

were a purely ceremonial and temporary institution.

But now we come to notice the main arguments employed against our view of the Sabbath; and I want to state them fairly, and just as strongly as our opponents, if I may use the word, would wish to state them. These say to us: "All your deductions from the Old Testament—from the Edenic institution of the Sabbath, from the fact that the Sabbath law is in the decalogue, that the prophets speak so highly of it, that it constitutes the bond of the covenant, must not override the plain teaching of the New Testament that the Sabbath is obsolete." Largely, no doubt, by the New Testament, must this question be decided. There is no person associated with us in this movement, who does not defer to the New Testament, who does not accept, I may say, every word of the New Testament as authoritative; and if the Lord says, or if his apostles say, that the Sabbath is obsolete, and that we have no day to take its place under the New Testament economy, we shall, with entire submission, accept the teaching of our divine Master, or of his inspired servants. I do not think that the New Testament does thus teach. Just for a moment consider the position that our Lord and Master occupied, and you will see that he is for us, not against us. And if the critics, higher or lower, tell me that the Lord's knowledge was limited, that he thought and spoke as a Jew about all ceremonial matters, and that we must not refer to his words when there is any question of strict exegesis to be considered—I must, with great decision, though with great humility, put myself by the side of the Lord rather than by the side of the critics. Yes, I say that when any question respecting the authority of the Old Testament or its institutions comes up, I want to be found upon the Lord's side—(hear, hear)—and I will believe that his knowledge was not simply adequate to the revelation