Let the adversaries of this day and diligence but observe, and if true experience tell not the world that more souls are converted on the Lord's-days than all the other days besides, and that religion best prospereth both as to the number and the knowledge and serious holiness of the professors of it, where the Lord's-day is carefully sanctified, rather than where idleness and playing do make intermission, then I will confess that I am incapable of knowing any thing of this nature by experience. But if it be so, fight not against the common light.

V. The poverty, servitude, and worldly necessity of the most, do require a strict observation of the whole Lord's-day. Tenants and labourers, carters and carriers, and abundance of tradesmen are so poor, that they can hardly spare any proportion of time: much less all their children and servants, whose subjection, with their parents and master's poverty, restraineth them. Alas! they are fain to rise early and hasten to their work and scarce have leisure to eat and sleep as nature requireth: and they are so toiled and wearied with hard labour, that if they have at night a quarter of an hour to read a chapter and pray, they can scarce hold open their eyes from sleeping. What time hath the minis-

ter then to come and teach them? (if we had such ministers again as would be at the pains to do it.) And what time have they to hear or learn? You must teach them on the Lord's-day, or scarcely at all. Almost all that they must learn must be then learned.

I deny not but in those former years, when the law forbade me not to preach the Gospel, the people came to me on the week-day, house by house; and also that they learned much in their shops while they were working. But, 1. It came to one family's turn but one hour, or little more, in a whole year (for about fourteen families a week so catechised and instructed, did no sooner bring their course about). 2. And our people were mostly weavers, whose labour was not like ploughmen's, masons', carpenters', carriers', &c. to take up their thoughts; but they would lay a book before them, and read, or meditate, or discourse to edification whilst they were working. But it is not the case of the multitude.

And let any sober man but consider, whether with people so ignorant and averse as the most are, should he be never so diligent on the Lord's-day, the six days intermission be not a great cooling of their affection; and a great delayer of their growth in knowledge; when they are like by the week's-end to forget all that they had learned on the Lord's-day. What then would these poor people come to, if the Lord's-day itself must be also loitered or played away?

VI. The tyranny of many masters maketh the Lord's-day a great mercy to the world: for if God had not made a law for their rest and liberty, abundance of worldly, impious persons, would have allowed them little rest for their bodies, and less opportunity for the good of their souls. Therefore they have cause with great thankfulness to improve the holy liberty which God hath given them, and not cast it away on play or idleness.

VII. The full improvement of the Lord's-days doth tend to breed and keep up an able, faithful ministry in the churches (on which the preservation and glory of religion much dependeth). When there is a necessity of full ecclesiastical performances imposed on ministers, they are also necessitated to prepare themselves with answerable abilities and fitness. But when no more is required of them, but to read the liturgy, or to say a short and dry discourse,



they that know no more is necessary (to their ends) are so strongly tempted to get ability and preparations for no more, that few will overcome the temptation. And therefore the world knoweth that in Moscovy, Abassia, and for the most part of the Greek and Armenian churches, as nothing or little more than reading is required, so little more ability than to read is laboured after, and the ministers are ordinarily so ignorant and weak, as is the scorn and decay of the Christian religion.

VIII. Yea, it will strongly incline masters of families to labour more for abilities, to instruct and catechise their families, and pray with them, and guide them in the fear of God, when they know that the whole day must be improved to the spiritual good of their families. And so knowledge, abilities, and family-holiness will increase: whereas those that think themselves under no such obligations, what ignorant, profane, and ungodly families have they? Because, for the most part, they are such themselves.

IX. A multitude of gross sins will be prevented by the due observance of the Lord's-day. Nothing more usual than for the sports, riots, idleness, and sensuality of that day, to be nurseries of oaths, curses, ribaldry, fornication, gluttony, drunkenness, frays and bloodshed. And is not God's service better work than these?

X. Lastly, This holy order and prosperity of the churches, and this knowledge and piety in individual subjects, will become the safety, beauty, order, and felicity of kingdoms, and all civil societies of men. For when the people are fit but duly to use and sanctify the Lord's-day, they are fit to use all things in a sanctified manner, and to be an honour to their country, and an ease and comfort to their governors, and a common blessing to all about them.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

*What other Church-Festivals or separated Days are Lawful?*

I SHALL conclude this discourse with a brief answer of this question.

I. No sober Christian doubteth, but that some part of every day is to be spent in religious exercise; and that

even our earthly business must be done with a spiritual intent and mind. And that every day must be kept as like to the Lord's-day, as our weakness, and our other duties, which God hath laid upon us, will allow.

II. Few make any question but that whole days of humiliation and thanksgiving may and must be kept upon great and extraordinary occasions, of judgments or mercies. And that many churches may agree in these. And I know no just reason why the magistrate may not (with charity and moderation to the weak) impose them, and command such an agreement among his subjects.

III. Few doubt but the commemoration of great mercies or judgments may be made anniversary, and of long continuance. As the Powder-plot-day (November 5.) is now made among us, to preserve the memorial of that deliverance. And why may it not be continued, whilst the great sense of the benefit should be continued? And so the Second of September is set apart for the anniversary humbling remembrance of the firing of London. And so in divers other cases.

IV. The great blessing of an apostolic ministry, and of the stability of the martyrs in their sufferings for Christ, being so rare and notable a mercy to the church, I confess I know no reason why the churches of all succeeding ages may not keep an anniversary-day of thanksgiving to God for Peter or Paul, or Stephen, as well as for the Powder-plot deliverance. I know not where God hath forbidden it, directly or indirectly. If his instituting the Lord's-day were a virtual prohibition for man to separate any more, or if the prohibition of adding to God's word were against it, they would be against other days of humiliation and thanksgiving, especially anniversary; which we confess they are not. If the reason be scandal, lest the men should have the honour instead of God, I answer, 1. An honour is due to apostles and martyrs in their places, in meet subordination to God. 2. Where the case of scandal is notorious, it may become by that accident unlawful, and yet not be so in other times and places.

V. The devil hath here been a great undoer by overdoing: When he knew not how else to cast out the holy observation of the Lord's-day, with zealous people, he found out the trick of devising so many days called holy-days to

set up by it, that the people might perceive that the observation of them all as holy, was never to be expected. And so the Lord's-day was jumbled in the heap of holy-days, and all turned into ceremony, by the Papists, and too many other churches in the world. - Which became Calvin's temptation (as his own words make plain), to think too meanly of the Lord's-day with the rest.

VI. In the lawful observation of days, it is most orderly to do as the churches do which we live among and are joined to.

VII. But if church-tyranny would overwhelm any place with over-numerous days (or ceremonies) which are (singly considered) lawful, we should do nothing needlessly to countenance and encourage such usurpation.

VIII. Yet it is lawful to hear a sermon, which shall be preached on a human holy-day, which is imposed by usurpation. Seeing such a moral duty may be done, and so great a benefit received, without any approbation of the inconvenient season.

IX. And when we think it unlawful to join in the positive celebration of unlawful days (as the Mahometan Sabbath), yet it may become a duty for the civil peace and our own safety, to obey the magistrate in forbearing open opposition or contempt, or working upon that day? And so Paul justifieth himself against the Jews' accusations, that they "found him not in the temple disputing with any man, nor raising up the people, nor in the synagogues, nor in the city," (Acts xxiv. 12,) unless it be when we have a special call, to reprove the error which we forbear complying with.

X. It is long ago decided by the Holy Ghost, (Rom. xiv. ; xv.) that we must not be contentious, contemptuous, nor censorious against one another, about things of no greater moment, than the Jewish days were, though some observed them without just cause : because the kingdom of God consisteth not in meats and drinks, and days, but in "righteousness, and peaceableness, and joy in the Holy Ghost. And he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God (and received by him) and approved of (wise) men, and should be received to communion with them." (Rom. xiv. 17, 18 ; xv. 7.) We must therefore "follow after the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." (Rom. xiv. 19.)

XI. The controversy, Whether it be lawful to separate an anniversary-day for the commemoration of Christ's nativity, circumcision, and such like things which were equally existent in the apostles' days, and the reason for observing them equal with following times, (and so the apostles had the same reason to have appointed such days had they thought it best, as we have) I acknowledge too hard for me to determine: not being able to prove it lawful, I cannot own and justify it; and not seeing a plain prohibition, I will not condemn it, nor be guilty of unpeaceable opposing church-customs or authority in it, but behave myself as a peaceable doubter.

XII. But that earthly power may appoint a weekly-day, in commemoration of any part of our redemption, besides the Lord's-day, and so make another separated weekly stated holy-day, I think plainly unlawful, because it is a doing the same thing for one day, which God hath done already by another; and so seemeth to me, 1. An usurpation of a power not given, And, 2. An accusation of Christ and the Holy Ghost, as if he had not done his work sufficiently, but man must come after and do it better.

But especially if such (or any day or ceremony) be by an universal law imposed on the universal church, it is arrogant usurpation of the Divine authority; there being no vicarious head or monarch under Christ of all the world, or all the church, nor any universal governor, who may use such legislation, whether personal or collective.

The same I may say of any that would presume to abrogate the Lord's-day.

And so much shall suffice, in great haste, of this subject.

And to Thee, O most glorious and gracious Creator and Redeemer, I humbly return my unfeigned thanks, for the unspeakable mercies which I have received on thy day; and much more for so great a mercy to all thy churches and the world: and craving the pardon (among the rest) of the sins which I have committed on thy day, I beseech thee to continue this exceeding mercy to thy churches and to me; and restore me and other of thy servants, to the privileges, and comforts of this day, which we have forfeited and lost; and let me serve thee in the life, and light, and love of thy Spirit, in these thy holy days on earth, till I be prepared for, and received to, the everlasting rest in heavenly glory. Amen.

## AN APPENDIX

FOR

FURTHER CONFIRMATION OF GOD'S OWN SEPARATION OF THE  
LORD'S-DAY,

AND

DISPROVING THE CONTINUATION OF THE JEWISH SEVENTH-  
DAY-SABBATH.

### CHAPTER I.

*An Answer to certain Objections against the Lord's-day.*

THOUGH they are answered before, the reader must pardon me, if upon the particular urgencies of some objectors, I again make answer to these that follow.

*Object.* 'Acts xx. 7. "The first day of the week;" (Gr. one of the Sabbaths.) That the breaking of bread there was common eating, compare the like Greek phrase, Acts xxvii. 35; ii. 42. See Isa. lviii. However, it was but an example of preaching, and breaking bread, upon a special occasion.'

*Ans.* 1. That 'Εν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων signifieth on the first day of the week, the generality of the ancients, both Greek and Latin, agree, whose testimony about the sense of a word, is the best dictionary and evidence that we can expect. And the same phrase used of the day of Christ's resurrection by the evangelists, proves it. Though I am sorry to hear of one that denieth that also, and asserteth that Christ rose on the second day morning, because else he could not, as Jonah, be three days and nights buried. But I am not so proud as to think myself capable of convincing that man in such a matter of fact, who will not believe the historical witness of the whole church of Christ, and expecteth to be believed against them all, at such a distance in the end of the world.

2. There is no doubt but that κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, breaking

of bread, was both a common and a sacred action: and the phrase is to be interpreted by the context, to know when it signifieth the common, and when the sacred. In Acts xxvii. 35, the context teacheth us to interpret it of common eating: but that it doth not so, Acts ii. 42. 46; or Acts xx. 7. is plain to him that considereth, 1. That it was then usual to communicate sacramentally in all their church-assemblies. 2. That these mentioned were church-assemblies; the church being met purposely for sacred works. Yet it is to be remembered, that the love-feasts did usually concur in the beginning with the sacrament, and the name might be used with respect to both.

3. That it was not a mere occasional meeting, is apparent to the unprejudiced, 1. Because they stayed at Troas seven days, (ver. 6.) and in all the seven make no mention of this exercise, but on the one only, which was the first, 2. Because as is said, it was not a family, or by-meeting, but a church-meeting; "The disciples came, or assembled together." 3. Because it is said that they assembled for this very end, "to break bread" *συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν τῇ κλάσει*. 4. The great length of time which was spent in the holy exercises: Besides the rest of the worship, and breaking of bread, Paul preaching till midnight; which intimateth that such work took up the day. 5. Because it is mentioned as a matter of custom: they did not assemble because Paul called them to hear him only, as being to depart to-morrow; but Paul assembled with them at the time of their assembling to break bread; and it seemeth that he deferred his journey for that opportunity. 6. Because other texts, as joined with this, and infallible church-history following, do prove, past all doubt, that it was the constant custom of all the churches so to do.

*Object.* '1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. "The first day of the week, &c." (Gr. one of the Sabbaths.) It is an ordinance to lay aside for charitable uses; but not one word about changing the Sabbath.'

*Ans.* The abolition of the Sabbath we prove not by this text, but by others: all that we bring this for, is but to shew in conjunction with others, as part of the sacred history, that the first day was the church's separated day. And I pray mark the strength of the proof, that the apostle did 'give order that all the churches of Galatia, as well as

the Corinthians, should deposit' their alms on one and the same day, viz. on the first day. Was it not enough to tie them to the contribution, but he must tie them all to one set day to lay it by, or deposit it; if it had not been because the churches used to assemble on this day, and not to appear before God empty (as Dr. Hammond noteth on the text)? Whoever heard else that God or man tied several countries to one set day, for the private depositing of their own monies afterward to be distributed? "With such sacrifices God is well pleased;" and therefore it was ever accounted by Christians a fit work for the sanctified day; but no other day was ever appointed peculiarly for the set time of laying by men's gifts of charity.

*Object.* 'Rev. i. 10. "John was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day." Compare Exod. xx. 10, &c.; Isa. lviii. 13, &c.; Luke vi. 5; Mark ii. 28; Matt. xii. 8, &c. And if the Scripture be the rule to judge, resolve whether that day be not the Lord's-day, and of which only, (as distinguished from the other days of the week,) the Son of man is Lord.'

*Ans.* We are not upon a controversy of title or property, whether God be Lord of other days: for so no doubt he is Lord of all, and therefore no more of one than another, because his propriety in each one is absolute; and it can be no more in any. Thus also he is absolute Lord of all things, all places, all persons, &c. And yet some things, some places, some persons have been separated to his service by a peculiar dedication and relation; and thence have been particularly called *the Lord's*. And the texts cited by you out of the Old Testament prove that such was the Seventh-day Sabbath then: but not that it is so now; or was to be so for perpetuity.

And the words of the New Testament cited, "The Son of Man is Lord also, or even of the Sabbath-day," shews no more than that it was in his power: he giveth it as a reason for his doing that which the Pharisees counted Sabbath-breaking (by which he oftentimes offended them), and not as a reason of his establishing it. And it seemeth plainly to mean, that being but a positive law, and a law of Moses, he had power to change it, and dispense with it, as well as with other positives and Mosaical laws. As it is said, Ephes. i. 22, 23. "he hath made him head over all things to the church;" not head to all things; so he is Lord over,

or of all days; but all are not separated to his worship. As it is said, John xvii. 2. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him:" so it may be said he hath power over all days, that he may sanctify one to his peculiar service, and use the rest in more common works.

But that which we bring this text for, is but to know what day is notified to the world by this title of *the Lord's-day*, and consequently was then accounted his separated peculiar day. Now the signification of words is known but by use: they are not natural signs, but arbitrary: you know not the sense of one word of Hebrew, Greek or Latin, but by the history of their use, by dictionaries, authors or other tradition. Now it is unquestionable to any man versed in antiquity, that all the churches and authors, Greek and Latin, Syriac, Æthiopic, Persian, Arabic, that have been known among us, and speak of such things, do unanimously call the first day of the week by the name of *the Lord's-day*, as being so called from the beginning, even from the apostles; and all old expositors so interpret this text. And you may as well question what day the word Sabbath signified in the Old Testament almost, as what day the name of the Lord's-day signified in the New; or what sort of people they were, that were called Christians first at Antioch, when only one sort hath ever since been notified by that name; even the disciples of Christ. The Greek, with the Syriac translation, the Arabic, the vulgar Latin, have all *the Lord's-day*; and the Ethiopic as equipollent, hath *the first day*. And Dr. Heylin (who would find something against it, if any thing were to be found,) speaking of some of late that otherwise expound it, is so ingenuous as to say, (part 2. cap. i. p. 37.) 'Touching this we will not meddle; let them that own it look to it: the rather since St. John hath generally been expounded in the other sense, by Aretas, and Andr. Cæsariensis on the place, and by Beda, de rat. temp. c. 6. and by the suffrage of the church, the best expositor of the word of God; wherein this day hath constantly, since the time of the apostles, been honoured with that name above other days.' And I know no one man (nor many) that at sixteen hundred years distance almost, is so worthy to be believed for the bare sense of a word, as the constant use and universal testimony of all ages from that time till now.



As Christ is the Lord of all our suppers, yet all are not called the Lord's-supper; so it is in this case.

I must needs conclude therefore, that if I should cast off the evidence of this text, upon no greater reason than you offer me, I think, I should resist the Holy Ghost, and use violence against God's word, which I should obey.

*Object.* ' There is no law in the Scripture to observe the first day, no promise made to the observers of it, no threatening against the breakers of it, &c. shew it. And if no law, no transgression, " Sin is a transgression of the law." (Rom. iv. 15.)

*Ans.* I have shewed you full proof of a law for it before. Though it was not Christ's way to enact his laws in that majestic commanding form as God did to Moses on the Mount. But as he condescended to come in flesh, to be a Teacher and Saviour, in the form of a servant, under the law himself, to redeem those that were under it, so he maketh his laws in a merciful, teaching-style. All that is revealed by him as his will, appointing our duty, is his law. But that we observe the Lord's-day, is revealed by him as his will, making it our duty.

These are his laws requiring us to hear and obey his Spirit in his apostles, " As the Father hath sent me, so send I you: and when he had said this he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c. (John xx. 21, 22.) " He that heareth you, heareth me." (Luke x. 16.)

And this is his law requiring his apostles by that Spirit to promulgate his laws, and make known his will. Go, disciple me all nations, baptizing them, &c. " teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (or age); (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20;) with the other texts fore-cited.

And that the Spirit in the apostles hath settled the Lord's-day, as the separated day for holy assemblies and worship, I have proved to you, both by the texts which you now sought in vain to make void, and the unquestionable practice and history of the universal church, from that age until this. And withal by other texts which you omit: which (not alone, but) all set together make up the proof, because it is historical evidence of a matter of fact, which we have to seek after.

1. Christ's resurrection laid the foundation, or gave the

cause; as God's ceasing from his works did the Sabbath. 2. Christ's appearing to them assembled on that day, began the actual separation. 3. The Holy Ghost coming down on them, on that day, did more notably sanctify it. 4. The Holy Ghost as an infallible Spirit in them, did cause them to make a public settlement of that day in all the churches, which was the full and actual establishment. 5. This settlement is fully proved 'de facto' in Scripture and infallible history. 6. And that there are promises and threatenings, to the obeyers and rejecters of Christ's commands, (whom the Father commanded us to hear, and who is the great Prophet of the church,) I hope you believe. "Happy are they who do his commandments that they may have a right to the tree of life," &c. (Rev. xx. 14.) "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more," &c. (Heb. xii. 25.) "It shall come to pass that every soul that will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." (Acts iii. 23.) "We are of God: He that heareth God, heareth us: He that is not of God, heareth not us: Hereby know we the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.

If besides this, you must have particular precepts, promises, threatenings, in the form which you imagine to be fittest, you may, for want of those, deny many other Gospel-laws, as well as this. Have you not much more for the separation of the Lord's-day, than you have for infants' baptism, for a Christian magistrate, for Christian's waging war, for prohibited degrees as to marriage, &c.

I am persuaded the sober study of these points would do much to convince the contrary minded, 1. How much of Christ's work, as to the settlement of church-orders, was committed to the apostles to be done; and how little he publicly settled himself in person, before his resurrection.

2. How much the Gospel-administration excelleth that of the law. And what eminent glory God designeth to himself by the work of man's redemption, and how much more now he calleth man to read, and study, and know him in the face of Jesus Christ, than in the creation; and how largely the change of the Covenant is proved in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

3. What a change is made herein as to man's duty, since the fall of man under the wrath of the Creator, who is not

now his rest, but his terror, and a consuming fire, till reconciled and adopting us in Christ; and since the earth is cursed to us as a punishment for our sins.

4. How much of the certainty, and glory of the Christian faith, and of all our rest and consolation in it, is laid in the Gospel on the RESURRECTION of our Lord, as beginning a new world, or creation, as it were, and as conquering and triumphing over death and Satan, and sealing the promise, and bringing life and immortality to light, and opening the kingdom of heaven to believers.

5. How much of Christ's legislation and administration of his church-settlement and government was to be done by the Holy Ghost! and how glorious this office of the Holy Ghost is, and of what grand importance to be understood: As he was the promised paraclete, or advocate, or agent of our glorified Lord, to do his work on earth in his bodily absence; to whom the infallibility of the Scriptures, the sealing operation of miracles, the sanctification of believers, and forming them for glory in the image of God, is to be ascribed: whom to blaspheme, is the unpardonable sin.

6. How dangerous a thing it is made by the Holy Ghost to seek to set up Moses's law, (as the whole epistle to the Galatians, besides most of the other epistles, testify,) as intimating a denial of Christ, and a falling away from grace, and a perverse setting up of that which Christ came to take down, as part of our own redemption. And how large and plain Paul is upon this subject; and how the Spirit in all the apostles did determine it, Acts xv. And how the Corinthians, Nicolaitans, Ebionites, Nazaræans, and many more of the condemned heresies of that age, which troubled the churches, and whom the apostles wrote against, went all that way of mingling the Jewish law with the Gospel.

7. How plainly and expressly Paul numbereth Sabbaths with the shadows that cease, Col. ii. 16, (to pass by other texts,) and what violence men's own wits must use, in denying the evidence of so plain a text. Their reason, that he saith not Sabbath but Sabbaths, is against themselves; the plural number being most comprehensive, and other Sabbaths receiving their name from this; and the word Sabbath always used in Scripture, for a rest which was partly ceremonial. See what Dr. Young in his excellent "Dies Domin."

saith of this text (though I know some say otherwise, to the injury of their own cause).

8. How many years together the churches had been in possession, and consequently in the undoubted knowledge, of the true established day of holy worship, before a word of the New Testament was written. And therefore that it was not written to be the first enacting of this day or change ; but for other uses.

9. And yet how much evidence of the fact there is in Scripture itself, that really such a day was used for the ordinary church-assemblies, as a peculiar, separated day ; even by the common order of the apostles in the churches, as 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, speaks.

10. And how impossible it is that all the churches in the world should from their beginning keep this as the separated day, even by the apostles and from their times, if it had not been so ordered by them indeed. And whether it be possible that in no age near the original hereof, no pastor, no Christian, no heretic, no enemy would have detected the fraud or common error, or once have written, that this day was not separated or used by the apostles, or apostolical churches ; no, nor any one (that I know of, that denied not the resurrection) ever to have scrupled or opposed the day.

11. Whether they that can reject such historical evidence as this is, do not unwittingly cast away the Holy Scriptures, what zeal soever they pretend to have for their honour and perfection.

12. Whether they that can reject all this evidence, and yet can find in the second commandment, the prohibition of all forms of prayer, sermons, catechisms, and all modal inventions of men, as images, if not idols, are without partiality, or do not walk as men, by very different measures, and partial conceptions.

I would on my knees entreat some dear and worthy friends, on their knees to ponder these twelve particulars.

But because by their passing by the text, Acts ii. 1, 2. I perceive they observe not that the Holy Ghost came down on the Lord's-day ; let them consider that the passover was on the Sabbath-day that year, and therefore it must needs be just fifty days to that Lord's-day, and it must be the day of Pentecost.

And it is not a trifle, that the first sermon to the people was preached by Peter on that day, and three thousand converted by it, and baptized.

Dr. Heylin's own words are these, (part 2. p. 13,) 'The first particular passage which did occur in Holy Scripture touching the first day of the week, is that upon that day the Holy Ghost did first come down on the apostles, and that on the same day St. Peter preached his first sermon to the Jews, and baptized such as believed, there being added to the church that day three thousand souls.' And to prove the day, he saith, p. 14, 'The rule being this, that on what day soever the second of the Passover did fall, on that also fell the great feast of Pentecost (as Scaliger de Emend. Temp. l. 2.). So that as often as the Passover did fall on the Sabbath, as this year it did, then Pentecost fell on the Sunday.'

The last part of our objections are from history; and it is said,

*Object.* ' *Quest.* Whether the observation of the first day was not brought into this island by Antichrist, about 408 or 409 years ago? Roger Hoveden about 1202 (above 1200 years after Christ), mentioneth a council held in Scotland for the initiation of first bringing in that which he calls the Dominical-day: See this testimony mentioned by Binius in his councils, and somewhat enlarged by Matthew Paris, the old impression fol. 192, 193, and the last edition fol. 200, 201; and how the king of England and nobility would not then receive this alteration—I conceive that in the first centuries the great controversy relating to this was about translating the keeping the Passover, which they now call Easter, from the fourteenth day of the first moon, &c. (under the colour of honouring Christ,) to the first day of the week, as the Dominical-day; which the popes first set themselves with great vehemency to introduce—And as the pope obtained his purpose for one day in the year, so by degrees in some places, came one day in a week; the first day to be observed, and the seventh day, by one of the popes, turned from a festival to a fast; whilst many of the Eastern, and some of the Western churches did still retain with all the observation of the Seventh-day Sabbath together with the first-day, and others of the churches in the East and West kept only to the Seventh day as the Christian's Sabbath, &c.'

*Ans.* How much more desirable an adversary is Heylin

by his acquaintance with history! 1. Were any of the authors I before cited either antichristian, or 1200 years after Christ?

Ignatius, if genuine was about anno 102; if not, as Daelæus thinks, then he was about 300.

The canons called the apostles,' and the constitutions called the apostles,' very ancient.

Justin Martyr wrote his Apol. anno 150, about fifty years after St. John's death; where his testimony is as plain as can be spoken. To which Pliny's, who wrote about 107, some seven years after St. John's death, may be joined, that he may be understood of the day.

Clemens Alexand. about ninety-four years after St. John, anno 194.

Tertullian who is most express, and full, and frequent, about 198, that is, ninety-eighty years after St. John.

Origen about 206 began his teaching.

Cyprian about anno 250.

Athanasius, who wrote largely of it, about anno 330.

To what purpose should I mention again Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Nyssen, and all the rest. It was but about anno 309 that Constantine began his reign, who made laws for the Lord's-day; which other Christian emperors enlarged. But how much earlier were all those synods which Eusebius mentioned, which in the determination of Easter owned the Lord's-day! And that of Nice was but about anno 327. The council of Laodicea, but about anno 314, or 320.

The council of Eliberis about anno 307, Can. 21, saith, 'If any that live in the cities shall stay from the church three Lord's-days, let him be so long suspended from the sacrament, till he be sensible of his punishment.'

After this, how many councils and how many imperial laws take care of the Lord's-days? It is tedious to cite them.

To these may be added, 1. The common agreement that is founded in the resurrection, and was from that time. 2. The early contest for keeping Easter only on that day, which you note, as being a day by all Christians received. 3. The common detestation of fasting on that day. 4. And the universal custom of not kneeling in adoration on that day: which all shew that the day was specially observed.

Athanasius saith, *de Sab. et Circ.* 'Even as at the first it was commanded that the Sabbath should be observed in memory of the finishing of the world, so do we celebrate the Lord's-day, as the commemoration of the beginning of a new creation.' And Hom. *de Sem.* 'The Lord transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's-day.' Though Nannius question the Hom. *de semente*, so do few others, and none that I know of, question that *de Sab. et Circ.*

Greg. Nyss. *Orat. in s. Pasc.* saith, 'As God rested on the Sabbath from all his works which he had done in the creation, so did the only begotten Son of God rest in truth from all his works, &c.'

August. *Epist. 119.* 'The Lord's-day was declared to Christians by the Lord's resurrection. From that time (or thence) it began to have its festivity.'

Maximus Taurinensis, saith, Hom. 3. *de Pentec.* 'The Lord's-day is therefore set apart, because on it our Saviour, as the rising sun, discussing the infernal darkness, did shine forth in his resurrection.'

And for fasting, Tertul. *de Cor. Mil. c. 3.* saith, 'We account it unlawful to fast on the Lord's-day.' And though the Montanists fasted excessively, they excepted the Lord's-day, Tertul. *adv. Psych. c. 15.*

Ignatius and the Apost. *Const. et Can.* are forecited of this.

Austin saith, *Ep. 86.* 'It is a great scandal to fast on the Lord's-day.' (Which the Manichees were accused of.)

The Concil. Gangr. *Can. 18.* saith, 'If any on pretence of abstinence fast on the Lord's-day, let him be Anathema.'

The Concil. Cæsar August. *c. 2.* is against fasting on the Lord's-day, either for the sake of any time (as Lent) or persuasion, or superstition whatsoever. So the Concil. Agath. *c. 12.* Concil. Aurel. *4. c. 2.* And the Concil. Carth. anno 398. *Can. 64.* 'Let him be taken for no Catholic who purposely fasteth on the Lord's-day.'

And the prohibition of kneeling in adoration, I have opened before, ex Concil. Nic. *c. 20.* Concil. Trul. Epiphan. &c. To which I add Collect. Can. Johan Antioch. sub titulo L. Tertul. *de Cor. Mil. c. 3.* (now cited) Hieronym. *adv. Lucifer. cap. 4.* 'Per omnem Pentecosten nec de geniculis adorare, et jejuniū solveres, multaque alia quæ non Scripta sunt, rationabilis sibi observatio vindicavit.' (Yet Paul

kneeled, (Acts xx.) in that time, vide Justell. ad Can. 20. Conc. Nic.) Question. ad Orthod. inter Justin. opera qu. 115. p. 283. 'Die Dominico genua non flectere sybolum est resurrectionis, &c.' Germanus Constantinop. in Theoria Eccles. p. 149. Our not kneeling on the Lord's-day, signifieth our erection from our fall, by Christ's resurrection, &c. See also Basil de Spir. Sanc. c. 27. Tom. 2. p. 112, 113. et Balsamon thereon, p. 1032. et Zonar. in c. 20. Conc. Nic. p. 66. See Casp. Suicerus de hisce sacr. observ. c. 6.

2. Your historical observations are utterly mistaken. The observation of the Lord's-day was in all the churches past all controversy from the beginning, while the time of Easter was in controversy, as I have proved. Why would you not name those churches in East and West, (which I never read or heard of,) yea, or that person, that was for the Seventh day alone? I am confident because you could not do it. Indeed all churches called the Seventh day alone by the old name Sabbath, while they maintained the Sabbath to be ceased; but under the name of the Lord's-day, the first was solemnly observed.

3. In Hoveden and Mat. Paris, there is not a word of what you say; so much do you miscite history. There is indeed, anno 1201, (which as I remember is Hoveden's last,) the story that many authors talk of and Heylin mentioneth, of one that found a letter, pretended from heaven, upon the altar, reproving the crying sins of the times, and especially the profanation of the Lord's-day, and requiring them to keep it strictly for the time to come; which was so far from being the imitation of the Lord's-day, that it was about 1167 years after it. And how could men pretend such a divine reproof for such a sin, if the day had not been received before? I pray read Heylin's history against us, which will set you more right in the matter of fact. And there is no mention of any such council as you talk of, for initiation of the Lord's-day, nor any resistance of the kings, or Scots. There is nothing of all this in Hoveden or Matth. Paris.

4. But what if England had been ignorant of the Lord's-day till then (which is utterly untrue), it followeth not that they kept the Sabbath on the Seventh day; Nor would a barbarous, remote corner of the world, prejudice the testimony of all Christ's churches in every age.



5. But that you may see how greatly you mistake the case of England; read but our eldest English historian, Beda Hist. Eccles. as l. 1. 26. he mentioneth an old church named St. Martin's, built in the Romans' time; and, cap. 33. a church built by the ancient, faithful Romans (and by the way, I think it most probable that the Roman soldiers first brought Christianity into Britain); so he oft describeth the worship as agreeable to other churches: And l. 2. c. 2. he begins his reproof of the Britains for not keeping Easter on the due Lord's-day, but never reproveth them for not keeping the Lord's-day itself. And though Britains and Scots had so little regard of the English bishops sent from Rome, that they awhile refused so much as to eat with them, yea, or to eat in the same inn, (cap. 4. l. 2.) yet about the Lord's-day there was no controversy. Lib. 3. cap. 4. he tells you that the Scots' difference about Easter-day continued till anno 716, for want of intelligence from other churches, though Columbanus and his followers were very holy persons. And (that you may see your error) he there tells you that they did not keep Easter-day with the Jews on the fourteenth day still, as some thought, but on the Lord's-day; but not in the right week: 'For, (saith he) they knew (as being Christians) that the Lord's resurrection which was on the first day of the week, was always to be celebrated on the first day of the week; but being barbarous and rustic, they had not yet learned when that same first day of the week, which is now called the Lord's-day, did come.'

Here you see that it was past controversy with them that the Lord's-day must be celebrated in memorial of Christ's resurrection; and the Scots keep not Easter on any other week-day; and they had not been like Christians, if they had not owned and kept the Lord's-day: only they had not skill enough in calculating the times, so as to know when the true anniversary Lord's-day came about, but kept Easter on a wrong Lord's-day.

The same he saith again in the praise of Finan, lib. 3. cap. 17. that though he kept not Easter at the due time, 'yet he did not, as some falsely think, keep it on any week-day in the fourteenth moon with the Jews; but he always kept it on the Lord's-day, from the fourteenth moon to the twentieth, because of the belief of the Lord's resurrection, which the church truly believed was on the first day of the

week for the hope of our resurrection, and which (they believed) will fall out on the same first day of the week, which is now called the Lord's-day.'

So, cap. 25. the king and queen kept Easter on several Lord's-days, and the difference made the stir : And Wilfrid in his speech there saith the same, and the Scots kept Easter only on the Lord's-day ; (by whom the king at that time was changed.)

And, lib. 3. cap. 26. Beda saith that Tuda, (another holy follower of the Scots,) being made bishop,

' On the Lord's-days the people flocked by crowds together, either to the church, or to the monasteries, not to refresh their bodies, but to learn the word of God ; and if any priest happened to come into a village, presently the inhabitants, ' congregati in unum,' gathered together, took care from him to seek the word of life.'

Cap. 2. lib. 4. Theodorus's consecration on the Lord's-day is mentioned.

Lib. 4. cap. 5. In the Synod at Herudford, the first canon is, that all keep Easter on the Lord's-day next after the fourteenth moon of the first month.

Lib. 5. cap. 22. Ceolfridus sendeth an Epistle to the king of the Picts, in which are these words, ' Postquam vero Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus, Diemque nobis Dominicam, quæ apud antiquos una vel prima Sabbati sive Sabbatorum vocatur, gaudio suæ resurrectionis fecit esse solemnem ; ita hanc nunc apostolica traditio festis Paschalibus inseruit.' That is, ' But when Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, and by the joy of his resurrection made the Lord's-day, which by the ancients was called one or the first of the Sabbath or Sabbaths, to be a solemn day to us ; so now apostolical tradition hath ingrafted it into the Paschal festivals : ' Where you see that the Lord's-day settled as solemn by the resurrection, he taketh for uncontroverted, but the grafting it into the Easter festivals, he ascribeth to apostolical tradition, meaning St. Peter's.

And after in the same epistle, ' Qui tertia post immolationem suæ passionis die resurgens a mortuis, hanc dominicam vocari, et in ea nos annuatim Paschalia ejusdem resurrectionis voluit festa celebrare ; ' that is, ' Christ rising from the dead, the third day after the sacrifice of his passion, would have this called the Lord's-day, and would have us

on it to celebrate the Paschal feast of his resurrection.' The like is after again in that epistle, with this addition, that, 'We hold that our resurrection will be on the Lord's-day.' By this epistle the king of the Picts was brought to conformity in that day, and made laws for it: And cap. 23. the Scots of Hy, who stood out so long, were brought to it by the persuasion of Egbertus. Judge now of your historical note of England.

But that you may see more of this, you may read Beda's mind that lived in England, in other of his works. On Acts xx. 'In una Sabbathi cum convenissemus ad frangendum panem; id est, Die Dominico qui est primus a Sabbato, cum ad mysteria celebranda congregati essemus;' that is, 'On the Lord's-day, which is the first from the Sabbath, when we were congregated to celebrate the mysteries.'—And he thinks it called the Lord's-day, because it is the remembrance of the Lord's resurrection, or ours.

And on Luke vi. fol. 78. he saith, 'The observation of the legal Sabbath, ought of itself to cease, and the natural liberty of the Sabbath to be restored, which till Moses's time was like other days. That as it is not circumcision, or the ceremonies of the law that save the church, but the faith of Abraham working by love, by which being uncircumcised he was justified; so he calleth the second sabbath after the first, no other but the spiritual Sabbath, in which, as on other days, it is lawful to do any profitable work, for distinction from the Jewish Sabbath, in which it was not lawful to travel, to gather wood, nor to do other needful things.' Pardon his error about that word; I only cite it for the historical use.

And on Luke xxiv. 1. fol. 143. 'One of the Sabbaths, or the first of the Sabbaths, is the first day after the Sabbath, which the Christian custom hath called the Lord's-day, because of the Lord's resurrection.'

And ibid. fol. 143. 'Whence ecclesiastical custom hath obtained, that either in memory of Christ's resurrection, or for hope of ours, we pray not with bended knees, but only with faces declined towards the earth, on every Lord's-day, and all the quadragesimæ.'

And in Acts ii. 1. "The Holy Ghost sent—the exam

ple of the ancient sign returning, did himself by his own coming most manifestly consecrate the Lord's-day.'

And on Col. ii. fol. 308. He sheweth that the Sabbath was a shadow, and Christ that made it was Lord of it, and ended it; and that to abstain from sin is now our Sabbath. See him also on Rev. i. 10; Heb. iv. fol. 308; 2 Cor. ii. fol. 176. D.

And because he was a Scot, I will add Sedulius, who lived 430. In Col. ii. fol. 91. 'The Sabbath being a shadow, ceased when the body came, because the truth being present, the image is needless.' And on Heb. iv. 9. 'There remaineth a rest, that is, the eternal rest which the Jewish Sabbath signified.'

See Philastrius Hæres. 8. Abundance more of this kind I might cite, but for making the book tedious to those that need it not. And so much for the history, to satisfy your objections and mistakes.

## CHAPTER II.

### *An Answer to more Arguments for the Seventh-day-Sabbath.*

#### *Reasons.*

1. 'THAT the Lord Jesus Christ is Jehovah, Zech. xi. 13; xii. 4—10: Gen. xix. 24; Acts ii. 25; compared with Psal. xvi. 8, &c. The Lord our Righteousness.' (Jer. xxiii. 6.)

2. 'That the world was made by Jehovah Christ, John i. 3. 10; Heb. i. 2, 3. 10; Col. i. 14—17; Eph. iii. 9; Psal. cii. 22. 24, 25; Heb. iii. 4; Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Gen. ii. 4, &c.'

3. 'The Seventh-day-Sabbath was instituted by Jehovah Christ, and kept by him, (Gen. ii. 2—4.) whilst man

#### *Answers.*

1. THIS is no controversy among us, meaning of Christ's divine nature; and his person in respect thereof.

2. Nor is this any controversy, if meant of the second person in the eternal trinity, nor yet incarnate, nor in the flesh anointed (Christ).

3. Though this have long been doubted in the church, some thinking it mentioned but by anticipation, yet I de-

was in innocency, before the fall, (Gen. iii. 6.) and before any types.'

ny it not, but believe that it was sanctified and kept from the beginning, because the reason of the consecration

was from the beginning. But, 1. The second person is not called Christ before the fall, nor without respect to his human nature. 2. It is uncertain whether it was before the fall; because we know not whether man fell on the same day in which he was created, which is the commonest opinion, (though unproved). Whereupon Mr. G. Walker in his Treatise of the Sabbath maintaineth, that the fall and promise went before the Sabbath, and so that God's rest had respect to Christ promised, as the perfection of his works, and that the Sabbath was first founded on Christ and the promise. But because all this is unproved opinion, I incline to the objectors, and the common sense.

4. 'The Seventh-day-Sabbath was kept by Abraham, (Gen. xxvi. 5.) by the Israelites, (Exod. v. 5.) The law for the seventh day was repeated.' (Exod. xvi. 22, 23.)

4. I am of the same opinion, but it is uncertain whether it was instituted actually at first. But the rest, (Exod. v. 5,) seemeth plainly to refer to no Sabbath, but to the people's neglect of their tasks, while Moses kept them in hopes of deliverance, and treated for them. And their tasks, with their desire to go into the wilderness to sacrifice, maketh it probable that Pharaoh never allowed them the Sabbath's rest.

5. 'The decalogue was spoken by Jehovah Christ, (Exod. xx. 1. See the Assemblies' lesser catechism on the preamble to the commands:) Because the Lord is our God, &c. Redeemer, &c. therefore we are bound to keep, &c. (Exod. xix. 3, compared with Acts vii. 38; Isa. lxiii. 9; Exod. xix. 17.) The decalogue written by his finger, (Exod. xxxi. 18.) On tables of stone, (Exod. xxxii.

5. All true, and uncontroverted, with these suppositions: 1. That the Father, as well as the Son, gave the decalogue: 2. That the second person was not yet incarnate, (Christ). 3. That the law was given by the ministration of angels, who it is like, are called the voice and finger of God. 4. That God our Redeemer did variously govern his kingdom, by his law and covenant in various edi-

15, 16. 19; xxxiv. 2. 28.) tions: Of which more anon, and kept by all the prophets.'

6. 'The decalogue was confirmed by Jehovah, Christ, (Matt. v. 17—19; Luke xvi. 17; Matt. xxviii. 20; John xiv. 25; xv. 14; Rom. iii. 31; vii. 12; James ii. 8. 12.) New covenant. (Heb. viii. 10; 1 John iii. 22. 24; 1 John v. 3; 2 John v. 6; Rev. xii. 17; xiv. 12; xxii. 14. 18; compared with Mal. iv. 4.)'

6. Here begineth our fundamental difference: I shall first tell you what we take for the truth, and then consider of what you allege against it.

1. We hold that every law is the law of some one; some law-maker or sovereign power: and therefore Christ being now the head over all things to the church, (Eph. i. 22, 23,) whatever law is now in being to the church, must needs be the law of Christ.

2. We hold that Christ's redeemed kingdom hath been governed by him, with variety of administrations, by various editions of his law or covenant: That, I. Universally to mankind, viz. 1. Before his incarnation: which was; First, to Adam, and secondly, to Noah, and to mankind in them both: 2. After his incarnation. II. Particularly to the seed of Abraham, even the Jews as a particular political society; chosen out of the world (not as the only people or church of God on earth, but) for peculiar extraordinary mercies, as a peculiar people.

3. We believe that each of these administrations was fittest for its proper time and subject, according to the manifold wisdom of God: but yet the alterations were many and great, and all tendeth towards perfection: so that the last edition of the covenant by Christ incarnate and his Holy Spirit, much excelled all that went before, in the kingdom of the Mediator. And all these changes were made by God-Redeemer himself.

4. As it was the work of the Redeemer to be the repairer of nature, and the recoverer of man to God; so in all the several administrations, the great laws of nature containing man's duty to God, resulting from, and manifested in our nature as related to God, and the 'natura rerum' or the works of God, was still made the chief part of the Redeemer's law: so that this law of nature, whose sum is the

love of God, and of his image, is ever the primitive, unchangeable law; and the rest are secondary, subservient laws, either positive or remedying, or both; and no tittle of this shall ever cease, if nature cease not.

5. But yet there are temporary laws of nature, which are above temporary things; or where the nature of the thing itself is mutable, from whence the natural duty doth result. As it was a duty by the then law of nature itself; for Adam's sons and daughters to marry, *increase and multiply*, being made a natural benediction, and the means a natural duty. And yet now, it is incest against the law of nature, for brother and sister to marry. So it was a natural duty for Adam and Eve before the fall to love each other as innocent; but not so when they ceased to be innocent: For 'cessante materia, cessat obligatio.'

6. So also some positive commands made to Adam in innocence ceased on the fall, and sentence; (as to dress that garden.) And some positives of the first administrations of grace, did cease by the supervening of a more perfect administration. As the two symbolical or sacramental trees in the garden, were no longer such to man, when he was turned out; so no positive ordinance of grace was any longer in force, when God himself repealed it, by the introduction of a more perfect administration.

7. Accordingly we hold, that a change is now made of the sanctified day. Where note, 1. That we take not the Seventh day (no, nor one day in seven, though that be nothing to our controversy,) to be a duty by the proper law of nature, but by a positive law: 2. That the Seventh day is never called a Sabbath till Moses's time, but only a sanctified and blessed day; the word Sabbath being ever taken in Scripture for a day of ceremonial rest, as well as of spiritual rest and worship. 3. That Christ himself hath continued a Seventh day, but changed the Seventh day to the First; not as a Sabbath, that is, a day of ceremonial rest, for he hath ended all Sabbaths, as shadows of things that were to come, even of rest which remained for the people of God. (Heb. iv. 9; Col. ii. 16.) And this is it which is incumbent upon us to prove, and I think I have fully proved already. 4. That having proved the thing done (the positive law of the Seventh day changed by the Holy Ghost to

the First day), it concerneth us not much to give the reasons of God's doings : But yet this reason may secondarily be observed ; That God having made the whole frame of nature very good, did thereby make it the glass in which he was to be seen by man, and the book which he would have man chiefly study, for the knowledge of his Maker and his will. But sin having introduced disorder, confusion, and a curse upon part of the creation for man's sake, God purposed at once, both to notify to man, what he had done by sin, in bringing disorder and a curse upon the creature, and blotting the book of nature which he should have chiefly used, and also that it was his good pleasure to set up a clearer glass, even Christ incarnate, in which man might see his Maker's face, in representation suitable to our need ; not now as smiling upon an innocent man, nor as frowning on a guilty man, but as reconciled to redeemed man ; and to write a book in which his will should be more plainly read, than in the blotted book of nature : yea, in which he that in the creature appeared most eminently in power, might now appear most eminently in love, even redeeming, reconciling, adopting, justifying, saving love. So that, though God did not change the day, till the person of the incarnate Mediator, with his perfect last edition of the covenant, was exhibited and set up as this clearer glass and book, yet then as the seasonable time of reformation (Heb. ix. 10, 11.) he did it. To teach man that though still he must honour God as the Creator, and know him in the glass and book of the creature, yet that must be now but his secondary study ; for he must primarily study God in Christ ; where he is revealed in love, even most conspicuous, wondrous love.

And how suitable this is to man after sin, and curse, and wrath, may thus evidently appear.

1. We were so dead in sin, and utterly deprived of the spiritual life, that the book of the creatures was not a sufficient means of our reviving : but as we must have the QUICKENING SPIRIT of Jesus the Mediator, so we must have a suitable means for that Spirit to work by ; which that the cursed, mortified creature is not, appeareth in the experience of the case of heathens.

2. We were so dark, in sin, that the creature was not a



sufficient means of our illumination: but as we must have the **ILLUMINATING SPIRIT** of Jesus, so we must have a glass and a book that was suited to that illuminating work.

3. We are so alienated from God, by enmity and malignity, and loss of **LOVE**, that as it must be the Spirit of Jesus which must regenerate us unto **LOVE**, so it must be a clearer demonstration of **LOVE** than the creature maketh in its cursed state, which must be the fit means for the Spirit to work by in the restitution of our **LOVE**.

Where further note, 1. That **LOVE** is holiness and happiness itself; and the operations of Divine love are his perfective operations, and so fit for the last perfective act. 2. That man had many ways fallen from **LOVE**: as he had actually and habitually turned away his own heart from God; and as he had fallen under God's wrath, and so lost those fullest emanations of God's love, which should cherish his own love to God; and as he had forfeited the assistance of the Spirit which should repair it; and as he was fallen in love with the accursed creature, and lastly, as he was under the curse or threatening himself, and the penalties begun; it being impossible to human nature, to love a God who we think will damn us, and feel doth punish us in order thereunto. So that nothing could be more to lapsed man, or more perfective of the appearance and operations of God, than this demonstration of reconciling saving love, in our incarnate, crucified, raised, glorified, interceding Redeemer. All which sheweth that God's removal of the sanctified day from the seventh to the first day of the week, and his preferring the commemoration of redemption, and our use of the glass and book of an incarnate Saviour before that of the now accursed creature, is a work of the admirable wisdom of God, and exceeding suitable to the nature of the things.

II. Now I come to consider of what you say against all this. You cite the numbers of many chapters and verses (contrary to your grand principles, these divisions being human inventions); in all which there is nothing about the controversy in hand. The texts speak not of the decalogue only, but of the law, and of God's commandments, and of Christ's commandments. Now I must tell you beforehand, that I will take no man's word for the word of God, nor believe any thing that you say, God speaketh, without

proof. Prove it, or it goeth for nothing with me. For as I know that adding to God's word is cursed, (Rev. xxii. 18.) as well as taking away; so if I must once come to believe that God saith this or that without proof, I shall never know whom to believe; for twenty men may tell me twenty several tales, and say that God saith them all.

I expect your proof then of one of these two assertions, (for which it is that you hold, no man can gather by your own words, or citations). 1. That all the law which was in being at Christ's incarnation, was confirmed or continued by him (which yet I do not imagine you to hold, because all Paul's epistles, and especially the epistle to the Hebrews, do so fully plead against it). 2. Or else that by the law in all those texts is meant all the decalogue, and the decalogue alone.

The texts cited by you prove no more than what we hold as confidently as you: viz. 1. That all the law of nature, (where the matter or nature of the things continue) is continued by Christ, and is his principal law. 2. That the decalogue, as to the matter of it, is continued as it is the law of nature (which is almost all that is in it), but not as the Jewish law given by Moses's hands to that political body. 3. That the natural part of all the rest of Moses's law is continued as well as the decalogue. 4. That all Moses's law, as well as the decalogue, shall be fulfilled, and heaven and earth shall sooner pass away, than one jot or tittle of it shall pass till it be fulfilled. 5. That the elements, shadows, predictions, preparations, &c. are all fulfilled by the coming of Christ, and by a more perfect administration. For Christ fulfilled all righteousness; (Matt. iii. 15;) *δικαιοσύνην* is sometimes but materially for *δικαιώματα*. 6. That a change may be two ways made, 1. By destroying a thing. 2. By perfecting it. And that by the law in Matt. v. 17, &c. Christ meaneth, the whole body of God's law then in force to the Jews, considered as one frame, consisting of natural and positive parts. Of which he saith, that he came not *καταλῦσαι τον νόμον*, to dissolve, pull in pieces or destroy the law, as a licentious teacher, that would take off God's obligations, and leave the wills and lusts of men to a lawless liberty (which was it that the Pharisees imputed to such as were against the law): but that he came to bring in a greater strictness, a righteousness not only exceeding that of his

accusers, (ver. 20,) but instead of destroying it, to perfect the law itself, that is, to bring in a perfecter administration and edition of the law. So that as generation turneth 'semen in suppositum,' and so doth do away the seed, not by destroying it, but by changing it into a perfecter being; and as Paul saith, (1 Cor. xiii. 16—18;) "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away: When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood (or was affected) as a child, I thought (or reasoned) as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things, &c." not that the child or his knowledge is destroyed, but perfected and changed into better; and yet many acts of his childish reasonings may cease; and as he that would repair the temple to a greater glory, may take away the brass, and put gold instead of it, and so not change one pin of the temple by a destructive change, but by a perfective change, which (to the frame) is to edify and not destroy; even so Christ professeth that he came not to gratify the lusts of men, nor to destroy the law in the smallest point, But, 1. Himself to fulfil it in the very letter, And, 2. To accomplish the shadows, predictions, and types, by coming himself as the truth and end, which when they had attained, they were fulfilled; And, 3. By a more perfect edition and spiritual administration, advancing the law to a higher degree of excellency; by which not the law is said to be put away, or destroyed, but the imperfections or weaknesses of it to be done away. Not but that all God's laws are perfect as to the time and subject which they are fitted to; but not in comparison of the future time, and degrees to be added. It is a better Testament that Christ bringeth in; (Heb. vii. 22; viii. 6;) established on better promises, and procured by better sacrifice, and bringing a better hope, (Heb. viii. 6; vii. 19,) and "better things that are provided for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." (Heb. xi. 40.) So that when Moses's law is considered as such, in that imperfect state, it is essentially or formally all done away; but not materially, for it is done away but by changing it into a better Testament and more perfect administration, which retaineth all that is natural in it, and addeth better positives suited to riper times.

So that the law as denominated from the nobler natural part, as signifying the whole law or system of precepts, then

in force, is not destroyed, but perfected : but the law, as called Jewish, delivered by Moses, to that republic, as such, though part of the said system, yet is the imperfect part, and is taken down, and is now no law, though it be not destroyed, but fulfilled, and turned into a more perfect testament and administration.

Now that by the law and commandments I am not to understand the decalogue only, in any of your cited texts, I thus prove.

1. From the notation of the name. The word *law* in its usual proper sense, doth signify the whole, or other parts as well as that; and not that one part only. Therefore I must so take it, till you prove that in any text it hath a limited sense. Else I shall turn God's universal or indefinite terms into particular, and pervert his word, by limiting by my own invention where God hath not limited.

2. Because the common sense in which the Jews (against whom Christ spake,) did take the word *law*, was not for the decalogue only, but for the pentateuch, or all Moses's law. And if Christ speak to them, he is to be supposed to speak intelligibly, and therefore in their sense.

3. Because Christ in this very chapter, Matt. v. extendeth the sense further than the decalogue: as, verse 17, he adjoins the prophets equally with the law, which he came not to destroy. And thus he speaketh as the Jews, who distributed the Old Testament into the law and prophets, when by the law they meant the pentateuch. Now it is certain that all the prophecies that say, The Messiah is not yet come, but shall come, and be incarnate, and that shew the time and manner, &c. are not now true, 'de futuro,' as they then spake; and yet they are not destroyed but fulfilled, and so cease as prophecies of things yet future. And so it is with the positives of Moses's law. 2. Verse 18, he saith universally, 'Till all be fulfilled,' and not the decalogue only. 3. Verse 19, he extendeth it to the least command. 4. Verse 20, he extendeth it to all the Pharisees' righteousness, which was righteousness indeed. 5. Verse 21, 'Whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment,' hath the political penalty in it, above the bare sixth commandment. 6. Verse 31, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement,' is not the bare seventh commandment, but fetched from Deut. xxiv. 1. And this instance it-

self expoundeth, ver. 17, 18. For when Christ had protested against destroying an iota or tittle of the law, yet he changeth this very law now cited by himself, so far as it indulgeth putting away; so that it is hence evident that he meaneth not that he came not to make a perfective change, but that he came not to indulge licentiousness and lust, by a destructive change. (Luke xvi. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Matt. xix. 9.) So, 7. Verse 33, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself," &c. 8. Verse 38, "An eye for an eye," &c. is fetched from Exod. xxi. 24; Lev. xxiv. 20; Deut. xix. 21; and not from the decalogue alone. 9. So, verse 43, is from Lev. xix. 18. and other places.

4. Because in all Paul's epistles, and commonly in all the New Testament, the word law is ordinarily, if not always taken more extensively than the decalogue: therefore to expound it for the decalogue only, is to contradict the constant use of the Scripture, under pretence of expounding the Scripture.

If then by the law, be meant either the whole system of God's laws, natural and positive, or all Moses's law, or the pentateuch, then I may thus argue. It is most certain that much of this law of Moses is ceased or abrogated. Therefore it is certain, that it was none of Christ's meaning that he would abrogate none of that law which he speaketh of, nor change it for a better.

That all and every word of the decalogue is not of the durable law of nature, I shall prove anon.

1. That by the word *law* the Scripture meaneth more than the mere decalogue, these texts among others prove, Exod. xiii. 9; xxiv. 12; Deut. i. 5; iv. 8; xvii. 18, 19; xxviii. 61; xxix. 29; xxxi. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 37; xxiii. 24, 25; 2 Chron. xxxi. 21; xxxiii. 18; xxxiv. 10; Ezra vii. 6; xiv. 26; x. 3; Neh. viii. 2, 7, 8, 13, 14; x. 29; xiii. 3; Mal. ii. 1—9; iv. 4; Matt. xi. 13; xii. 5; xxvi. 36, 40; xxiii. 23; Luke ii. 22, 27; John i. 17, 45; vii. 19, 23, 51; viii. 5; x. 34; xii. 34; xv. 25; Acts vi. 13; xiii. 15, 39; xv. 5, 24; xxi. 20, 28; xxii. 3, 12; xxiii. 3, 29; xxviii. 23; Rom. ii. 12—14, 17, 18, 20, 23; iii. 19—21, 28, 31; iv. 13—16; v. 13; vii. 1—6, &c. and so to the end of the New Testament, which I need not further number.

7. ' That the Seventh-day      7. 1. So Christ was circumcised, and joined in the Lord Jehovah Christ during synagogue-worship, and held

his life, Mark i. 21; vi. 2; Luke iv. 31; vi. 6; i. 5; xiii. 10; Matt. xii. 1. 9; xiii. 1, 2; and constantly, Luke iv. 16, 17. See Christ's counsel, which was to come to pass above forty years after his death, Matt. xxiv. 20.

communion with the Jewish church, and priesthood, and observed all the law of Moses, never violating any part; for he was "made under the law to redeem them that were under the law." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) Do you think that all this is established for us? 2. And

his counsel (Matt. xxiv. 20.) had respect to the Jews' misery and not to their duty. He therefore foretellet their destruction because they would reject him and his law, in a perverse zeal for Moses's law; and therefore intimateth that even Moses should condemn them, and their misery should be increased by their zeal for their law; for their city was taken on the Sabbath-day, which increased their calamity, who scrupled on that day to fight or fly. And can you think Christ approved of that opinion, who had so oft before condemned the like, about their over rigid sabbatizing? Or as Dr. Hammond thinks, it is more like to be spoken of a Sabbath-year, when the war and famine would come together. However it be, it only supposeth their adherence to their law and Sabbath, but justifieth it not at all: though yet the total and full abrogation of the Jewish law, was not fully declared, till, at that time of the destruction of their city and temple, their policy more fully ceased.

8. That after Jehovah had finished the work of redemption, (John xix. 30,) his body rested in the grave, (Matt. xxvii. 66,) and himself in heaven, (Luke iii. 42, 43,) as he rested when he ended the work of creation. (Gen. ii. 2, 4.)

8. You again add to the word of God: It is not said that, he had finished the work of redemption, but only "It is finished," which seemeth to mean but that, 1. This was the last act of his life, in which he was actively to fulfil the law, and offer himself a sacrifice for man: 2. And

in which all the law and prophets were fulfilled, which foretold this sacrifice. For that it is not meant of the whole work of redemption as finished, when he spoke those words, is evident, 1. Because after those words he was to die; 2. Because his state in death, and his burial, were part of his humiliation, as is implied, 1 Cor. xv. 4; John xii. 7;

Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12; Isa. liii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Acts ii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 26; Phil. iii. 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. ii. 14, 15. 3. Because his resurrection was his victorious act, and a part of the work of man's redemption; 4. And so is his intercession. For redemption is larger than humiliation or sacrifice for sin. As, Exod. vi. 6; Luke xxiv. 21; Rom. iii. 24; viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 14; Luke xxi. 28. It is the resurrection by which we are made righteous, and receive our hope of life, and victory over death and Satan. (Rom. i. 4; Phil. iii. 10, 11; 1 Peter i. 3; iii. 21; Rom. iv. 25.)

2. The clean contrary therefore to your collection is true: viz. That God did indeed end the work of his creation on the sixth day, and rested in it, as finished on the seventh. But Christ was so far from ending his on the sixth, and resting in it on the seventh, that on that day, above all other, he seemed conquered by men, and by him that had the power of death, (Heb. ii. 14,) and was held as captive by the grave, so that his disciples' hopes did seem dead with him, (Luke xxiv. 21.) This state of death being not the least, if not the lowest part of his humiliation: Whence came the church's article that he descended into Hades. 3. I did more probably before prove from Christ's own words, compared with his burial, a casting down of the Seventh-day Sabbath, thus: That day on which the disciples are to fast, is not to be kept as a Sabbath, (for that is a day of thanksgiving.) But on the day of Christ's burial, the disciples were to fast (that is, to walk heavily): which appeareth from Mark ii. 20. When the Bridegroom is taken from them, then they shall fast. Now though this meant not to command any one day for fasting, much less the whole time of his bodily absence, yet both the sense of the words themselves, and the interpretation of the event, tells us, that as there was no day in which he was so sadly taken from them as that Sabbath-day, which almost broke their hearts and hopes (for the next day he was restored to them). So there was no day in which they were so dejected, and unlike to the celebraters of a Gospel-day of joy, or Sabbath. Do you call the day of Satan's power and triumph, and of the disciples' greatest fear and grief that ever befell them, the celebration of a Sabbath rest? It had indeed somewhat like an outward rest, but so as seemed plainly to bury in his grave

the seventh-day ceremonial Sabbath. And from the reasons now pleaded it was, that the Western churches kept the seventh-day as a fast.

9. 'Whilst the Lord Jehovah Christ rested, private believers rested according to the commandment.' (Luke xxiii. 55, 56; Mark xv. 42; xvi. 1, compared.)

9. They did indeed keep the Jewish Sabbath, till Christ's resurrection, and the coming down of the Holy Ghost: And so they did the rest of the Jewish law. For they yet knew not that it was

abrogated; but must we do so too? You may as well argue from their keeping the Sabbath before Christ's death, as on that day when he was dead. The change of the day was made by degrees, by three several acts or means. 1. The resurrection of Christ, was the founding act, which gave the cause of changing it; like God's finishing his works of creation at first. 2. The inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the apostles doth teach them, and bring all things to their remembrance which Christ commanded, and was the authorising means of the change; and the apostles' actual settlement thereupon was the promulgation. 3. The gradual notification by the preachers to the churches, and finally the destruction of the Jewish polity, and temple, and priesthood, were the fuller proclamation of it, and the way of bringing the change that was made by command into fuller execution.

10. 'The Seventh-day Sabbath was observed by the apostles after the resurrection and ascension, Acts xiii. 14—16. 42. 44; xvi. 13, 14, and constantly, Acts xvii. 2; (the same Greek phrase with that, Luke xiv. 16, for Christ's constant keeping the Seventh-day-Sabbath as before,) Acts xviii. 1. 4, &c.

10. But withal, in this time they established the Lord's-day, as soon as (on that day) the Holy Ghost came down upon them.

2. So all that while they kept other parts of the Jewish law: They scrupled, yea refused awhile, communion with the Gentiles, as Acts x. shews. They so carried it to the Jews, that Paul made it

his defence, that he "had not offended any thing at all, either against the laws of the Jews, or against the temple." (Acts xxv. 8.) And when he circumcised Timothy, purified himself, shaved his head, for his vow, &c. Do you think that all these are duties to believers?



3. None of the texts cited by you do prove, that the apostles kept the Sabbath at all as a Sabbath, that is, a day on which it was their duty to rest; but only that they preached on that day in the synagogues, and to the people; for when should they preach, but when they were congregated, and capable of hearing? They took it for no sin to preach on the Sabbath, no more than I would do to preach Christ on Friday, which is their Sabbath, to the Turks, if they would hear me. But sabbatizing according to the law, was something else than preaching.

4. And it is most evident that for a long time the Christian Jews did still keep the law of Moses; and that all that the apostles did against it then, was, but 1. To declare that Christ was the end of the law, and so to declare the keeping of it to be unnecessary to salvation, but not unlawful, laying by the opinion of necessity. 2. That the Gentile Christians should not be brought to use it, because it was unnecessary; for the apostles, (Acts xv.) do not forbid it to the Jews, but only to the Gentiles (who were never under it). Therefore the apostles who lived among the Jews no doubt did so far comply with them to win them, as to keep the law externally, though not as a necessary thing, that is, not as a law in force obliging them, but as a thing yet lawful, to further the Gospel. And therefore no wonder if Peter went so far as to withdraw from the Gentiles, when the Jews were present; when even Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, who speaketh so much more than all the rest against the law, doth yet as aforesaid circumcise Timothy, shave his head, purify himself, &c. and as he became all things to all men, so to the Jews he became a Jew. But when the Jews' policy and temple ceased, the change was executively yet further made, and the Jewish Christians themselves were weaned from their law. In the meantime Paul and John (Rev. ii. iii.) do openly rebuke the Judaizing heretics, the Ebionites, and Cerinthians, and Nicolaitans, and shew the perniciousness of their conceits.

11. ' The Holy Spirit calls the seventh-day (and no other day) the Sabbath, throughout the Scriptures, before and after the death, resurrection and ascension

11. Though it be not true that the seventh is called the Sabbath; (Gen. ii;) and though others deny the sufficiency of your enumeration, yet I grant your assertion as

of the Lord Jehovah Christ; true. And therefore am satisfied that it is the seventh day which is put down, when Sabbathizing was put down; and that it could be none but the seventh-day which Paul

meant; "Let no man judge you in meats, &c. and Sabbaths, which were shadows of things to come;" Col. ii. 16. For the first-day is never called a Sabbath, as you truly say; therefore it was not put down with the Sabbath. See Dr. Young's Dies Dom. on Col. ii. 16.

<p>12. 'The Seventh-day-Sabbath was profaned by the church heretofore and reformed; Neh. x. 28, 29. 31. xiii. 15. 17, 18, 22. See Belg. Annot. on Dan. vii. 25, &amp;c.; as prophesied who would change it.'</p>	<p>12. This is all granted. Sacrificing also was then profaned and reformed, and polluted and destroyed by Antiochus; and yet we are not still under the obligation of sacrificing. We are not under the law, but under grace.</p>
--	--

### CHAPTER III.

*Whether the Seventh-day-Sabbath be part of the Law of Nature, or only a Positive Law?*

It is but few that I have any controversy with on this point: but yet one there is, who objecteth and argueth as followeth.

God hath put this into nature: (Exod. xx. 10 :) Thy stranger. (Deut. v. 14.) The three first chapters of Romans; particularly chap. ii. 14, 15. 26, 27. iii. 9. 21. 1 Cor. xi. 14. Nature hath its teachings. The human nature in the first Adam was made and framed to the perfection of the ten words; some notions whereof are still retained, even in the corrupt state of fallen man. (Gen. i. 26, 27. Eccles. vii. 29; Ephes. iv. 20; Col. iii. 10.) The law of the Seventh-day-Sabbath was given before the ten words were proclaimed at Sinai; (Exod. xvi. 23;) even from the creation: (Gen. ii. 2, 3 :) given to Adam in respect of his human nature, and in him to all the world of human creatures. (Gen. i. 14; Psal. civ. 19; Lev. x. 23; Numb. xxviii. 2. 9, 10.) It is the same word in the original. Set times of Divine appointment for

solemn assembling, and for God's instituted service, are directed to, and pointed at, by those great lights which the Creator hath set up in the heavens. (Psal. xix. with Rom. x. 4—8. 18—20; Deut. xxx. 10. 15; John i. 9.) Every man hath a light and law of nature which he carrieth about him, and is born and bred together with him. These seeds of truth and light, though they will not justify in the sight of God, and bring a soul thoroughly and safely home to glory; (Rom. i. 20;) yet there are even since Adam's fall, these relics and dark letters of this holy law of the ten words, to preserve the memory of our first created dignity, and for some other ends, though those seeds are utterly corrupted now. (Titus i. 15.) Natural reason will tell men, that seeing all men in all nations do measure their time by weeks, and their weeks by seven days, they should (besides what of their time they offer up as due to God every day) give one whole day of every week to their Maker, who hath allowed them so liberal a portion of time, wherein to provide for themselves and their families. There being no other portion of time that can so well provide for the necessities of families, as six days of every week, and that is so well fitted to all functions, callings and employments. And the light of nature (when cleared up) will tell men, that all labour and motion being in order to rest, and rest being the perfection and end of labour, into which labour, work and motion doth pass, that therefore the seventh day, which is the last day in every week, is the most fit and proper day for a religious rest unto the Creator, for his worship. (Gen. ii. 1, &c.; Exod. xx. 9; Deut. v. 13, 14; Heb. iv. 1. 11; Exod. xxxi. 17; Rom. xiv. 13; Exod. xxiii. 12; xxxiv. 21.)

*Ans.* How far a day is of natural due, I have shewed before. In all the words of this reason (which I set down as I received them) there is much which is no matter of controversy between us; as that there is a light, and law of nature (which few men doubt of, who are worthy to be called men); and that by this law of nature God should be solemnly worshipped, and that at a set or separated time. I hope the reader will not expect that I weary him with examining the texts which prove this, before it is denied. But the thing denied by us is, that the Seventh-day-Sabbath, as the seventh, is of natural obligation. The proofs which are brought for

this I must examine: for indeed this is the very hinge of all our controversies; for if this be once proved, we shall easily confess that it is not abrogated; for Christ came not to abrogate any of the law of nature, though as I have said, such particles of it may cease, whose matter ceaseth, by a change in nature itself.

The first proof is Exod. xx. 10. The stranger. To which I answer, Our question is not, whether the Sabbath was to be rested on by strangers that are among the Jews, but, whether it was part of the law of nature? If it be intended that 'whatever such strangers were bound to, was of the law of nature: but strangers were bound to keep the Sabbath. Ergo.' I deny the major, which they offer not to prove. And I do more than deny it: I disprove it by the instances of Exod. xii. 19. Was eating leavened bread, forbidden by the law of nature? "One law shall be to him that is home-born, and to the stranger that sojourneth among you." (ver. 48, 49.) Circumcision was not of the law of nature. (Lev. xvi. 29.) Resting from all work on the tenth day of the seventh month, was not of the law of nature, though made also the stranger's duty. So eating blood, and that which dieth, or was torn. (Lev. xvii. 12. 15. So Lev. xxv. 6; Numb. xv. 14—16. 26. 29; xix. 10; xxxv. 15; Deut. xxxi. 12; Josh. viii. 33—25; xx. 9, &c.)

The next pretended proof is Rom. ii. 11, &c.; where there is not one syllable mentioning the decalogue as such, but only in general, *the law*, so far as it was written in the Gentiles' hearts. But where is it proved that the law or the decalogue, are words of the same signification or extent; any more than the whole and a part are? Or where is it proved that none of the rest of the law is written in nature, but the decalogue only? Or else that every word in the decalogue itself is part of the law of nature, (which is the question). I shall prove the contrary anon: in the meantime the bare numbering of chapters and verses is no proof.

3. It is next said, 'that Adam was made and framed to the perfection of the ten words.' *Answ.* Adam was made in the image of God, before the ten words were given in stone: but so much of them as is the law of nature, and had matter existent in Adam's days, no doubt, was a law to him as well as it is to us. But that is nothing to the question, Whether all things in the ten words are of natural obligation?

4. It is said, 'That the law of the Seventh-day-Sabbath was given before the ten words were proclaimed in Sinai.'

*Answ.* So was circumcision; and so was sacrificing; yea, so was the law about the dressing of the garden of Eden, and about the eating or not eating of the fruit thereof, even in innocency; which yet were no parts of nature's law, but positives, which now cease.

5. It is said, 'That it was given to Adam in respect of his human nature, and in him to all the world of human creatures.'

*Answ.* So was the covenant of works, or innocency, which yet is at an end. But what respect is it (to his human nature) that you mean? If you suppose this position, 'Whatever law is given with respect to human nature, and to all men, is of natural and perpetual obligation,' I deny it. The law of sacrifices and oblations was given with respect to human nature, that is, in order to its reparation, and it was given to mankind, and yet not of natural, perpetual obligation. The law of distinguishing clean beasts from unclean, and the law against eating blood, were given to Noah, and to all mankind, with respect to human nature, (Gen. viii. 20; ix. 4,) and yet not wholly of nature or perpetual obligation. All common laws have some respect to human nature. But if your meaning be, that this law was given in and with the nature of man himself, or that it is founded in, and probably by the very essentials of man's nature, or any thing permanent, either in the nature of man, or the nature of the world, I still deny it, and call for your proof. Positives may have respect to human nature as obliged by them; and yet not be written in human nature, nor provable by any mere natural evidence.

6. It is said, 'Set times of Divine appointment for solemn assemblies, &c. are directed by the great lights, &c.' (Psal. xix; Rom. x, &c.) *Answ.* But the question is not of set times in general (that some there be), but of this set time, the Seventh day in particular. It will be long before you can fetch any cogent evidence from the lights of heaven for it. Nor do any of the texts cited mention any such thing, or any thing that can tempt a man into such an opinion. It must be the Divine appointment and institution (which you mention) that must prove our obligation to a particular day, and not any nature within us or without us.

7. The only appearance of a proof is at the end, that 'time being measured by weeks, and the end of the weeks being fitted for rest, therefore nature points us to the last day.'

*Answ.* But, 1. You do not at all prove, that nature teacheth all men to measure their time by weeks. 2. Nor is your philosophy true, that all motion is in order to rest. Indeed all labour is, that is, all the motion of any creature which is out of its proper place, and moveth towards it. But if you will call the action of active natures, such as our souls are, by the name of spiritual motion, or metaphysical motion, as many do, then no doubt but cessation is as contrary to their nature, as corporal motion is to the nature of a stone: and the rest, that is, the perfection, pleasure, and felicity of spirits, consisteth in their greatest activity in good; "They rest not saying, Holy, Holy, &c." 3. You transfer the case from a day of worship to a day of rest. And so make your cause worse: because nature saith much for one stated day of worship; but not for one stated day of rest from labour, further than the worship itself must have a vacancy from other things. For reason can prove no necessity to human nature of resting a whole day, any more than for a due proportion of rest unto labour every day. The rest of one hour in seven, is as much as the rest of one day in seven. Or if some more additional conveniences may be found for days than hours, there being no convenience without its inconvenience, this will but shew us, that the law is well made when it is made, but not prove a 'piori' that there is or must be such an universal law. As you can never prove, that nature teaches men the distribution of time by weeks, (1.) It being a thing of tradition, custom and consent. (2.) And no man naturally knoweth it, till others tell him of it. (3.) And many nations do not so measure their time. (4.) And no man can bring a natural reason to prove that it must be so, which they might do if it were a law of natural reason;) so also that every family, or country at least, should not have leave to vary their days of rest, according to diversity of riches and poverty, health and sickness, youth and age, peace and war, and other such cases, you cannot prove necessary by nature alone, though you may prove it well done when it is done. 4. You cannot prove the last day more necessary for rest, than the first, or any other. For there are few countries, where wars, or

some other necessities, have not constrained them sometimes to violate the Sabbath's rest; which, when they have done, it is as many days from the third day to the third, as from the seventh to the seventh. 5. If time were naturally measured by weeks, yet it followeth not, that rest must be so: some countries are strong and can labour longer, and others tender and weak, and can labour less. 6. And seeing that the reason of a day for worshipping-assemblies is greater and more noble than the reason of a day for bodily rest, nature will rather tell us, that God should have the first day, than the last; 'a Jove principium:' a God was to have the first-born, the first-fruits, &c. 7. If we might frame laws for Divine worship by such conceits of convenience, as this is of the last day in seven as fittest for rest, and call them all the laws of nature, what a multitude of additions would be made, and of how great diversity? whilst every man's conceit went for reason, and reason for nature, and so we should have as many laws of nature, as there are diversities of conceits. And yet that there is such a thing as a law of nature in which all reason should agree, we doubt not. But having in vain expected your proof, that the Seventh-day Sabbath is the law of nature, or of universal obligation, I shall briefly prove the negative (that it is not).

1. That which is of natural obligation may be proved by natural reason (that is, by reason arguing from the nature of the thing) to be a duty. But that the Seventh day must be kept holy as a Sabbath, cannot be proved from the nature of the thing. Therefore it is not of natural obligation. He that will deny the minor, let him instance in his natural proof.

2. That is not an universal law of nature, which learned, godly men, and the greatest number of these, yea, almost all the world, know no such thing by, and confess they cannot prove by nature. But such is the Seventh-day-Sabbath,—&c. It is not I alone that know nothing of any such law, nor am able by any natural evidence to prove it, but also all the divines and other Christians that I am or ever was acquainted with: nay, I never knew one man that could say, that he either had such a law in his own nature, (unless some one did take his conceit for a law,) nor that he could shew such a law 'in natura rerum.' And it is a strange law of nature, which is to be found in no one's nature, but per-

haps twenty men's, or very few in a whole age; nor is discerned by all the rest of the world. If you say, that few understand nature, or improve their reason: I answer, 1. If it be such a law of nature as is obliterated in almost all mankind, it is a very great argument that nature being changed, the law is changed. How can that oblige which cannot be known? 2. Are not we men as well as you? Have not several ages had as great improvers of nature as you? If grace must be the improver, are there, or have there been none as gracious? If learning must be the improver, have there been none as learned? If diligence or impartiality must be the improvers of nature, have there not been many as diligent, studious and impartial as yourselves? Let all rational men judge which of these is the better argument, 'I and twenty men more in the world do discern in nature an universal obligation on mankind to keep the Seventh-day-Sabbath: therefore it is the law of nature.' Or, 'The world of mankind, godly and ungodly, learned and unlearned, discern no such natural obligation, except you, and the few of your mind: therefore it is no law of nature.'

3. That is not like to be an universal law of nature, which no man since the creation can be proved to have known and received, as such, by mere natural reason, without tradition. But no man since the creation can be proved to have known and received the Seventh-day-Sabbath by mere natural reason, without tradition: therefore it is not like to be an universal law of nature. If you know any man, name him and prove it; for I never read or heard of such a man.

4. If the text mention it only as a positive institution, then it is not to be accounted a law of nature. But the text mentioneth it only as a positive institution.—As is plain, Gen ii. 3. "God blessed the Seventh-day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, &c." If it had been a law of nature, it had been made in nature, and the making of nature would have been the making of the law. But here are two reasons against that in the text.

1. *Blessing* and *sanctifying* are positive acts of supernatural institution, superadded to the works of nature: they are not Divine *creating* acts, but Divine *instituting* acts.



2. That which is blessed and sanctified, "Because God rested in it from all his works," is not blessed and sanctified merely by those works or that rest; and if neither the works of nature, nor the rest of God from those works did sanctify it, then it is not of natural sanctification, and so not of natural obligation.

5. If the very reason of the day be not of natural, but of supernatural revelation, then the sanctification of the day is not of natural but supernatural revelation and obligation. But the former is certain. For no man breathing ever did or can prove by nature, without supernatural revelation, that God made and finished his works in six days, and rested the seventh. Aristotle had been like to have escaped his opinion of the world's Eternity, if he could have found out this by nature.

6. The distinction of weeks is not known by nature, to be any necessary measure of our time; therefore, much less that the seventh day of the week must be a Sabbath. The antecedent is sufficiently proved, in that no man can give a cogent reason for the necessity of such measure. And because it hath been unknown to a great part of the world. The Peruvians, Mexicans, and many such others knew not the measure of weeks. And Heylin noteth out of Jos. Scaliger de Emend. Temp. lib. 3, and 4, and Rossinus Antiq. and Dion, that neither the Chaldees, the Persians, Greeks, nor Romans, did of old observe weeks; and that the Romans measured their time by eights, as the Jews did by sevens; Hist. Sab. part 1. chap. iv. p. 83, 84; and p. 78, he citeth Dr. Bound's own words, p. 65. ed. 2. confessing the like, citing Beroaldus for it, as to the Roman custom. Yea, he asserteth, that till near the time of Dionys. Exig. anno 500, they divided not their time into weeks as now. In which he must needs except the Christians, and consequently, the ruling powers since Constantine. And if they were so unsettled through the world in their measure by months, as bishop Usher at large openeth in his Dissert. de Macedonum et Asianorum anno solari, (see especially his Ephemeris in the end, where all the days of each month are named without weeks,) the other will be no wonder.

I conclude therefore, 1. That one day in seven, rather than in six or eight, may by reason be discerned to be con-

venient when God hath so instituted it: But cannot by nature be known to be of natural universal obligation.

2. That this one day should be the seventh, no light of nature doth discover: Therefore Dr. Bound, Dr. Ames, and the generality of the defenders of one day in seven against the Anti-sabbatarians, do unanimously assert it to be of supernatural institution, and not any part of the law of nature: though stated days at a convenient distance is of the law of nature:

---

#### CHAPTER IV.

*Whether every Word in the Decalogue be of the Law of Nature, and of perpetual Obligation? And whether all that was of the Law of Nature, was in the Decalogue?*

BUT the great argument to prove it the law of nature is, because it was part of the ten words written in stone. To which I say, that the decalogue is an excellent summary of the generals of the law of nature, as to the ends for which it was given; but that,

I. It hath *more* in it than the law of nature.

II. It hath *less* in it than the law of nature: And therefore was never intended for a mere or perfect transcript of the law of nature: But for a perfect general summary of so much of that law as God thought meet to give the Jews by supernatural revelation, containing the chief heads of nature's law (lest they should not be clear enough in nature itself) with the addition of something more.

I. That the decalogue written in stone hath *more* than the law of nature, is proved 1. By these instances; 1. That "God brought them out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of servants," and that he is to be worshipped in that relation, is none of the law of nature, universally so called.

2. That God is merciful (and therefore reconciled) to a thousand generations of them that love him notwithstanding man's natural state of sin and misery, and all men's actual sin, this is of supernatural grace, and not the law of mere nature.

3. The great difference between the ways of justice and mercy, expressed by the third and fourth generation, compared to thousands, is more than the mere law of nature.

4. Those divines who take all God's positive institutions of worship, to be contained in the affirmative part of the second commandment, must needs think that it containeth more than the law of nature. (Though I say not as they ; but only that as a general law, it obligeth us to perform them, when another law hath instituted them.)

5. To rest one day in seven, is more than the law of nature.

6. To rest the seventh day rather than the sixth, or first, is more than the law of nature.

7. The strictness of the rest, to do no manner of work, is more than a law of nature.

8. That there be man-servants, and maid-servants, besides natural inferiors, is not of the primitive or universal law of nature.

9. The distinction of the Israelites from strangers within their gates, was not by the law of nature.

10. That cattle should do no manner of work (as for a dog to turn the spit in a wheel, or such like), is more than a law of nature.

11. That God made heaven and earth in six days and rested the seventh, is not of natural revelation.

12. That this was the reason wherefore God blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it, is not of natural revelation.

13. Some will say that more relations than natural being meant in the fifth commandment, maketh it more than a law of nature.

14. That the land of Canaan is made their reward, is a positive respecting the Israelites only.

15. That length of days in that land should be given by promise, is an act of grace, and not of nature only.

16. That this promise of length of days in that land, is made more to the honouring of superiors, than to the other commanded duties, is more than natural.

11. I prove it also by the abrogation of the law written in stone, which I proved before ; if the decalogue had been the only and perfect law of nature, it would not have been so far done away, as the apostle saith it is (of which before).

II. All the law of nature was not in the tables of stone. Here I premise these suppositions.

1. That a general law alone, obligeth not to all particulars, without a particular law; *e. g.* If the second command say, that, Thou shalt perform all God's instituted worship; or, Thou shalt worship me, as I appoint thee; this bindeth no man to baptism, the Lord's-supper, &c. till another law appoint them. Therefore there is not so much in the general law alone, as in that and the particular also.

2. All that is presupposed in a particular law, is not part of that law.

3. It is not so much to infer a duty indirectly and by far-fetched consequences, as to command it directly.

Now I prove the assertion by instances. All these following are Natural duties, and commanded also in other parts of Scripture, and yet are not in the law of Moses as written in stone.

1. To believe that the soul is immortal. 2. To believe that there is a heaven, where we shall be perfectly blessed in the knowledge, love, and fruition of God. 3. To believe that there is a hell, or life of future punishment for all the impenitent. 4. To love ourselves, with a just and necessary love, as such. 5. To take the greatest care to save our souls, above our bodies. 6. To tame and mortify all our fleshly lusts, in order to our own salvation. 8. To forbear all outward acts of gluttony, drunkenness, sloth, &c. as they tend to our damnation. 9. To rejoice in persecution, because of our great reward in heaven. 10. To pray constantly, and fervently for heaven, as the means of our obtaining it.

Let none say that many of these same things are commanded in order to God, and our neighbour. For I grant that the same material acts be so; as they are expressions of love to God and man. But to do them in love to ourselves, and for our own salvation, is another principle and end, not contrary to, but necessarily conjunct with the former two; and indeed all the duties of self-love, as such, are passed by (as supposed) in Moses's decalogue; because they are deeply written in man's nature, and because the law was written as political, for another use.

*Object.* 'But these are all supposed in the first command of loving God, and in the second table, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

*Answ.* 1. These last were not the words of the decalogue; but a part of the summary of all the law. 2. Both tables indeed suppose the love of ourselves, but that which is supposed, is not a part of them.

*Object.* 'But it is the Socinians that say, the Old Testament speaketh of no reward or punishment but in this life.'

*Answ.* True; but Camero ('de tripl. fæd.') and others that rightly understood the matter, affirm, that, 1. The law of nature containeth future rewards and punishments in another life. 2. And so doth the covenant of grace made with Adam, and all mankind in him, and renewed to Noah, Abraham, and the Israelites, which by Paul is called the promise, as distinct from the law. 3. But the law of Moses, in its own proper nature, as such, was only political, and spake but of temporal rewards and punishments. 4. Though yet all the faithful were bound to take the law and promise together, and so to have respect both to temporal and eternal things. For the law itself connoted and supposed things eternal, as our great concernment.

III. There is more of the law of nature in other parts of Moses's law, conjunct with the decalogue, than is in the decalogue alone.

I will stay no longer in the proof of this, than to cite the places as you do, Exod. xxiii. 13. 32; xxii. 18. 20: Lev. xx. 1. 4. 6; Deut. xiii; xvii: Exod. xxiii. 24; Deut. xii; xxiii: Lev. xxiv; xxiii. 3: Exod. xii. 16; Deut. xxiii. 18; Exod. xxii. 28; xxiii. 20; xxi. 15. 17: Lev. xix. 32; Deut. xxi; i; xvi; vi; xi: Exod. xxi. 12, 13. 18. 20. 22, &c.; xxii. 2, 3; Lev. xiii. 14; xvii: Deut. xxi; Exod. xxii. 19; Lev. xviii; xix. 29; xx; Deut. xxii; Exod. xxi. 16. 21. 32. 35; xxii. 1. 4, to 17; Lev. xix. 30. 35; Deut. xxiv; xxix. 14; xxi; xxv; Exod. xxiii. 1—9; Deut. xxiii; xxiv; Lev. xix. 11. 15; Exod. xxii. 21, 22; xxv; xxvi; xxiii. 4; Lev. xix. 14. 16. 18, &c.

By all this I shew you why, 1. I allow not of your making the word *law* in the New Testament to signify the decalogue only, or taking them for equipollent terms. 2. Why I take not the decalogue and the law of nature for equipollent terms, or their matter to be of the same extent; and consequently why I take it for no proof that all things in the decalogue are perpetual, because all things in the law of nature are so.

## CHAPTER V.

*Whether the truest Antiquity be for the Seventh-day-Sabbath, as kept by the Churches of Christ ?*

'It is here further objected that the Seventh-day-Sabbath hath the truest testimonies of antiquity; that it is convertible when and how the Lord's-day came in; but the antiquity of the Seventh-day-Sabbath is past controversy: that the Eastern Christians long observed it, and Antichrist in the West did turn it into a fast: that the empire of Abassia keepeth it to this day.'

*Answ.* There is enough said of this before, were it not that some objectors causelessly look for more. I answer therefore, 1. That it is true that the Sabbath is more ancient than the Lord's-day; and so is Moses more ancient than Christ incarnate, and his law than the Gospel as delivered by Christ and his apostles, and circumcision than baptism, and the passover than the Lord's-supper; and so every man's conception, nativity, infancy, and ignorance, was before his maturity and knowledge. And what can you gather from all this? Thus the Papists say that their way of religion was in England before ours, and that the relics of it in our monuments, ('Orate pro animabus,' &c.) is their standing witness, which we cannot totally deface: and it is true, if by our way they mean the reformation of theirs, as such; for the cure is ever after the disease: though it is false, if they speak of our religion itself; which was here before their errors, as health is before sickness. But they should consider, that by this prerogative the heathens excel us both: and that they may say, you have yet many more monuments of our more ancient religion, which you have not been able to obliterate. You still call your week-days by our ancient names, Sunday, Monday, &c. Your adoration towards the East was fetched from us, and so were abundance of your customs; which we hope may recover the reputation of our religion.

2. I have shewed you already how, and why the Eastern Christians kept the Sabbath: 1. They kept it not as a Sabbath, but only met on that day as they did on the fourth and sixth days, (Wednesdays and Fridays,) as it is used in

England to this day. And for the most part they celebrated not the Lord's-supper on that day. And they abhorred the keeping it as a day of rest.

2. They met on that day for all these reasons. 1. Because having been used in the beginning to meet every day in the week (when they had all things common, and were to shew the power of the evangelical doctrine to the height, Acts ii. 44—46; iv. 33—35.) as they found cause to retrieve their community, so did they meet seldomer, and yet not so seldom as once a week: and therefore as we now keep other meetings for lectures and prayers, besides the Lord's-day, so did they then on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. 2. Because the conversion of the Jews was a great part of their work and hope; and therefore to win them, they would with Paul become Jews; that is, not affect an unnecessary distance, but come as near them as lawfully they could. 3. Because converted Jews were no small part of the Eastern churches; who could not easily be brought off from Jewish customs; and the rest were unwilling to offend them: being taught not to despise the weak that observed meats and days. (Rom. xiv; xv; Gal. ii. 4.) Because the assemblies on the Seventh day were taken as fit preparatories to the sanctifying of the Lord's-day, on which account the church of England now appointed them. These things one that is acquainted with church-history needeth no proof of.

And they are sufficiently proved before. Ignatius's words before-cited are full. And those of the Council of Laodicea, Can. 29. are more full, who do at once appoint meetings on the Seventh day, and yet anathematize them that Judaize thereon, by bodily rest; and would have men labour on it, and prefer the Lord's-day before it.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, doth largely shew that circumcision and the Sabbath are ceased by the coming of Christ, and his institutions, and are not now to be used by Christians. And what writer have we of full reputation and credibility more ancient than Justin, from whom any testimony in this case might be sought?

Tertullian (one of the next) li. 2. against Marcion, saith, that the Sabbath was for that time, and present occasion, or use, and not for perpetuity.

Athanasius was one that was for meeting on the Sab

bath; and yet writeth his book "de Sab. et Circum." purposely to prove that the Sabbath is ceased with circumcision, as a shadow, and that now the Lord's-day is the sanctified day. And the like he hath most expressly in Homil. de Semente, as is cited before, saying, that, 'The master being come, the usher was out of use; and the sun being risen, the lamps are darkened.'

Basil Epist. 74. writeth against Apollinaris for holding that after the resurrection, we should keep Sabbaths, and Judaize; as if that were the perfection to which Christ would restore men.

See Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 43. and Chrysost. Hom. 19. in Matt. xii. against the use of the Sabbath. Cyril. Hieros. cat. 4. and Epiphan. against the Nazaræi, condemn them for keeping the Sabbath and circumcision, though withal they kept the Lord's-day. The same doth Epiphanius, lib. 1. Hær. 30. n. 2. and before him, Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. say of the Ebionites. Augustine oft telleth us, that the observation or keeping of the Seventh-day-Sabbath is ceased, and not to be done by Christians. (Qu. ex. N. Test. 69; Ad Bonif. l. 3; Contr. Faust. Manich. l. 6. c. 4; De Genes. ad lit. l. 4. c. 13; de spir. et lit. c. 14; de util. Cred. c. 3.)

3. And as for the Abassians keeping the Sabbath: it is true, they keep that day in some sort; but it is as true, that they use circumcision, and many other Jewish ceremonies; besides oft baptizings; and that they profess not to use these as the Jews do, but only as ancient customs, and as Paul did while he complied with them, using the outward action for other ends than Judaizers do. And the rather because they think their emperors descended from Solomon. But the Lord's-day they keep on the same account as other Christians. And if this instance make any thing for sabbatizing, it will make as much for circumcising, and other Jewish rites, but nothing against the sanctifying of the Lord's-day.

4. And as for the matter of fasting on the Sabbath, the churches greatly varied their customs. The Eastern churches and Millan in the West, were against fasting on the Sabbath on two accounts: 1. Because, as is said, they would not offend the Jews. Even as many peaceable nonconformists, who are against many holy days now established, do yet forbear labouring and opening their shops on those



days, because they will not give offence; yea, and go to hear the sermons on those days, though they keep them not holy, as such days. 2. Because there were many sorts of heretics in those times, who held that the world was made by an evil God, and thence came evil and so they fasted on the Seventh day on that reason; which made the Christians avoid it, lest they should symbolize with those heretics. And therefore (the real or pretended) Ignatius speaketh so severely against fasting on the Sabbath, as well as on the Lord's-day. And so do the constitutions called the apostles; yea, and the canons called theirs. (Can. 65.)

But in the Western churches (as is aforesaid), both Jews and heretics were more distant, or less considerable for numbers; and therefore they fasted on the Seventh day, and that the rather, lest they should seem by sabbatizing to Judaize. Which was before Antichrist's appearing, unless you think all the holy doctors before cited, and all the Western churches, to be Antichristian.

Having gone thus far, I here add two more Scripture-arguments to prove the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath. The first is, because it is frequently made (as circumcision is) a sign of the particular covenant between God and that nation, as they were a political body, and peculiar people. Therefore if their policy cease, and God's relation to them as a political body, and peculiar people, and so that political covenant with them, then also the sign of the covenant and relation ceaseth. And though the word 'for ever' is sometimes added, it is no other than is oft added also to the Jewish law and ceremonies.

2. From Acts xv: where the case is determined by a council of apostles, elders and brethren, yea, by the Holy Ghost. (ver. 28.) It appeareth by ver. 24, that the thing asserted by the false teachers was 'that the Gentiles must be circumcised and keep the law; that is, of Moses. (ver. 1.) Now the Seventh-day-Sabbath was part of that law (as sacrificing was, though it was a law before). But the Holy Ghost determineth the case, "to lay on them no greater burden than these necessary things," after named; where the Sabbath is none of them, and therefore hereby shut out. The precepts given to Noah are named (of which the Sabbath was not one.)

*Object.* 'By this exposition you may say that the rest of

the decalogue is excluded: for idolatry, murder, &c. are not here forbidden by name.' *Answ.* I have fully proved that the decalogue as written in stone, and part of the law or covenant of Moses, is not at all in force, especially to the Gentiles; nor yet as part of the covenant (or promise) of works made with Adam in innocency: for the form of the promissory covenant of works ceased upon man's sin, and the promise of a Saviour; and the form of the Mosaical law or covenant never reached to the Gentile nations, and is ceased to the Jews: therefore the matter must cease as it constituted the same covenant, when the form ceased. And Paul saith expressly that this law written in stone is done away. But, 1. The law of nature, as a mere law, never ceased. 2. And Christ hath taken it into his covenant, as part of the matter of it. So that it is wholly in force, though not as part of the covenant of works, either Adamical or Mosaical. But the Sabbath, as to the seventh day, was no part of the law of nature, as is proved: And Paul expressly saith, that it was a "shadow of things to come," and is therefore vanished away. (Col. ii. 16.) Had it been part of the law of nature, it had bound us as such, and as Christ's law: or had it been one of the enumerated particulars, Acts xv, it had bound the neighbour Gentiles, 'pro tempore' at least. But being neither, that council dischargeth Christians from the observation of it, as far as I can understand the text.

---

## POSTSCRIPT.

It is long since the foregoing Treatise was promised to a person of honourable rank who was inclined to the Jewish Sabbath; but before it was finished or well begun, I had a sight of a treatise on the same subject, by the late reverend worthy servant of Christ, Mr. Hughes of Plymouth, which inclined me to take my promised work as unnecessary. But yet some reasons moved me to re-assume it. Near two months after it went from me to the press, the said treatise of Mr. Hughes first, and after another on the same subject by Dr. J. Owen came abroad. Yet do I not reverse mine, because many witnesses in an age of enmity and neglect, can

be no injury to a truth so serviceable to the cause of Christianity; and the prosperity of the church, and the good of souls. Though if I were one that took the church's prosperity to consist in riches, grandeur, ease and domination, or empire of papal pastors, rather than in the humble, holy, heavenly, self-denying imitation of a crucified Christ, I would have forborne a subject which is all for our preparation for a heavenly Sabbatism, and carrieth men above the sensual rest of fleshly men, and therefore is so much disrelished by them. (Rom. viii. 6—8.) But supposing it to be my duty to do what I have done, I think meet to advise the reader; that when several men treat of the same subject, though they speak the same things in the main, yet usually each of them bringeth some considerable light, which is omitted by the rest. And as the same Spirit sets them all on work, so all together give fuller evidence to the truth, than any one of them alone. And I hope the concourse of these three tractates doth prognosticate, that (though the devil hath so contrived the business for the profane, that like Papists, they will hear and read none, but those that are not like to change them; yet) God will awaken the sober and serious believers of this age, to a more holy and fruitful improvement of his day; which will greatly tend to the increase of real godliness, and consequently to the recovery of the dying hopes of this apostatizing and divided age.

But that which moveth me to write this Postscript, is to acquaint thee, for the prevention of scandal by any seeming differences in our writings, 1. That it cannot be expected, that all who plead the same cause, should say just the same thing for it, for matter and manner of argumentation.

2. That if I own the name of Sabbath less than some others, and adhere more to the name of the Lord's-day, I do not hereby oppose the use of the name of Sabbath absolutely; nor is that in itself a controversy about the matter, but the name, which though not contemptible, yet is of far less moment than the thing.

3. That if I make not use of so many Old Testament texts as some others, I do not thereby deny the usefulness of them, nor call you off from the consideration of any argumentation or evidence thence offered you.

4. That if I seem to be more for the cessation of Moses's law, than some others, even of that part which was written in stone, yet no part of the law of nature is thereby denied by me, any more than by any of them ; and they that are angry with me, for writing so much against the Antinomians, should not also be angry with me for going no further from them, than the force of truth constraineth me.

5. That you must pardon me for my purposely avoiding the name of the ' moral law ;' Mr. Cawdry and Mr. Palmer, who have written most largely of the Sabbath, have told you the reason. I love not such names, as are not fitted to the nature of things, but are fitted to signify almost what the speaker pleaseth.

I know no law which is not formally moral, as being ' *Regula actionum Moralium.*' And men may if they will, as well confine the signification of the word ' law ' itself, as of a ' moral law.' Nor doth use itself sufficiently notify the distinguishing signification of it. For one meaneth by that name, all the law of nature as such. Another meaneth only so much of the law of nature as is common to all mankind. Another meaneth all positive laws of supernatural revelation, which are perpetual and universal, as well as the law of nature. Therefore without finding fault with others, it sufficeth me to distinguish laws by such names as plainly signify the intended difference. And though by the law of nature, I mean not formally the same thing that some others do, I have sufficiently opened my sense and the reasons of it, in my " *Reasons of the Christian Religion.*"

6. That they who say, that the Old Covenant, or the covenant of works made by Moses with the Jews, is abrogated or ceased, and the decalogue as a part of, or belonging to that covenant, do say the same thing that I do, when I maintain that the decalogue and whole law, as Mosaical, is ceased, but that all the natural part is by Christ assumed into his law, or covenant of grace. For it is the same thing which is denominated the law (of Moses, or of Christ) from the preceptive part, and a covenant from the terms, or sanction, especially the promissory part. Nor is there any part of the law of Moses, which was not a part of the Mosaical covenant. And if the form cease which denominateth, the being and denomination ceaseth, and all the parts, as parts of that which ceaseth. So that if the covenant of works

made with the Jews cease, (which Camero calleth a third or middle covenant, and several men do variously denominate, but the Scripture calleth the old or former covenant, or testament or disposition,) then all the law, as part of that covenant ceaseth. And that is as much as to say also that it ceaseth as merely Mosaical, or political to the Jews. And then the argument is vain, 'This or that word was written in the tables of stone; therefore it is of perpetual obligation.' For as it was written in stone, it was Mosaical, and is done away; and under the new covenant all that is natural and continued, shall by the Spirit be written upon the heart; whence sin at first did obliterate it.

7. That as the rest of God in the creation is described by a cessation from his work, with a complacency in the goodness of it: But Christ's rest is described more by vital activity and operation, than by cessation from work, even his triumphant resurrection, as the conquest of death, and beginning of a new life. So I think the old Sabbath is more described by such corporeal rest, or cessation from work, which was partly ceremonial, or a signifying shadow, and that the word Sabbath is never used in Scripture, but for such a day of ceremonial rest (though including holy worship). But that the Lord's-day, and its due observation, is more described by spiritual activity and operation, in the spiritual resurrection of the soul, and its new life to God; and that the bodily rest is no longer ceremonial and shadowy, but fitted to the promoting and subserving of the spiritual activity and complacency in God, and holy exercises of the mind, as the body itself is to the service of the soul.

8. That I am not ignorant that many of the English divines long ago expounded Matt. xxiv. 20, of the Christian Sabbath, and Col. ii. 16, as exclusive of the Jewish weekly Sabbath: but so do not most expositors, for which I think they give very good reasons, which I will not stand here to repeat.

9. That I intend not a full and elaborate treatise of the Lord's-day, but a brief explication of that method of proof which I conceive most easy and convincing, and most fit for the use of doubting Christians; who are many of them lost in doubts in the multitude and obscurity of arguments from the Old Testament: When I think that the speedy and satisfactory dispatch of the controversy is best made by a plain

proof of the institution of Christ by the Holy Ghost in the apostles; which I thought to have shewed in two or three sheets, but that the necessity of producing some evidence of the fact, and answering other men's objections, drew it out to greater length. And my method required me to say more of the practice of antiquity, than some other men's. But again, I must give notice that Dr. T. Young's "Dies Dominica" is the book which I agree with in the method and middle way of determining this controversy, and which I take to be the strongest written of it. And that I omit most which he hath, as taking mine but as an appendix to his, and desire him that will write against mine, to answer both together, or else I shall suppose his work to be undone.

END OF THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF THE LORD'S-DAY.