

proof of his being the Son of God ; and an evidence that *that* sacrifice, upon which the happiness of millions depended, was accepted ; a fit reason for returning to the original day, and furnishes a strong argument for the diligent observance of it.

But what must be thought of the conduct of those who divide the time of the Sabbath between two days, or fix a day suitable for themselves ? Can the system, which encourages such wanton liberties with a Divine institution, promote Christian humility ? Does it not rather tend to foster pride ? Is it not presumptuous to assume the prerogative of Deity, and alter his laws to suit the pleasure or convenience of man ?

What better judgment can be formed of the conduct of those who begin the day at six o'clock on the evening of Saturday, and end it at six o'clock on the evening of the following day ? It is not difficult to ascertain when the Sabbath should begin. Our Lord did not rise out of the grave at the end of the Jewish Sabbath ; but between its expiration and the dawn of the following light ; so that the commencement of the Sabbath with the time when the other days of the week begin, is sufficiently near to the period of the Lord's resurrection.

The uniform observance of the day of the Sabbath, is as imperative as a Divine command can make it ; and it is also necessary to give to the Sabbath all that moral influence which it ought to exert upon Society.

THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

THIS is a very vexed question, and were it one merely of doubtful disputation, and not vital in its importance, on the great subject of Justification, we might avoid the discussion of it, as entirely controversial. But, inasmuch as the extent of the atonement depends upon its *nature*, the enquiry will, I trust, be at once entertaining and profitable.

I. *Let us recall a few leading principles heretofore settled.*

1. In the government of a holy God, an innocent being cannot suffer. To suppose that God would lay the punishment of sin—or treat a moral being, entirely free from sin, as a sinner, by delivering him up to suffer, is to charge God foolishly.

2. The sufferings of Jesus were by appointment of God, therefore, as he had no sin of his own.

3. He must have suffered for the sins of some other person or persons. I say *person*, because,

4. We have seen, that the idea of a person representing or acting morally for a *nature*, for a mere abstraction that never existed, and never could exist, is a speculation so foolish to claim serious attention.

5. Jesus, in acting and suffering for persons, stood in their moral relations—he occupied their place—he bore their legal responsibilities. For,