

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

AN APOSTOLIC MISSIONARY IN CHINA.

About ten years ago, a young man was quietly ordained to the foreign mission work in a small church in Montreal, Canada. He had been from boyhood an enthusiast as to missions, and having now finished his preparatory studies, was ready to go forth as an ordained medical missionary to China. No public attention was aroused by his ordination, and there were but few to bid the young missionary God-speed, though there were some, even then, who were deeply impressed by the quiet *intensity* with which he spoke at meetings which he addressed before leaving the country, and who long after remembered him as one especially characterised by apostolic faith and fervor. He was the first missionary whom the then "Canada Presbyterian Church" sent forth to the heathen in the regions beyond Canada, which, of course, is a wide mission-field in itself.

The Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston—then of Halifax—happened to be in Montreal, and to be present at the dedication service, and he thus describes the impression produced on him at the time: "The committee had not selected one of the large churches for the service, probably because it estimated rightly the amount of public interest in foreign missions. The small church was not filled. The missionary-elect, a small, dark young man, seemed to make little impression on the con-

ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S DAY, AND NOT THE JEWISH SABBATH.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN BEVERIDGE.

No. I.

INTRODUCTION.

It has long been a disputed point among Christians, whether the Lord's day, commonly called the Christian Sabbath, is, or is not, a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath into the Christian or New Covenant system, merely changing the day of the week and suppressing the death penalty attached to it under the Old Covenant. At the present time, a large majority of evangelical Christians firmly believe that the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to the Christian system, while a very small minority believe the Lord's day to be an institution peculiar to the New Covenant, and an outgrowth of the New Testament system, similar to the gospel ministry, and in intimate connexion with it, and yet no more of a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath than the gospel ministry is a transfer of the Levitical priesthood; both of these being but a shadow or prophecy of the corresponding institutions of the New Covenant.

The author of the following articles, after a careful examination of the claims of both parties, has decided in favor of the minority, finding himself fully convinced that they are in possession of the truth. He cordially invites fair and honest criticism, either to confirm him in the truth, or clearly indicate where his line of argument departs from the solid basis of the inspired oracles. From all those critics who condemn without examination, merely because his views are not those of the majority of professing Christians, or not in accordance with the opinions of illustrious teachers who are as liable to error as himself, he asks no sympathy, and expects none from that Judaising class who are ever ready to exclaim: "Except ye be circumcised after the

manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." To the cause of truth the condemnation of such men is far preferable to their praise.

On referring to the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, it will be observed that the Westminster divines left the question undecided. It says: "The fourth commandment requireth of all men the sanctifying or keeping holy to God such set times as he hath appointed in his word, expressly one whole day in seven; which was the seventh from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week ever since, and so to continue to the end of the world; which is the Christian Sabbath, and in the New Testament called the Lord's day." The designation "Christian Sabbath" here, would indicate a distinction between this and the Jewish Sabbath.

In accepting the position that the Lord's day is not a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, the author has the satisfaction of knowing that he has at least one illustrious Presbyterian in his favor—John Calvin.

Calvin says: "If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day, as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the Church, *another day* was appointed for that purpose."—*Calvin's Institutes*, Book 2, Chap. 8, Sec. 33. Calvinists of the present day appear to have departed from the views of Calvin, probably owing to the loose manner in which the Lord's day is observed in those portions of Continental Europe where the Reformation was first established by Calvin and Luther. It is usually supposed that these views lead to a disrespect of the Lord's day, and consequently should be deprecated. This is not right. We should not depart from the truth of God's word because ignorant or wicked men abuse it. The author of these articles would not detract one particle from the proper observance of the Lord's day, as required by the Sacred Scriptures, and would rejoice to see the day observed and respected far more than it is, by the great majority of evangelical Christians of the present day: his only object in presenting his

views to the world being a desire to know and teach the truth as revealed by God's word, and not erroneous views based upon human prejudice or tradition. But was Calvin right? Were his views of the Lord's day in accordance with Scripture? Was he not in error on this point? Have not his disciples become wiser than their teacher? It is hoped that these questions may be answered satisfactorily in this investigation.

The author has chosen as a clear exposition of the views he combats, a prize essay entitled "The Holy Sabbath," and published by the "Presbyterian Committee of Publication," from which he has taken the liberty of making frequent extracts. In doing this, he wishes to say that he has no desire to depreciate his brethren in the ministry, but, by pointing out their errors, he would desire that we may all grow in knowledge as well as in grace, till we arrive "in the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and by "speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into him in all things."

THERE IS NO COMMAND GIVEN TO MEN TO OBSERVE THE JEWISH SABBATH BEFORE THE EXODUS FROM EGYPT.

The first record we have of the Seventh day is in connexion with the creation of the world. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii. 2, 3. There is certainly no command here to men to keep the day holy. This is merely an historical record, telling us that God rested after completing the work of creation. Nor are we told how long he rested. Did he rest one day of twenty-four hours and then resume the work of creation? No one will answer this in the affirmative. Did he on the eighth day resume the work of supporting and sustaining the creation which he had made? If so, what became of the creation on the seventh day? It is universally admitted that, were God to withdraw his sustaining power from the universe but for a single moment, it

would be utterly annihilated. This power, then, was exercised on the seventh day, according to our Saviour's words: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

We find ourselves, then, compelled to accept the conclusion that the seventh day, or day following the six days of creation, was not a literal day of twenty-four hours, but a period—a day in creation's history, reaching from the end of the six days in which creation was brought into existence, down to the morning of redemption, when a still more holy day was ushered in.

Now, as geologists have proved as clearly that the world was not created in six literal days, as geographers have that the world is a globe and not an extended plain, and the Church universal has accepted this view, (except a few, who would have us believe that God created the world with its great mountain ranges largely composed of countless millions of sea-shells, which would be as absurd as to suppose that he created the pyramids of Egypt in the same way, only to try men's faith), we can have no doubt but the seventh day is a period reaching from the time when he created man, and that then looking upon everything that he had made, he pronounced it good; down to that hour when the work of redemption was completed, and the Second Adam exclaimed from the cross, "It is finished."

We are told that at the commencement of this period, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made," and then, towards its close, prophecy points forward to its termination and says: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy." Dan. ix. 24.

"God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." He blessed and sanctified it in an especial manner. The six periods in which God created all things, were but preliminary to that period in which man should dwell upon earth. He blessed it by walking with man in the beginning, and sanctified it by coming himself clothed in human flesh to redeem man from the curse of the

fall. God blessed and sanctified the seventh day of the world's creation ; but does this prove that he commanded man to observe the seventh day of the week ?

There is absolutely no command given to men in the Bible to observe the seventh day of the week before the exodus from Egypt, nor is there any passage of Scripture from which such an inference can be derived ; and any assertion to the contrary is pure assumption. If any such command had been given, Moses would certainly have recorded it ; or are we to assume that he did record it, and that the Jews lost it out of the Bible ? Give us proofs, and we will believe them ; but mere assertions without proof are of no value. To assert that "the great Creator should in some way demand of his creatures a formal acknowledgment of their fealty to his throne ; that he should seek to bind them to himself by levying a tribute upon their love and affection ; that he should appoint a place and designate a time when he would condescend to meet them, and graciously admit them to communion with himself ; that he should select for this purpose the day of his resting from his creative work ; and that he should hallow the day thus selected, by separating it from all the rest, and making it holy as he is holy, that it might thus ever stand as a perpetual witness for him," would be all well and good, if we had any proof to that effect. To assert that God would not abandon his creatures without giving them the Sabbath day from the beginning, merely because our finite views thus deal with his character, would also assert that a holy God would not abandon his creatures to sin. The latter we know is not true, and the former is equally deficient of proof. It has no basis in Scripture, and to our own finite reasoning we have no right to appeal.

We know that God walked with the patriarchs, and no doubt taught them to obey his will by verbal communications ; and we also know that he had his servants who, like Noah, were preachers of righteousness, or, in other words, teachers of the Moral Law ; and thus have good reason to infer that he required of his children a proper portion of their time in consecration to himself, a first fruits, as it were, of that day which he had blessed and

sanctified, and which the patriarchs doubtlessly gave him; but this is vastly different from a direct command to keep holy the Jewish typical Sabbath day. The former we admit from inference; the latter we deny.

INSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH SABBATH.

That the Jewish Sabbath was given to the Jewish nation, or rather nation of Israel, and not to the world, is plainly evident to any one who will carefully read the history of its institution as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. On the evening of the fifteenth day of the second month of the Jewish sacred year, the Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin, weary with the day's march through the desert, and having exhausted the unleavened bread which they carried out of Egypt, and which had now lasted them thirty days, counting from the morning of the day in which the Passover lamb was killed, and fearing that they would all perish there in the desert, they murmured against Moses and Aaron. Then we are told that the Lord said unto Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Then according to this promise quails were given them in the evening and manna in the morning, until the sixth day. "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Our English version here would rather indicate, that what Moses tells them that the Lord said, had been said sometime before; but such is not the case. The true rendering is, "This is *what* the Lord said," now revealed to the people for the first time. Then when the seventh day had arrived, "Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a

sabbath [not THE sabbath] unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none."

Here we have the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, which in its institution is denominated "*a sabbath,*" and henceforth called "the sabbath." Then we read, that in direct violation of this commandment *some* of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and found none. Then the Lord said unto Moses, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" (Other versions say, "Till when do you not wish to keep my commandments and my laws?") "See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Here, then, we have a record of the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, instituted among and for the Jews; a commandment given to the Jewish nation, and not to the world. Those who maintain that the Christian Lord's day is the Jewish Sabbath transferred into the Christian system, contend that it was given to the whole world from the beginning, and that this is but an historical record enforcing its observance. The writer of the prize essay, "*The Holy Sabbath,*" quotes the first half of the twenty-third verse of this chapter: "To-morrow is the sabbath of the Lord;" and then adds: "This is not the language of a legislator, but of an historian, and the whole context shows that it was not a new, but simply the revival of an old statute that had fallen into disuse."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 29. The writer is undoubtedly in error here. The whole context clearly indicates that it was the giving of a new law, and not the revival of an old one. The command: "Eat to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord;" like the whole of the context, contains not only a law regulating the gathering of the manna, *but also an authoritative appointment of a day of rest.* Moses tells the people: "The Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you the bread of two days;" which proves clearly that the Jewish Sabbath was a new institution given with the bread, and that the manna, or its equivalent, and

the day of rest are so intimately united that they cannot be divorced. "So the people rested on the seventh day:" that is, because the bread of two days had been given them. This is the first record of any people resting on the seventh day, and we are not left in doubt as to the reason why they did this and why God commanded them to do so. The Sabbath day was given to the Jews because God gave them food from heaven for six days, doubling the supply on the sixth. The confirmations of this day with other and more important reasons for observing it, will be examined in their proper place. If the observance of the Jewish Sabbath is an old statute, we should be pleased to see more potent proof of it than can be derived from the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. Until such proof is forthcoming, we shall believe as we now do, that it was first given and only given to the Jews and not to the world.

THE PROPHETIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JEWISH SABBATH IN THE DESERT.

The author of the prize essay, after referring to the manner in which the Sabbath is interlaced in all the symbolisms of Scripture, says: "This recurrence is just as noticeable in the *typical development of Scripture*. That development is in septenary cycles. Seven is the archetypal number, and seven periods the archetypal cycle, in typical cosmogony. Thus the seventh seal contains the seven trumpets, and the seventh trumpet contains the seven vials. Seven days bring on the Sabbath, seven weeks the pentecost, seven months the atonement, seven years the sabbatic year, seven sabbatic years the jubilee, seven thousand years the millenary period, as is generally believed, and for aught we know the seventh millenary period will be the dawn of heaven, the final everlasting jubilee."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 10. Excepting perhaps the latter part of this quotation, that referring to the millennium, it contains a very important truth. Let us see how well it applies to the institution of the Jewish Sabbath in the desert.

The Jewish nation may be considered to be a type of the whole world from the death of Christ to the end of time. The exodus

from Egypt may, then, well represent God's calling a people to himself through Christ, either by the preaching of the word to adults, or as in the case of infants by being born under gospel influences. The cold, hard unleavened bread which they brought with them from Egypt, is that innocence of childhood (the innocence of ignorance) which Paul knew before the commandment came.—Rom. vii. 9–11. This can but barely sustain life, and that but for a short time. It gradually grows harder and more mouldy until it finally disappears altogether, and we are brought face to face with Moses and Aaron, the representatives of the Law and the Sacrifice; where we are found murmuring at our sad condition. The promise is then given us and immediately fulfilled of bread from heaven. Christ himself is the true bread from heaven, but he was not given to the Israelites in the form of the Holy Comforter at the same time that the law was given. The sacrifices were first instituted, and then the prophecies given; a temporary bread, which could afford life only for the time being, but which would disappear before the coming of the true bread. A double supply of these, however, was given, in the teachings of John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ, and of Christ himself in the flesh, before the rest of the Holy Comforter was instituted. And so it is with us through the journey of life; as the hard unleavened bread of the world passes away, we find ever increasing consolation in God's word, till we are about to leave the world, and then comes a double supply, and we enter into rest. These six days are prophetic days, and if multiplied by seven, give us forty-two. Counting from the tenth day of the first month, when the Passover lamb was chosen (Ex. xii. 3), to the twenty-second day of the second month, that on which the Jewish Sabbath was first instituted, including both the first and last of these two days, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, we have just forty-two days; or omitting these two days, we have forty. In like manner after journeying forty years in the desert, stopping at just forty-two stations, the whole nation arrives at the land of Canaan, and *rests* from the toils and weary wanderings in the desert. Here the manna, which had furnished them with food through these long years, suddenly ceases, and they partake of the fresh fruits of the land.

But the Jewish Sabbath is not discontinued when the Jews enter Canaan. A law had already been given which confirms its continuance till the true manna and the true rest should come. On the contrary, in connexion with this, another Sabbath was now to be established, a yearly Sabbath, which was not given to the world, nor to Israel in the desert, but was confined alone to Canaan. "And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard and gather in the fruit thereof: but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard." And in connexion with this was also established the Jubilee, which, like the former, belonged alone to the land of Canaan, and not to the world.—Lev. xxv. These Canaanitish Sabbaths were an outgrowth of the condition of the Jews in their own land, and ceased to exist when Canaan ceased to be a type of God's kingdom, just as the Jewish Sabbath ceased to exist when the family of Jacob ceased to be the typical kingdom of God, in the coming of the Saviour, not of Israel, but of the world.

Now just as the Jewish Sabbath was instituted forty-two days after the Passover lamb was chosen and the nation entered into the rest of Canaan after forty-two journeys in the desert; so the Son of man came after forty-two generations had passed away from Abraham according to Matthew's genealogy; and forty from David according to Luke. That true bread from heaven of which the manna was an imperfect type, if type at all, gives, not life to the body, but life to the soul, sent not to the typical Jew, but to the Christian world; not to give a rest after the labor of gathering it, but to give a rest from sin. The Shadow has passed away now; the Body, Christ, has come.

Some critics have supposed that Luke, writing for the Gentile church, speaking of the ascension of our Lord as occurring forty days after his resurrection (Acts i. 3), did not use the Jewish mode of reckoning, which would give forty-two days, counting

the day he arose and the day he ascended. If this is true, the forty-second day would fall upon a Jewish Sabbath, a most appropriate day for the completion of our Lord's entire work upon earth. That our Lord ascended from earth to heaven on the Jewish Sabbath, and not on Thursday according to the old almanacs, can hardly be doubted; otherwise Luke would not have been so careful to tell us that the place where he ascended was a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem.—(See *Alford on Acts*, i. 12.)

The words of the prophet Hosea: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt," being a prophecy of future events, are not as applicable to ancient Israel as to the present Israel of God, or those who are called by his word, as it is revealed to us in the Old and New Testaments. Those who are born of religious parents are called out of Egypt in infancy, when the manna, the "milk of the word," is fed to them by their parents in childhood. The manna does not appear to be so much a type of Christ in the Holy Comforter, promised before and sent down after his ascension, that "strong meat" which Paul speaks of (Heb. v. 12);—but a type of the word as taught before regeneration; something coming from heaven, yet through a human instrumentality, and not directly from the Father as were the teachings of the Holy Spirit; something that if abused might become corrupted (Ex. xvi. 20), yet of which a double supply was to be secured in preparation for that rest when the Holy Spirit by regeneration becomes our teacher.

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they [the Jews] unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."—John vi. 32–35.

Now we well know that what Moses gave was the *law*, and that which frees us from the law is the gospel. The law condemns to death; the gospel gives life. We now see the full meaning of Christ's words: "I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which

cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die."—John vi. 48–50. The Jewish Sabbath, then, is typical of that rest under the gospel which frees us from the fear of death.

It is usually supposed that the manna was a type of Christ. This can hardly be true. If it were, it would not become filled with worms, nor would the gathering of it be prohibited on the Sabbath day. Again, the manna ceased when the Israelites entered Canaan. Does Christ's presence leave us when we enter into the rest of his kingdom? Paul refers to a spiritual food of which the Israelites partook on the night in which they passed through the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 3, 4), but then Paul tells us that that spiritual food was Christ himself, and not the material manna which fell in the desert. It would rather appear, then, that as Moses gave the law, and the manna was not given by Moses, but rained from heaven, it was a type of something that would give life for the time being, but would disappear when the true bread came which giveth life to the world. Now, if the gospel is the true bread *rained from heaven* (Deut. xxxii. 2), then the spiritual manna which precedes the gospel must be the ceremonial law and the prophecies, occupying an intermediate position between the moral law and the gospel, and yet being in reality but an introduction to the gospel. The ceremonial law is fulfilled, and the prophecies cease to be given, after the true bread of Canaan, the gospel, comes. Yet on the last day, that period when our Saviour walked the earth clothed in human flesh, there was a double supply given in the parables which he spake and the miracles which he performed.

CONFIRMATION OF THE JEWISH SABBATH IN THE GIVING OF
THE LAW.

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore

the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Here we have the Jewish Sabbath confirmed to the Jewish people, and a second reason given why they should observe it. That reason is, that in six days God rested from his work and rested on the seventh and blessed it. The cause as stated here, is the glory and magnificence of the day of rest after the labor of creation, prophetic of Christ's rest after the labor of redeeming a world, and of our rest through him after having toiled through the Old Covenant and resting in the New.

No one can doubt for a moment that this commandment was given to the Jews. But it is maintained that it was not given to them alone. They tell us, "It was set at the beginning, and was clearly intended for Adam and his posterity. Hence the 'stranger within the gates,' the representative of the whole outside world, was also required to keep the law."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 27. It is rather difficult to understand how the stranger within the gate can be a representative of the outside world before the gate is opened to the Gentiles. When Christ comes, who himself is the *gate*, and by the sacrifice of the cross opens the door to the Gentile world, then the Gentiles will be admitted into his kingdom. We find no proof here that God gave the Jewish Sabbath to the world.

Now, if we turn to the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, we will learn the reason why this day was given especially to the Israelites. We have already learned when it was given, and why it was to be observed as a holy day, and here we have God's own word as to why it was given to typical Israel. After repeating the Fourth Commandment, he adds: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; THEREFORE *the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.*" As God rested after the work of creation, so he commanded the children of Israel to observe a day of rest from the toil and affliction of Egypt. Exodus xx. 11, tells us why the day was blessed and hallowed, and Deut. v. 15, tells us why it was given to the Israelites.

But an argument in favor of the transfer of the Jewish Sab-

bath is deduced from the fact that "*it was formally incorporated in the moral law.*" We quote again: "The Ten Commandments were spoken in an audible voice, by the Lord himself, from the summit of Mount Sinai, in the audience of the people. They were then written with his own fingers upon enduring tables of stone. They were then by his express command deposited in the ark of the covenant, directly under the overshadowing mercy seat, the symbolic throne of the Most High, indicative of the fact that they constituted the foundation of that throne; 'and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail.'"—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 32. Can it be possible? We read this sentence again and again, but there can be no doubt about its meaning. It certainly means just what the words express. We find it upon the page of a prize essay for which the sum of two hundred dollars was awarded by a committee appointed for the purpose, and it was chosen from one hundred and eight manuscripts, at least so the prefatory notice informs us. It is written by a prominent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and published by a Presbyterian Committee of Publication. There can be no doubt about it, and yet how much error it contains. The quotation "and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail," is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. Christ says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matt. xxiv. 35; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33.) But then he means by "my words," his own gospel, in contradistinction to the passing away of the whole Jewish economy which he has just described under the symbolic language of sun, moon, and stars, and which did pass away when the veil of the temple was rent at the hour of his death on the cross. Again he says: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, *till all be fulfilled.*" Matt. v. 18. This is simply a declaration that the law is binding until fulfilled, and no longer. When fulfilled, it ceases to exist. The passage from which these words were probably intended to be a quotation are to be found in Luke xvi. 16–18. The whole passage reads: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the

kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. *And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail.* Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." The declaration here is, that it is *easier* for heaven and earth to pass, not that they *shall pass away before* the law is fulfilled. The very point of the law which Christ is here talking about, *adultery*, is one that must be fulfilled, and consequently pass away, before the heavens and the earth. When the author of *The Holy Sabbath* penned these words, he never dreamed that he was misquoting the Scriptures in order to prove an error. It is the natural result of an entire misconception of the relations sustained by the Old and New Covenants. The author's heart is right, but he has failed to obtain a distinct perception of the line of demarcation between the Old and New Covenants, and stumbling over the word *mercy-seat* in our version, which is a mis-translation of the *propitiatory* of the ark or symbolical covering of sin (Psalms xxxii. 1) in the bosom of Christ Jesus, he at once supposed that it was a symbol of God's throne. Are the Ten Commandments the foundation of God's eternal throne? Throughout the whole Mosaic ritual, the whole symbolism of the Mosaic law is accompanied by blood; blood poured out, blood sprinkled, blood mingled with running water, blood everywhere, indicative that the moral law invariably condemns to death. The universal language of Scripture, whether in symbol, prophecy, or epistle, is that there is no life in the moral law. "Salvation is of the Jews" only, as the ceremonial law and prophecy adumbrate the gospel. We may well inquire, then, whether a law whose empire is universal death can be the throne of him in whose presence death shall never come. Why, even here upon earth, we are told that "the sting of death is the law," but death is disarmed of its sting by the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We read in the New Covenant of a "*throne of grace*," but not of a throne based on the moral law. Will any one tell us that the command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," is one of the pillars of the eter-

nal throne in a kingdom where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels? We read of the *everlasting gospel*, but nowhere do we read of the *everlasting law*. The members of the New Covenant Church are spoken of as "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone," but they are nowhere represented as being built upon Moses. Moses' disciples belong to the covenant of works, not that of grace. Not the name of Moses, but "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb," appear upon the foundation stones of the wall of jasper.

Are we still to be under the Mosaic law written upon tablets of stone when we arrive at home in heaven? Is that throne, which shall shelter us then, to be based on the Ten Commandments? Does not our state of probation end when we pass from earth to heaven? Of what use are the Ten Commandments in a world where there can be no sin? Do the Scriptures teach that God's throne is based on the Ten Commandments, or is it but a *baseless* tradition?

We do not deny but there is a moral law given to the universe, written, "not in tablets of stone," but in "fleshly tablets of the heart," which is eternal; but the Jewish Sabbath forms no part of it, any more than a piece of canvas on which is painted a portrait of Martin Luther forms a part of Luther's body and soul. The Ten Commandments spoken in an audible voice from the summit of a typical mountain, in the ears of a typical people, and engraven upon tablets of material stone, and then laid away in a typical ark—which, with all its contents and appurtenances, except the Shekinah, was afterwards doubtless destroyed (tradition to the contrary) by the enemies of Israel and of Israel's God—are vastly different from the moral law given by God to the universe. A Jewish Sabbath given to a typical nation in remembrance of a rest from carnal bondage, and a type of a rest from sin, is immeasurably different from its own antitype. In Christ we enjoy the antitype, and will for ever. To keep one day in seven holy, in memory of a rest from sin through the resurrection of Christ from the dead, is part of the moral law; but even this must pass away when we enter that holy Jerusalem where

there is no priesthood, no altar, no temple, and no gospel ministry, and where all eternity (not time) is equally holy. To observe one day in seven, in memory of a nation's escape from carnal slavery, let that nation be Jew or pagan, is not an everlasting law.

The ark of the covenant was a type of Christ's human nature. In his bosom was hid the law. He alone of the woman's seed has kept the law in all its purity. Christ was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;" and when redeemed, they are dead to the law even here in this life. To be redeemed from under the law is to be redeemed from the penalty of the law, and that penalty is death; and shall those who are heirs of eternal life be for ever beneath the shade of a throne whose very foundation stones speak of nothing but universal death? Impossible! The Shekinah dwelling between the cherubim was a type of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ, and which descended in visible form upon him at his birth, in the form of the star which the wise men followed from the East, and in the form of a dove on the day of his baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. Christ kept the law for man through life, and annihilated it for him through eternity.

IF THE JEWISH SABBATH IS TRANSFERRED TO THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, WE ARE MORALLY BOUND TO KEEP IT AS THE JEWS WERE REQUIRED TO DO.

If our Lord's day is but a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, then we should observe it with the same care and attention that the Jews were required to do by the Mosaic law. In the history of creation we read: "The evening and the morning were the first day." We well know that the Jewish Sabbath commenced at sunset Friday evening, and ended at sunset Saturday evening. Now if this were a part of the moral law, and in memory of the "evening and morning" of the seventh day of creation, we should be strict in its observance, and not commence the day at twelve o'clock Saturday night, and end at twelve o'clock Sunday night, as we now do.

Again, we should observe Saturday and not Sunday, as we

now do. To this it is answered that the apostles changed the day. They did! Where is the *proof* of it? The *apostles* changed the day? And who were the apostles? If the apostles changed the day, then they are superior to Moses. If the apostles changed the day, then they had a right to demolish the day and substitute another day. Changing seven to eight by the apostles is a failing of a pretty big "jot" long *before* the heavens and the earth have passed away. If the apostles made this change, then there must have been something in the law that has been fulfilled. But did the apostles change the day? Let us examine the proof they give us. They present passages of Scripture which speak of the apostles as meeting on the first day of the week; breaking bread, etc., on the first day of the week. We may accept these passages merely for the inference that may be derived from them in favor of the observance of the Lord's day instead of the Jewish Sabbath; but in the absence of something more positive, they prove nothing. We say they prove nothing, from the very fact that inferences may be derived from other passages of Scripture, equally as valid, that the apostles observed the Jewish Sabbath. Just as Christ had been in the habit of "standing up to read" in the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath day, so the apostles went into the synagogues and preached on the Sabbath day. Paul "reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts xviii. 4. His historian says of him, that at Philippi, "on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi. 13. At Antioch, he and his companions "went into the synagogue on the sabbath day" and preached to the people, and at the close of his discourse the people invited them to come the next Sabbath. Then we are told: "And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii. 14-44. At Thessalonia, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures." Acts xvii. 2. Now, if in any of these meetings they had continued their preaching until sundown, and had then partaken of bread, as it would be natural they should do after the

toils of the day; or celebrated their communion or breaking of bread, as Christ did with his disciples after partaking of the pass-over, and as the apostles probably often did, it would have been recorded by the sacred historian as having been done on the first day of the week, as sundown Saturday evening closed the Jewish Sabbath. Now, the proof in favor of the Jewish Sabbath being transferred to the New Covenant, and then changed by the apostles to the first day of the week, is so extremely slender that we feel that we are guilty of no heresy if we abandon that view altogether.

The Lord's day we believe to be established by a higher authority than either the apostles or Moses, even by him who is Lord of the Sabbath day.

If the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to Christianity, we are morally bound to observe it as the Jews did, and the man who does not do so should be put to death. The writer says: "The only part that strictly belonged to the state was the death penalty, which was afterwards added, and which has been repealed, being no part of the original law."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 30. By whom was it repealed? Did the apostles do it? If so, when? Where is the record? The *death penalty* for murder is no part of the original law written upon the tablets of stone. Was that repealed at the same time? By whom?

Again, no beast was permitted to perform any labor on the Jewish Sabbath. No manservant nor maidservant, and no Gentile who was temporarily stopping at the house of a Jew, for so the phrase "stranger that is within thy gates" is to be understood, were permitted to do any work whatever. "In it thou shalt not do any work." No fire was allowed to be kindled, no food was allowed to be purchased or even prepared on that day. The command was very strict. "On the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death."—Ex. xxxv. 2. Even a man found gathering sticks on that day was commanded to be stoned. "And" they "stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." Num. xv. 32-36. Nor was this all. We read in the New Testament, as the kingdom of God (not the Jewish nation)

was verging on toward the New Covenant, of a Sabbath day's journey, but the ancient law says, "Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Now, will you tell us that that was a law given to the world and not to a nation? Will you tell us that the Esquimaux in his snow hut must not kindle a fire on the seventh day to prepare his food; but that he must take it frozen as hard as a rock or perish with hunger? No. The very demands of the New Covenant that we should not forget the assembling of ourselves together, prove that not only the death penalty, but the Jewish law itself, in the ceremonial and national part of it, is fulfilled by the establishment of the New Covenant.

But you plead works of necessity. Necessity? We would rather hear you plead a God of reason and of justice, whose laws can be obeyed without inconvenience by all classes and conditions of men, than to see you resort to such miserable subterfuges as this. If the Jewish law is binding now, why do you not obey it? If the Jewish Sabbath, as given and observed in the desert, is binding on Christians to-day, then our evangelical Churches are a band of Sabbath breakers. You ride to church on your horses and in your carriages, and you return to a warm dinner, prepared by the "stranger within your gate," (if your cook happens to be a foreigner,) and you complacently tell us that the only thing about this law that is repealed is the death penalty. Will you tell us that you feel yourself free to break God's holy law with impunity, merely because the Jewish nation does not possess the power to enforce the death penalty? Or, do these infringements on the law written on *tablets of stone*, come under the category of works of mercy and necessity? Look the stubborn fact squarely in the face, and then tell us whether these are works of mercy and necessity any more than the gathering of manna by the Israelites in the desert, or the gathering of sticks to cook it with? Works of mercy and necessity, indeed! If it is your law, obey it. Will you charge us with heresy because we deny that the Jewish Sabbath is binding on Christians? Then you will permit us to charge you with being a band of Sabbath-breakers, and according to *your own law* you should be stoned till you are dead.

THE SABBATH MADE FOR MAN, AND NOT MAN FOR THE SABBATH.

“We have the emphatic declaration of the Master himself that ‘the sabbath was made for man,’ not for the Jew only, or for the Hottentot or Arabian or any other one nation or people, but for man universally.”—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 28. Will any candid unprejudiced mind read the second chapter of Mark, and the fifth chapter of Luke from the thirty-sixth verse to the twelfth verse of the sixth chapter, and then tell us that the idea Christ wished to convey to the minds of his hearers when he pronounced the above words was, that the Jewish Sabbath was made for *all men*, and not alone for the Jew, when he himself, before their very eyes, broke the Jewish Sabbath, and was here defending his disciples for having done so? The passage, in connexion with its context, proves just the reverse of what is intended in the above quotation. Christ had again and again broken the Jewish ceremonial law: when he sat at the table with lepers, put his hands on a corpse, allowed ceremonially impure women to fondle and caress his feet, and his disciples to prepare food on the Sabbath day. The scribes and Pharisees could not believe him to be the Messiah unless he observed the law of Moses. But he gives them to understand that the kingdom of God was coming—a new creation, and not a patch sewed upon an old garment; that the Jewish law, like an old leather bottle, was now worthless when the old wine was exhausted; but new bottles must be prepared for the wine of the New Covenant; and then he tells them that “The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.” Can anything be plainer than this? The Sabbath being made for man, and he being the Lord of the Sabbath, as well as of the whole Mosaic law, has a right to dispose of the Sabbath as he thinks best. If he chooses to set the Jewish Sabbath aside by the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, he has a perfect right to do so. The very fact that he breaks the Jewish ceremonial law, is proof that he is Lord of that law; and establishes his Messiahship, although the short-sighted Pharisees could not see it. It is a sad misquotation of Scripture that would force this passage to do service in defence of the universality of the Jewish Sabbath. “The sabbath was made for

man," and when man's representative shall come in the power and glory of his kingdom, then he will give that true rest, of which the Jewish Sabbath is but an imperfect shadow.

THE NEW COVENANT IS NOT A PATCH ON AN OLD GARMENT.

"Let it first be asserted that if the day was intended for the Jews," says the author of *The Holy Sabbath*, page 25, "then for that very reason it must still exist, for they are still the people of the Lord, cast off for a time, it is true, but not for ever; for they are yet to be brought back into the fold of their covenant-keeping God (Rom. xi. 25). The covenant with Israel is an everlasting covenant. If the Sabbath is the sign of that covenant, it, too, must be a perpetual sign. Besides, 'he is not a Jew who is one outwardly.' If the covenant be transferred to believers, and now confirmed unto them as the spiritual children of Israel, it must still remain the same everlasting covenant, and as such must retain the same perpetual sign." That we may know how well the above corresponds with the language of Scripture, let us turn to Jeremiah xxxi. 31, and read, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." This prophecy is now being continually fulfilled in the regeneration of the Christian Gentiles, and has no reference to the people called Jews, of the present day. Paul, after quoting these words, adds: "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."—Heb. viii. And yet the writer tells us that "the covenant made with Israel is an everlasting covenant." If he had told us that the new covenant made with the regenerated Israel of God, and which is now being gathered into the spiritual Canaan from among all nations, is an "everlasting covenant, even

the sure mercies of David," (Isa. lv. 3,) he would then have told us what is perfectly true. Prophecies to the same effect may be found throughout the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth chapters of Isaiah, in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-38, and many other portions of the Old Testament, referring to the New Covenant, not established with the old typical Israel, but with the antitype, the true Israel of God; not born of the flesh, but born of God's Holy Spirit—proving that "the everlasting covenant" in Christ's blood is the covenant made with God's true Israel redeemed from sin, and not the covenant made with the typical Israel relieved from Egyptian bondage.

The author of *The Holy Sabbath*, like many other well meaning but misinformed theologians, is lost in the fog of old Judaism. He thinks that because there is a people in the world claiming to be the carnal seed of Abraham, and that although Christ told them that they were of their own father the devil, yet in some way "they are still the people of the Lord," and then he misquotes Rom. xi. 25 in support of his erroneous views. He might as well have quoted the next verse, "And so all Israel shall be saved," to prove that no Jew could be lost, as to quote this to prove that the Jews are still the people of the Lord. In Paul's time the temple was still standing with all the sacrifices and ordinances connected with it. The gospel, according to our Lord's command, was first to be preached to the Jews, and every possible effort was made by the apostles to win them to Christ. The "remnant" which was to be saved, spoken of by the prophets, did embrace Christianity; some of them, as did the Ebionite Jews, continuing to observe the ceremonies of the Old Covenant in connexion with faith in Christ. But when the temple was destroyed and the sacrifice taken away, Old Israel ceased to be the typical people of God. Rejecting the Prophet like unto Moses, (Deut. xviii. 15: Acts iii. 22,) as presented to them in the gospel by the preaching of the apostles, they were spiritually destroyed, and as God's people were completely annihilated, (Acts iii. 22, 23,) and henceforward were no more heirs of God's kingdom, any more than any other Gentile nation. Virtually they became Gentiles, and in the eyes of God occupy the same position to-day that the Laplanders and Japanese do. They are not heirs of the New

Covenant, for they have never entered into it; and they are not heirs of the Old, for they have broken it. There is not a promise in the Bible that is not an heritage of the converted Gentile as much as of the converted Jew, and without conversion to Christ there are no promises to either. To the Jew out of Christ, there are no other promises than those to all other members of Satan's kingdom, that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The assumption that the Jews are to return to the literal Jerusalem, and that the Old Covenant is to be established with them, is a most dangerous error, and contrary to all the teachings of God's word. The only door to Canaan to-day is Christ, and the Jew who enters Christ is as much in Canaan in the pork-killing city of Cincinnati as he would be in Jerusalem; and should he go to Jerusalem with the superstitious idea that by doing so he would enter the kingdom of Israel, it would be a most positive proof that he was going to Satan in search of the kingdom of God. All prophecies concerning the restoration of the kingdom of Israel and the gathering of the dispersed among all nations, must have their fulfilment in the antitype and not in the type.

Paul, in the third chapter of Galatians, compares the Jewish nation to a school and the law to a schoolmaster. Now a schoolmaster may write on his blackboard laws for the use of his pupils while they are in his school, but when they pass out of his school they are no longer under *his laws*, and yet the system of morality which the schoolmaster's laws were designed to teach them, is of infinitely more importance. This is the reality, of which the schoolmaster's laws are only the shadow. The schoolmaster prepares his pupils for a higher destiny than that of occupying his benches and submitting to his laws; laws which are only intended to prepare them for a higher code of morals than any ever written upon his blackboard or engraved upon Moses' tables of stone.

The Jewish Sabbath, then, is a shadow fulfilled when the body comes, and that body is Christ. When he comes, the shadow, like the schoolmaster's blackboard laws, is of no further use and passes away. And the apostle says that "The righteousness of

the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Those, then, who have Christ's spirit are not bound by the law of the schoolmaster. Christ says: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath," and in the same way we say: The school was made for the pupil, and not the pupil for the school. The schoolmaster's law is intended for the preparation of his pupil for a higher destiny than that of occupying a seat in his school, and when he has entered upon that destiny, the morality taught by his law, and not the law itself, is binding upon his soul. Hence we say that the Lord's day is a rest of the soul, and not a rest of the body alone. It is a Sabbath of the soul. The Jewish Sabbath was a rest of the body in memory of a rest from Egyptian bondage, the liberator being Moses, who led the people out into the desert, but was unable to provide them with food to keep them from perishing of hunger. The Christian Lord's day is a rest of the soul from sin, our leader being Christ Jesus, who himself gives that true bread from heaven which giveth life unto the world. At the earnest request of Moses, God gave the Israelites manna, and with it the Jewish Sabbath; but the true bread and the true rest are given, not to typical Israel, but to the world; and whosoever eateth this bread shall enter into rest; that is, have everlasting life.

Again, we ask, can a Jewish carnal ordinance, typical of a spiritual blessing, be transferred from a carnal typical kingdom over into a spiritual kingdom? Are not the words of our Lord Jesus Christ most decisive upon this point? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." What a host of disciples Nicodemus has, who cannot distinguish between a Jewish Sabbath and the rest of God's spiritual kingdom! Can the carnal be transferred to the spiritual when the Scriptures emphatically declare that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"? But supposing the Jewish Sabbath to be transferred, why not transfer a thousand other things? The only evidence we have that the temple service was done away with, is that the shadow is fulfilled in the body—

Christ. If not, why not transfer the sacrifices of sheep and oxen? Why not transfer circumcision? Some will tell us that we do in baptism, which we most emphatically deny; the whole argument in favor of it being based upon an erroneous foundation. Why not transfer the golden altar, with the burning of incense, just as the Roman Catholic Church has done? There is certainly as much authority for it as there is for transferring the Jewish Sabbath.

About the only thing that may be said to be transferred from the Old Testament system to the New, is the Jewish synagogue, which now appears under the form of the Christian church; but even this had no foundation in Moses. It undoubtedly owes its origin to the prophets, and was probably in some way connected with the schools of the prophets, and being an outgrowth of the prophetic system, which was nothing more or less than an outline of the gospel ministry, it has come down to us with very little modification. We do not deny that there was a shade of the gospel extending back into the Old Covenant. There was, and so there is, a shade of the Old Covenant extending down into the New, but it is only a shade. The reality of both ceases at the dividing line. The moral law runs through both, just as the life blood of the New Testament, flowing from Christ's heart, runs through the whole ceremonial law; but is as different from the law written upon tables of stone as the true bread from heaven, which giveth life to the world, is different from the manna which fell in the desert, giving but temporary relief, and disappearing when the bread of Canaan supplies its place.

Now we take the ground that the Jewish Sabbath, like any other strictly Mosaic law, was fulfilled in Christ. Christ says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." If the Jewish Sabbath was a type of Christ, then it most certainly must have been fulfilled in him.

But we are told that "the Fourth Commandment is enjoined on Israel as one of 'the ten words;' and if you strike out this one, why not strike out any other, or in fact all the rest?"

We answer, that we do not propose to strike out the Fourth Commandment from the Decalogue. We consider the Fourth Commandment fully as binding as any one of the Ten. Those who hold the views which we are endeavoring to sustain, do not base the divine authority for the observance of the Lord's day upon the Fourth Commandment, but upon the practice of the apostles. We must here beg leave to differ from them, for we consider the practice of the apostles alone as too vague and uncertain; whereas, we find a divine command for the observance of the Lord's day in the Fourth Commandment. Prof. Schaff says: "The former was only a type and prophecy of the latter. For as this *new* creation, the resurrection of Christ and the founding of his Church, is greater than the first creation of the heavens and the earth, and brings it to its perfection, so does the Christian *Sunday* transcend the Jewish Sabbath. This direct derivation of the Church festival of Sunday from the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ, is certainly the primitive view of it, and the one which best answers to Paul's system of doctrine; whereas, the exclusively legal view which bases the institution primarily and directly on the Fourth Commandment, in the first place affords no sufficient explanation of the transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; and secondly, is utterly irreconcilable with clear declarations of the New Testament."—*History of Apostolic Church*, p. 554.

Prof. Schaff we believe to be right in basing the divine authority for the Lord's day "*primarily or directly*" upon "*the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ;*" yet we consider the Fourth Commandment, when eliminated from its typical and prophetic character, of equally binding authority. What is stricken out by the coming of Christ is this *typical and prophetic character*, leaving the *moral* part of it as binding as any other of the ten.

But a careful examination of the Decalogue will give us a better understanding of this matter. The preface to the Ten Commandments is included with the Commandments, and was written upon the tables of stone; and yet, applying it individually, it is *literally* true of but one generation of Hebrews; and collectively,

of but one nation of all the tribes and races of men that have ever lived, or ever will live, on our globe; and if applied either individually or collectively to the Christian Church to-day, would be absolutely false. But in its metaphysical and moral sense—or, in other words, in the fulfilment of its typical and prophetic character—it is as true to-day of every man, woman, and child brought under gospel influences, as it was literally of each individual Hebrew the day that God pronounced these words from the top of Sinai. Every professing Christian teaches it to his child, and the beginning of all missionary labor is to teach it to the pagan; yet no one ever dreams that this preface is to be understood to-day in its literal sense. The passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites is not a type of regeneration, but a type of any influence that brings any son or daughter of Adam under the reign of the law. Were it a type of regeneration, it would annihilate that great fundamental doctrine so firmly taught in the New Testament, the perseverance of the saints; for a large proportion of the Israelites that came out of Egypt, perished in the desert *on account of their unbelief* (Heb. iii. 16–19); and God will allow no truly regenerated soul to perish. But the teaching of God's word brings the soul out of pagan darkness and sends it on its way towards regeneration, which is accomplished in the reception of Christ, and not Moses, as a complete and sufficient Saviour.

Now, if we eliminate the typical from the Fourth Commandment, as we do from the preface, we shall have a Commandment as binding as any in the Decalogue, to sanctify and keep holy the Lord's day, and not the Jewish type. How far the change may affect the *mode* of observing the day, may be more difficult to determine. The death penalty is certainly abolished. Preparing a warm dinner, riding to church in a carriage or on a horse, when these do not infringe upon the duties or conscience of others, are considered permissible by the majority of professing Christians. Perhaps, if we consider that the day is one to be fully dedicated to God's service, we will not go far astray if we observe the day according to the rules we observe in exacting duties from those in our employ during the days of the week,

and the obligations we feel bound to comply with in rendering service to those who employ us. This subject will, however, be more fully examined when we come to discuss the duties and obligations of the Lord's day.

AN INCONTROVERTIBLE ARGUMENT.

When the Jewish Sabbath was instituted, the Lord commanded the Israelites not to travel or do any work on the seventh day. The command is very explicit: "Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." (Ex. xvi. 29.) And then we are told, "So the people rested on the seventh day." Now the day they went out of Egypt, the fifteenth day of the month Nisan, would have been a Sabbath day, had the Jewish Sabbath been instituted before that time. On this day we find them packing up in hot haste and hurrying out of Egypt; and then the Scriptures tell us that in memory of that day, the Jewish Sabbath was instituted (Deut. v. 15), but it was not instituted for five weeks after this event. On the fourth week after this, on the same day of the week, and on the same day of the month, we find them travelling in the desert. (Ex. xv. 27, and Ex. xvi. 1.) Now, they either broke the Sabbath on this day, or the Jewish Sabbath was not then instituted.

But it will be answered, that the fifteenth day of the second month was not a Sabbath day, as some of the commentators give the month Nisan thirty-one days. According to this, the fifteenth day of the second month would fall on Tuesday, and not on Saturday. But we answer that we can prove beyond a shade of a doubt, that the fifteenth day fell on a Saturday, and consequently the month Nisan must have contained but twenty-eight days.

1st. The commentaries do not agree as to the number of days Nisan contained; some giving twenty-nine days, others thirty, and others thirty-one. But little confidence can be placed where there is so much difference of opinion.

2d. "The Talmudists are generally of the opinion that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week."—*Patrick, Lowth, etc., Commentaries on Ex. xvi. 1.*

3d. Any person whose mind was not already prepossessed, on

reading the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, would decide that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week. On that day the Israelites arrive at the wilderness of Sin, and murmur because they have no food. Then follow six days in which they are fed on manna, and the seventh day is the first Jewish Sabbath.

4th. Those Israelites who, from any ceremonial defilement, could not keep the passover on the appointed day of the first month, were commanded to keep it on the same day of the second month. (Num. ix. 10, 11.) This law was observed by the nation in later years. (2d Chron. xxx. 2-15.) This proves that the days of the second month corresponded with the days of the first month, otherwise the Sabbath would not be preceded by the passover on the occasions which fell on the fourteenth day of the month.

5th. The whole Jewish chronology was calculated from the passover eve, or the full moon on that eve, when the passover lamb was slain. Counting two weeks back from this time, brought the first day of the month, or new moon, on a Sabbath day. This new moon was the first day of the Jewish new year, for it was necessary that the year should begin with the new and not the full moon; otherwise the analogy of development and decay, between type and antitype, would be completely destroyed. Now, counting forward from the Exodus, brought the first day of the second month on a new moon, and consequently a Sabbath; and the fifteenth day on another full moon, and also a Sabbath day.

So far we have given inferences. Now we will give positive proof.

6th. Josephus says that the Israelites, on leaving Egypt, ate of the unleavened bread that they brought out of Egypt, thirty days; and in the same section he calls the feast of unleavened bread "a feast of eight days," showing that he includes the day of the passover as the first day of the feast. Now, if we count thirty days from the first day of the passover, and including the first day, the last of the thirty will be the day that they arrived in the wilderness of Sin. This gives twenty-eight days for the

month Nisan; the unleavened bread is exhausted on a seventh day, and they ate manna for the first time on the first day of the week and sixteenth day of the second month.—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 2, Chap. 15, Sec. 1.

7th. Now there can be no doubt but the fifteenth day of the first month was ever observed as a Sabbath day. Josephus says, "On the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth, for before that day they do not touch them."—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 3, Chap. 10, Sec. 5. And from Num. xxiii. 15, we learn that this sixteenth day was the morrow after the Sabbath.

Now, from Leviticus xxiii. 39, we learn that the fifteenth of the seventh month was a Sabbath day and that the twenty-second was also a Sabbath day, although not one of the seven days of the feast of tabernacles; and consequently not called a Sabbath because it was a holy day, or great feast day, but because it was the regular seventh day Sabbath. This is also confirmed by the feast kept by Solomon at the dedication of the Temple (2 Chron. vii. 8–11). The people were sent away on the twenty-third day of the month, or first day of the week, being the first day after the conclusion of the feast. Now this brings the first Sabbath of the seventh month on the first day of the month, or a new moon. Now, having established the full moon of the first month on a Sabbath day and the new moon of the seventh month on a sabbath day, we have but to count five moons between the two in such a way that the Sabbath will fall on the new moon or first day of the seventh month. Now, there is only one way in which this can be done; that is, by giving twenty-eight days to the first month and alternately twenty-nine and thirty to the others. Thus we have undoubted proof that the Sabbath falls on the fifteenth day of the month. It may be objected that the fifth full moon does not invariably fall on the same day of the week. We do not claim that it does, nor is it necessary that it should to prove our ground. The full moon may have occurred any time during the day of the passover, yet sunset of that day would be the time from which the Jews would begin to count. If we

turn to the calendar of the year, 1880, we will find that five times out of seven, four in succession, the full moon of the fifth month falls on the same day of the week :

BEGINNING.

Tuesday, January 27.
 Wednesday, February 25.
 Friday, March 26.
 Saturday, April 24.
 Tuesday, June 22.

ENDING.

Tuesday, June 22.
 Wednesday, July 21.
 Friday, August 20.
 Saturday, September 18.
 Tuesday, November 16.

We acknowledge that this is not always the case, and this want of uniformity may account for the discrepancies existing between the record of John and the other Evangelists in regard to the time when our Lord partook of the last passover with his disciples. When a discrepancy of this kind did occur, as it might occasionally, we do not know what arrangement the Jews had to overcome it. It is well known that in making up their years of twelve moons, they intercalated a thirteenth month every three years; and we presume they made a similar arrangement when the fifth moon, after the completion of the first two, did not fall on a Sabbath day, although I have at present no evidence that they did so. If they did, it would prove that the Jewish Sabbath was not the seventh day counting from the creation. We suspect, however, that these intercalary days, if there were such occasionally in making up the Jewish half year, falling as they necessarily must do, on the Feast of New Moons, the two days were considered as a sort of double Sabbath. Again, we notice that on the first Sabbath of the first, second, and seventh months, the two sacred days were combined in one, thus bringing them into most intimate relation with each other. (Amos viii. 5.)

Having now proved beyond all doubt that the fifteenth day of the second month, when the Israelites came into the wilderness of Sin, was the seventh day of the week, we ask, can any honest mind believe that the Jewish Sabbath was "an old statute, that had fallen into disuse"? Is it possible that the Creator himself could possibly trample upon his own statutes and lead a whole nation, by cloudy pillar and column of fire, to break his laws and then immediately command them to obey them under penalty of

death? No! never! The fact is, that on that fifteenth day of the second month, no such law had as yet been given. The Israelites travelled on that day and broke no law. God's laws, after given, are immutable.

It is easy to understand why the Israelites, fleeing from the wrath of a nation enraged by the death of all its first-born, and cast out of Egypt by a powerful enemy, should spend the Sabbath in travelling; and if true, as some suppose, they passed through the Red Sea on the night forming the fore part of a seventh day, they should again travel in order to escape from an enemy burning with revenge, determined to destroy or enslave them; but that the Holy Spirit in the guiding cloud on that quiet day in the wilderness, while the corpses of their enemies lay dead upon the sea shore, should lead them to break the holy Sabbath, and then under penalty of death forbid them to imitate his example, is perfectly incomprehensible except upon the ground that the Jewish Sabbath was not yet instituted. We therefore submit to the consideration of the defenders of the Jewish Sabbath as an institution from the beginning of the world, whether the attribution of such a fickle inconsistent character to a God of immutable justice is not a greater heresy than the denial of the Jewish Sabbath being a law given to man from the beginning.

144.113
DEC 22 1906

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

WHAT IS INDUCTIVE DEMONSTRATION?

The terms deduction, induction, are very currently used, and they seem to be regarded as signifying two contrasted methods of ascertaining truths. The description usually given in popular statements is, that, while deduction is the drawing down of an inference from a more general truth, induction is the leading in of a general truth from individual facts. There has doubtless been much bandying of the terms, which was not more intelligent than the word-play with that other pair of ambiguous terms, "analysis and synthesis." It is customary to say that Aristotle first examined and formulated the deductive logic or syllogism, and Bacon the inductive method. While almost entire barrenness is imputed to the syllogism, the glory of great fruit and utility is claimed for the induction. Some, indeed, are perspicacious enough to see that neither Aristotle nor Bacon was the inventor of the one or the other method of reasoning, any more than the first anatomists of human limbs were the inventors of walking. Nature has enabled men to walk, and ensured their doing so, with at least imperfect accuracy, by fashioning the parts of their limbs, nerves, bones, tendons, and muscles. The anatomist has only described what he found in the limbs by his dissecting knife. Men virtually syllogised before

of Christ, who gives us the true rest of the soul, then it is evident that it passed away with the coming of Christ.

But they tell us that the "sabbath days" mentioned in the passage are "Jewish festivals and holydays" and have no reference to the "seventh day of rest." If this is the case, let us substitute "holydays" for *sabbaths* in the passage and see how it will read. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the *holydays*: which are a shadow of things to come." The tautology is too evident to need further refutation.

Then again, they tell us that the word is plural, *sabbaths*, and means the seventh year Sabbath and the Jubilee, whereas the seventh day is called by way of preëminence *The Sabbath*. (*The Holy Sabbath*, pages 36, 37.) This is certainly a strange way of reasoning. If we say that a man is diligent in business during the week days, do you understand by that that we exclude Mondays and Tuesdays because these are preëminently working days? If we say that a man observes the national holidays, do you understand us to say that he does not observe the Fourth of July, because that is preëminently the national holiday? The very fact that Paul made no exceptions is superabundant proof that he meant all the Jewish Sabbaths. When Paul says the Sabbath days, he means *all* the Sabbath days, and not one Sabbath day out of thirty, which would have been the case if every seventh day Sabbath had been excluded. What one Jewish Sabbath was, that all Jewish Sabbaths were. They were all types of the same anti-type, *shadows of the same body*, and unless there is clear and positive proof forthcoming that the seventh day Sabbath was a type of one thing, and the seventh year Sabbath and the Jubilee types of something entirely different, we must be pardoned if we believe that they were all fulfilled in the coming of Christ. No one who has not a pet theory to sustain would have ever thought that "sabbaths" in this passage meant monthly and yearly Sabbaths, and not *all* Jewish Sabbaths. When we see good men thus easily sliding unconsciously into error, we do well to search the Scriptures that we do not likewise depart from the truth.

The author of *The Holy Sabbath* says, "It is used in both

places in connexion with eating or feasting; and nothing is said about eating or feasting in the sabbatic law." Paul is not speaking of feasting, but of taking food in a ritual sense, contrary to our Lord's own teachings to his disciples, that it is that which cometh out of the man that defileth him. (Matt. xv. 17-20; Rom. xiv. 17.) But if he had turned to Lev. xxiii. 2, 3, he would there have found the Jewish Sabbath (seventh day) termed *a feast*, and one of the very "*feast days*" which, according to the writer, have been fulfilled in the coming of Christ.

But the "sabbaths" spoken of in Col. ii. 15, have no reference to the Lord's day. We understand that these Jewish Christians at this time were not only observing the Christian Lord's day, but also the Jewish Sabbath. This was the practice of many of the early Christians. The Ebionite Christians, who established themselves in Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem, continued to observe two days in the week—the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's day, for two or three centuries after the Christian era. It is this practice which Paul here condemns, and has no reference whatever to the Lord's day, which it was proper and right for them to observe.

We now come to a more important argument, and again quote from *The Holy Sabbath*, page 30: "That it was not abolished . . . appears from the fact that it *cannot comply with the terms of abolition*. There is absolutely but one way to abolish a typical ordinance, and that is to fulfil it. Christ broadly asserted the rule when he said, 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' He arbitrarily and absolutely destroyed nothing. He only removed what was fulfilled, and because fulfilled. The shadow only gives place to the substance, the type to the antitype. Thus the sacrifices were not destroyed; they only gave place to the great atoning sacrifice of which they were shadows. The type is but another form of prophecy; and no prophecy can fall short of fulfilment. No type can vanish until it reaches the antitype. The Sabbath antedating the Mosaic economy, and being the prophecy and pledge of future rest, cannot be abolished until it merges into the everlasting rest of heaven."

That a type is a prophecy that cannot be abolished until ful-

filled in the antitype, is a truth which no one can question. But Paul declares that the Jewish shadows or types are fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The Jewish Sabbath, in memory of a rest from carnal bondage, is a type of that rest of the soul from the bondage of sin which our Saviour introduced into our world. The writer's great error here is that he supposes that "the everlasting rest in heaven" does not begin till after the death of the body. This is quite a prevalent error, and one which distorts many plain facts contained in the Scriptures. The court of the Jewish tabernacle was a type of childhood life under Christian training and example, until regeneration. The sanctuary was typical of a regenerated priesthood, and the holy of holies of heaven itself, and yet the division between the court and the "holy places" was much greater than that which separated the sanctuary from the holy of holies. And a careful student of the Scriptures cannot but observe that the whole tenor of Scripture indicates that regeneration, or the "new creation," as Paul styles it, is of ten-fold more importance than the transit of death. In fact, the great burden of prophecy relates to the former, while very little is said about the latter. Paul's declaration on this point is most emphatic: "There remaineth therefore a rest (literally, a keeping of the Sabbath) to the people of God." (Heb. iv. 9.) An examination of the context will show us that this passage refers to a rest beginning here upon earth, and not confined exclusively to heaven; and that we enter it by regeneration, and not by death as is usually supposed. It would almost appear that theologians had rent God's kingdom asunder by the awful chasm which they introduce in the transit of death, of which God's word says very little indeed. Prophecies and parables relative to God's spiritual kingdom on earth should not be applied to his kingdom in heaven. This is the great error that would deprive us of a Sabbath, unless we accept the Jewish typical Sabbath day rest of the body. The rest symbolised by the rest in Canaan, as well as of the seventh year Sabbath and Jubilee being fulfilled in the coming of Christ, we are left, according to their view, in a wide vacuum which reaches from the crucifixion of our Lord to the morning of the general resurrection, with no visible fulfilment of

the Jewish antitype this side of the grave. And yet they tell us that a part of the Jewish Sabbaths have been fulfilled. Fulfilled by what, pray?

“THERE REMAINETH THEREFORE A REST FOR THE PEOPLE OF GOD,” IS NOT ALONE A REST IN HEAVEN, BUT A REST OF GRACE HERE ON EARTH.

Without even making a critical examination of the third and fourth chapters of Hebrews, and especially of the passage, “There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God,” one would suppose that it would be impossible for any person, even for a moment, to doubt that Paul is speaking here of a rest of the soul that remaineth for the people of God when the Jewish type has been fulfilled in the antitype—Christ, who giveth his people rest from the power of sin and from the fear of death. But let us examine the passage carefully, and we cannot but be convinced that Paul is speaking of the rest of the New Covenant here on earth. The third chapter commences with a comparison of the champions of the two covenants, Moses and Christ; one a carnal leader and the other a spiritual guide. Moses is presented to us as a servant over a visible temporal nation (house—family), and Christ as a Son over a spiritual kingdom. “Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.” Then follows a quotation from the ninety-fifth Psalm, stating the reason why many of the Israelites were not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. Now, if we are willing to accept the idea that the Jordan which separates the desert from the land of Canaan is not so much a type of the Jordan of death as of the Jordan of regeneration, we will see at once who were symbolised by those whose corpses fell in the desert, and why they fell there. Unbelief, that mighty arm in the hands of Satan, destroys them in the desert of Satan’s kingdom, before they arrive at the point where regeneration takes place. Once having arrived safely in the spiritual kingdom of regeneration, they no longer fall by un-

belief in the desert, according to our Calvinistic view of the Perseverance of the Saints. We thus see where the shade of the Old Covenant, extending down into the New Testament Church, controls the lives and actions of those who have been trained under Christian influence from childhood, the leadership of Moses ceasing just where religion ceases to be felt binding as a duty, and Canaan commencing where service to God is felt to be a pleasure. The same reason may be given to-day why all who fall short of God's spiritual kingdom must perish outside of that kingdom. "They cannot enter in because of unbelief." But once safely in that kingdom here, they have entered into "that rest which remaineth for the people of God;" and they must first become the people of God by being drawn by his Spirit as were the children of Israel, and taught by the old schoolmaster Moses, and become members of his kingdom on earth, or they can never enter his kingdom hereafter. First under the law, then under grace.

Then in the fourth chapter the analogy is still continued, showing that that rest towards which Moses led ancient Israel was not the true rest, but only a type of that rest which Christ gives his people here in this world. The language here is very simple indeed: "Let us [us Hebrews, for Paul is here addressing his own nation] therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For we which have believed do enter into rest." [We Christians which have believed *do now* enter the rest of the spiritual Canaan.] Will any one pretend to tell us that Paul has only in view the rest after death? By no means. This rest is here, *now*. Believers in Christ Jesus enter into the rest of his spiritual kingdom by a rest from sin. The Apostle Paul entered this rest when he became a believer, and thousands of others were entering it when he penned this Epistle, who did not enter heaven for many years after.

Then Paul quotes from David, whose Psalms were written long after the Israelites had entered the land of Canaan, to show that

the true rest did not come in Joshua's time, but was still in the future. "For if Jesus [Joshua] had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. *There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God.*" Then he tells them that as God entered into a period of rest after he had completed the work of creation, so Christ has now entered upon a period of rest after the work of redemption. "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." This passage, as can be clearly seen from the context, refers not only to Christ, but the believer in Christ, who has already entered into rest, having "ceased from *his own works*;" his *own* works being the works of the law, while Christ's *own* work, the work which the Father gave him to do, supplies, or gives efficacy to, the believer's works. The rest here, then, is a REST OF FAITH, the covenant of works being now fulfilled. Jesus, having finished the work of redemption, has now come into his spiritual kingdom. On the believer having ceased from the works of the law, he enters the spiritual priesthood; that is, he now no longer obeys the law through fear of punishment, but through love to its author, Christ.

Then follows an exhortation to the Hebrews, to strive to enter into that spiritual rest. "Let us [us Hebrews] labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." If Paul here means the regenerated believing Christians, and not the doubting Jews, then he strikes a blow at the Calvinistic doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints, which we cannot admit, as the Scriptures everywhere teach that those who have fully entered upon this rest can no longer fall by unbelief in the desert. All falling from grace must be confined to the covenant of works and excluded from the covenant of faith. (I mean by "covenant of works" the covenant of Sinai, which I believe to include both typical Israel and its antitype the baptized children of the Church in the Christian dispensation, and not the covenant made with Adam. Salvation, however, is by grace, and not by works, under all dispensations. There can be no redemption without a Redeemer—"the only Redeemer of God's elect.")

Nor is this language alone to be found in the fourth chapter of the Hebrews. The Scriptures are full of similar expressions. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," does not mean to enter the gate of heaven after death, but the gate of Christ's kingdom here on earth. When Christ says, "I am the door," he does not only mean that he is the door of the kingdom of glory after death, but he is the door by which the believer enters his kingdom of salvation here on earth; not the door of heaven; but the door of his spiritual fold. "I am the true vine," Christ says to those who were yet under the old covenant, some of which would yet be broken away on account of unbelief; but those who remained would be purged by the word (that is, regenerated), and then bear much fruit, not in heaven, but here on earth, in the conversion of the Gentiles.

This rest is a rest from the works of the law; a rest from sin; a rest of grace. As Moses led the Israelites to a rest in Canaan, so Christ leads us to the rest of his kingdom here. We must first labor in Moses' school, and then rest in Christ's kingdom on earth, or we can never rest in heaven unless we die in infancy, before having rebelled against known light; and even then our salvation is purchased by the blood of Christ. It is true that the Israelites never enjoyed a complete rest in Canaan. They were almost continually at war, either with the Philistines within their own land, or with foreign powers, or engaged in terrible combat with each other; nor do we enjoy a complete rest from sin under the New Covenant. Sin is in our members; and if he cannot control us with the authority of a master, he will show us at least that he only submits as an unruly slave to a power stronger than himself; therefore we see that the analogy drawn between our present rest and that of the Jews in Canaan is perfect in every particular. Nevertheless, the rest which Paul tells the Hebrews "remaineth for the people of God," is that rest which Christ promises to those who come to him by faith: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Man must partake of the tree of

Life and he healed by the medicinal virtue of its leaves before he enters the portal of the tomb, or he can never enjoy its blessed fruits in "the power of an endless life."

WHAT RELATION DOES THE LORD'S DAY BEAR TO THE REST OF
THE NEW COVENANT?

The New Covenant rest bears the same relation to the Lord's day that the rest in Canaan bore to the Jewish Sabbath. It is the basis or foundation upon which the Lord's day is built. As God rested after the work of creation, so Christ rested after the work of redemption. Now, we maintain that the rest from the labor of creation was a long period, passing through several thousand years; so Christ's rest is a period commencing with the morn of his resurrection from Joseph's tomb, and ending with the consummation of all terrestrial affairs.

But God did not rest from work in the full sense of the term. He continued to sustain that which he had created. Christ says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." As the Father created the world and continued to sustain it, so Christ redeemed the world, and now comes in the form of the Holy Spirit to support and sustain all regenerated believers.

Now, if we wish to know what relation the Lord's day bears to the rest of grace which Christ has introduced, we must first learn what relation the Jewish Sabbath bears to the rest in Canaan, and then carry out the analogy, and the whole question will become perfectly plain.

The whole Jewish system consisted in a separation of a part, as a symbol that the whole should be consecrated to the Lord. One nation from among all the nations of the earth was chosen as a symbol of all nations. One son, the eldest of the family, was chosen as a priest, and to some extent the king or ruler of the whole family. (This rule in the case of Jacob's family, however, was set aside, most likely, on account of sins committed by the eldest son against his father, and the tribes of Judah and Levi were chosen instead to these offices.) The first fruits of their harvest were consecrated to God as a symbol of the whole harvest being his own property. Certain animals were considered by them

as holy, and certain vessels were supposed, by having been passed through a ceremonial purification, to have become more holy than others; while all implements used in the tabernacle and temple service were consecrated to God as holy. Their own land above all other lands, was in a typical and symbolical sense that which truly bore the inappropriate title applied to it to-day—“*The Holy Land.*” A certain city was to them “The Holy City,” being a symbol of all cities, as well as a type of “that Jerusalem which is from above” in the worship of true believers; but in her destruction by Titus, for apostacy, she became a type of the destruction of Satan’s empire—Great Babylon. We also find that the first-born of all cattle was also consecrated to God, as a symbol indicating that all the flocks of the field were at his service whenever he should demand them.

Now, in regard to time, one day in seven was consecrated to God as a first-fruits of all their time, in memory of that first day of the new period in which God rested from the creation of the world; this day being, if we may so express it, an outgrowth of that long period of rest. It was also a memory of the first day of freedom from Egyptian bondage, and, as might be expected, ended the last day of the Old Covenant; that day in which the world’s Creator, having now taken upon himself the work of becoming the world’s Redeemer, was laid away in the cold and silent grave. This Sabbath day was also a type of that “first day” of the more glorious rest which follows it—the first day of man’s redemption.

Now, if we follow up the same chain of evidences, we will learn from the Jewish law what day observed by the Jews was in the end to be developed into the Lord’s day, and by the manner in which they observed that day, together with the prophecies, we learn how the Lord’s day should be observed by us.

THE JEWISH PENTECOST A GERM OF THE LORD’S DAY.

As the giving of the manna in the desert was so intimately connected with the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, we naturally look to its cessation for at least one of the roots which in the end shall develop into the Lord’s day. From Joshua v. 10–12 we

learn that the Israelites kept the Passover in the plains of Jericho on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and that on the morrow, or Sabbath day, they ate of the old corn of the land, and that on the next day, corresponding with our Lord's day, the manna ceased. This was the day on which, in future years, the wave offering was to be presented. Just forty-nine days from that day was to be the day of Pentecost.

Now, as the Jewish Sabbath was instituted in commemoration of the exodus from Egyptian bondage, and at the giving of the manna, after the unleavened bread they brought with them out of Egypt had been exhausted; so we find the Pentecost established in the land of Canaan, which was but a type of the true rest which should come in the future, although the unbelieving Jews of Paul's time thought that it was that true rest, in commemoration of that rest which they had entered fifty days before. The Jewish Sabbath being the seventh day rest, the Pentecost could be observed only yearly; but even in this yearly observance we see it clearly indicated as an outgrowth of the rest which they now enjoyed in Canaan. Now, if we observe carefully the two days which form the feast of Pentecost, the sixteenth day of the month Nisan and the eighth of the month Sivan, we cannot fail to see their close relationship to the two covenants. (Lev. xxiii. 9-21.) The first was connected with the Passover, a day on which all leaven was excluded, and the first-fruits were consecrated to God, not in the loaf, but in the sheaf; but on the latter day, not one sheaf, but two loaves, were to be presented, baked with leaven, and consequently just the reverse of the feast of the Passover. Everything connected with the Passover indicates an unfinished work, while everything connected with the Pentecost denotes a complete work. Now, as the Jewish Sabbath belongs to the Mosaic system instituted in the desert, and the Pentecost falling not upon the last but the first day of the week, and foreshadowing the light or leavened bread of a better rest, we consider that this day could be none other than a foretaste of the Christian Lord's day. In the Pentecost we find the very opposite of the Passover. The latter was a day of exclusion, quiet, separation; and the other, it is true, a day of exclusion from servile work, but yet a day of

activity, of permeation. One bearing the sad remembrance of the death of the first-born in Egypt, the other of new life in the land of Canaan; one symbolising the unleavened bread of sorrow and affliction—of weariness and hunger in the desert, the other of the light bread of joy and peace in their own home in Canaan; one a symbol of death, the other a symbol of life.

Now, if our reasoning is correct, we can have no doubt that the day of Pentecost was a basis of the Christian Lord's day, rather than the Jewish Sabbath, just as the Jewish synagogue was the basis of the Christian church, rather than the temple at Jerusalem. In both these cases the shadow or type passed away, while the germs are retained in their full development in the Christian system. If such is the case, then the laws concerning the Pentecost have an intimate connexion with the Lord's day. We read: "And ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein." "And thou shalt keep a feast of weeks unto the Lord thy God with a tribute of a free will offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee. And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man servant and thy maid servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen." (Lev. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26; Deut. xvi. 9-12.) Is it a strange thing, then, if we find similar precepts in the New Testament in regard to the Lord's day? Paul says: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." (1 Cor. xvi. 1-2.)

Most commentators suppose that the law was given from Sinai on the day of Pentecost. Even Mr. Atwater, in his admirable work on the Jewish tabernacle, says: "Fifty days after the exodus from Egypt, Moses received on Sinai the two tables of stone on which God had inscribed the Ten Commandments."—*The Sacred Tabernacle*, p. 2. Is there any proof of this? Does Exodus xix. 1 mean the first day of the third month, or does it mean the

same day of the month that the Israelites left Egypt? In either case it would be the first day of the week; but the former gives too little, and the latter too much. But no matter; the Pentecost was an outgrowth of the rest in Canaan, and was not observed in the desert, and had no other connexion with it than being given there in anticipation, as the law concerning cities of refuge, and similar laws, to be enforced only in their own land. Pentecost did not exist at the time the law was given. That people should confound the giving of the law in the desert, with the rejoicing over the first-fruits of Canaan, is so far out of place that we wonder that any one should ever have imagined such a thing.

As a temperance question, it has been maintained by the defenders of total abstinence that the Jewish law concerning the feast of the Passover required the entire expulsion of not only leavened bread, but of anything that partook of the nature of leaven; consequently of all fermented wine, and, therefore, Christ on the night of his betrayal partook with his disciples of the unfermented juice of the grape, and not of fermented wine; that the apostles must have followed his example, and only later ages have departed from it. On the other hand, it has been maintained by those who take a different view, that there can be no doubt that the early Corinthian church used fermented wine, and Paul does not censure them because they used fermented wine, but because they got drunk on it. Now the facts of the case are just these: that the Jews used no leaven or fermented wine at the Passover, but they used both on the day of Pentecost, and the apostles continued to do so. The present practice of using unleavened bread, then, at our communion table is unwarranted by the practice of the apostles. As the Passover lamb was the symbol of death, so now light bread is a symbol of life, Christ, the true Bread, giving us life by his resurrection from the grave. The unleavened bread brought out of Egypt by the Israelites could not give them life, even in the desert, but was soon exhausted, leaving them on the point of perishing of famine in the desert; therefore the Bread of Life, the true Bread from heaven, should be symbolised by something more palatable than that which Israel carried out of Egypt. In defence of the cause of temperance, let it be said that no harm can come

from a truthful statement of the case. If, on account of temptation, it be thought best to depart from the early practice of the apostles, there can be no harm in doing so, as long as we have the sanction of the apostles themselves. In 1 Cor. viii. and x. 19-33, we find Paul countermanding a decree given by the first council at Jerusalem, in regard to meats consecrated to idols, and yet he says: "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." May God give us all strength of mind and will to use no intoxicating liquor, or anything else, that may cause a weak brother to stumble and fall!

Now, if we are correct thus far, that Pentecost was really a germ of the Lord's day, then we must expect to find in the first Pentecost which Christ's people held after his ascension, and after having brought them into the spiritual Canaan, a confirmation of the Lord's day, then and there instituted in all its plenitude, in commemoration of the morning of his resurrection, when he delivered them from the spiritual bondage of sin. As the day of Pentecost had been observed up to this time as a season of returning thanks to God for his bounties and for the deliverance of his ancient people from Egypt (Deut. xvi. 12), we may expect to find the apostles celebrating the day in its true spiritual sense. We find a full record of this event in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and cannot doubt but it is an example for the members of God's spiritual kingdom through all coming time.

No consecrated temple was needed for this service, as the Jewish synagogue had now culminated in the Christian church. No chosen family like that of Levi officiated there, nor first-born anointed with consecrated oil and clothed with symbolical vestments, but the first-fruits of Christ's ministry, anointed with the Holy Spirit descending visibly upon them in the form of cloven (not single) tongues like as of fire, to show the world that they had a double mission to perform: 1st, to proclaim the law, whose end is death; and 2d, to present the remedy—the gospel, which gives life.

We behold here no flocks of cattle, sheep, or birds; no altar with its flames of fire and columns of black smoke; no costly ar-

ray of smoking incense; no wonderful ceremonies or peculiar forms of dress, but a powerful sermon backed up by proofs from the Old Testament Scriptures, converting three thousand Old Covenant Jews, not away from the Mosaic ritual, not into modern Christians free from all Jewish prejudices, but to faith in a risen Saviour who was undoubtedly the Messiah they had long been looking for.

This Lord's day was spent in God's service as no Jewish Sabbath had ever been. It was not so much a Sabbath of bodily observances, a rest from manual labor, as a Sabbath of the soul.

THE CHRISTIAN LORD'S DAY AN OUTGROWTH OF THE NEW COVENANT SYSTEM.

. In Christ's Sabbath of grace no costly temple or temple service is required. The blue dome of heaven is God's temple, while towering mountains and rolling hills are its arches; carpeted by the green sward, and lighted, not by seven golden candlesticks, but by the seven prismatic colors of light, streaming from the radiant face of the king of day; all nature rolls up one universal anthem of praise to the great Creator, proclaiming that not in temples made with hands, either in Mount Gerizim or at Jerusalem, do the true worshippers worship the Father in spirit and in truth. In the New Covenant no commands are given to any Solomon about the building of temples. God's spiritual temple is universal, and yet a synagogue or church is required where men can congregate for the study of God's word. We know this from the practice of the apostles and early Christians, although there are given no directions about building it. It is not the Jewish temple transferred into the New Covenant system, but the germ which existed in the Jewish synagogue that is now developed into the Christian church.

In the New Testament dispensation nothing is said about a chosen priesthood initiated into the duties of his office by a ceremonial purification and the anointing of oil, nevertheless Christ's spiritual kingdom is a priesthood, "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices;" "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people" (1 Pet. ii. 5-9), out of which, as

an outgrowth of the Christian system, has come the Christian ministry, corresponding with the Christian church and the Lord's day; and yet no one will pretend to say that the Christian ministry is nothing more than the Levitical priesthood transferred to the Christian system. Such an assumption would at once be met with ridicule. Nor will any one for a moment admit that the Christian ministry is less honorable, or the position less sacred, than that of the Jewish priest. In fact, the antitype is infinitely superior to the type. The very first-fruits of the "holy nation" should be consecrated to God for this purpose. Not the spiritually halt and maimed, but the man of firm character and noble purpose, in whose eye beams the fire of intellect, whose mind, thoroughly trained in the requisite institutions for imparting human knowledge, shall have obtained all the acquirements possessed by the apostles, and then profoundly imbued with God's Holy Spirit, and baptized with the living water of life—God's living word—he may be able to proclaim, with power from on high, the gospel plan of salvation to a ruined world. Oh, this mission is infinitely superior, and infinitely more holy, than that of a typical Jewish priest offering typical sacrifices on a typical altar in the temple of ancient Jerusalem!

As in the New Covenant all space is holy to God, and all regenerated believers are a spiritual priesthood, so all time should be consecrated to his service. All time is holy and should be considered a holy rest from sin, that true "sabbath which remaineth for the people of God" after the Jewish Sabbath and the rest in material Canaan have all been taken away. And yet, as an outgrowth of the Christian system, there is one day in seven, the Christian Lord's day, which is especially holy, a day to be observed above all others by his people, as consecrated to his service, and in which they are particularly required to engage in the duties pertaining to his Church and ministry. This day is not the Jewish Sabbath transferred to the New Covenant, but a new day chosen for the purpose, and in itself an outgrowth of the Christian system. This day is not so much a rest of the body as it is a rest of the soul. Now, just as the Christian church is not a transfer of the Jewish temple, but is peculiar to the New Cove-

nant; just as the Christian ministry is not a transfer of the Levitical priesthood, but is a part of the Christian dispensation; so the Lord's day is not a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, but a day originating out of the necessities of the New Testament dispensation.

THE LORD'S DAY MORE HOLY THAN THE JEWISH SABBATH.

We would not detract one iota from the proper observance of the Lord's day. What the Scriptures demand, that is our duty to teach, and as far as possible to enforce. But the Lord's day is the Sabbath of the soul, and as such the soul of the believer should be so absorbed in the duties of the day, that the day will be observed and sanctified by him without the necessity of any outward command to obey it. In fact, there is no command in the New Testament to observe the day. Such a commandment would be out of place in the New Testament economy. (See Jer. xxxi. 33-34.) Let the State enforce what laws it sees proper to keep miscreant nominal Christians, Jews, and infidels out of mischief, but he whose soul is baptized in Christ needs no such laws. Let the State adhere to the morality of the Old Testament, but our duty as Christian believers is to the morality of the New Covenant. We live not under the fear of the law, but above the law. People who are under the law would run into anarchy were the law to be abolished, but the morality of the New Covenant Christian would undergo no change were all laws to be annihilated.

But the question may be asked, "If the Lord's day is to be observed with as much attention and respect as was the Jewish Sabbath, why defend the view that a new day has been chosen, and not the Jewish Sabbath transferred? What is to be gained?" We answer, We gain the truth. We present the teachings of the Bible. We destroy not only this error, but others that may grow out of it. We show more distinctly the relations existing between the two Covenants, and make it more difficult for men to confound the one with the other.

To the true believer, then, the Lord's day is a Sabbath of the soul. He becomes so absorbed in the gospel and its privileges and duties, that he is completely drawn away from all desire to

prosecute his own business or pleasure on that day. But the Church has not alone to deal with Pentecostal believers. Her influence extends over a large class, who, to a certain extent, yet belong to that shade of the Old Covenant which still exists along with the New. We mean children and young people, and perhaps some older persons, who, like the Hebrews that Paul wrote to, are still in the desert, travelling, it is true, towards Canaan, but who are nevertheless exposed to the danger of falling through unbelief and perishing in the desert. For all such, we need still to proclaim the 'aw written upon stone: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," not in its typical character as a remembrance of Israel's departure from the land of bondage, but in its prophetic character as a remembrance of Him who died and rose again for them, and that through belief in him they may enter into rest and be saved from their sins.

THE JEWISH SABBATH A SYMBOL OF DEATH; THE LORD'S DAY
A SYMBOL OF LIFE.

We now come to another aspect of the case. The Jewish Sabbath was a terrible memento of death—death in Egypt. The destroying angel was at work on that terrible night when Israel left Egypt, and the Jewish Sabbath was instituted as a monument of the sad events of that night. In every house there was a corpse, and that corpse was the first-born of every family; literally, the first-born of the nation. The Egyptians, doubtless observing the same rules which prevailed among the early Hebrews, considered the first-born as the consecrated priesthood of the nation, and a symbol of the entire nation itself. If such was the case, then Pharaoh saw in the death of the first-born the condemnation of the entire nation to death. And the language of Scripture would rather bear out this view: "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste: for they said, *We be all dead men.*" (Ex. xii. 33.) "In every house was a corpse," and that corpse spake louder than words could possibly do, of the doom of the nation. Friends and relatives gathered in awful sorrow around their dead, not so much, perhaps, in mourning for the dead, as in dread anticipation of

their own doom. The day which followed that terrible night indicated to the Hebrews an escape from death, but an escape that was not consummated until they had passed the Red Sea and were safe on their way to Canaan; and which is not spiritually confirmed to us until we have passed the red sea close by the cross of Christ.

The last Jewish Sabbath, consummating the period before the Christian era, was also a terrible memento of death. The First-born of Creation, the only begotten Son of God, lay in the cold embrace of death in the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. In his sad fate, his disciples read their own condemnation. If he were an impostor, as they now supposed, all their inheritance in Israel was destroyed; and all their expectations lay buried with Christ in his tomb. Nor was this sad night and day of mourning alone confined to the twelve disciples. All who had looked to him as their Messiah were in mourning. The fate of the carnal Jewish nation was sealed. The carnal first-born lay in the tomb in Egypt on that day which was the origin of the Jewish Sabbath, and on this last Sabbath day the carnal hope of Israel had perished for ever. During that long day, Christ's friends, if they met at all, only met to tell one another of their great sorrow. But as is natural to suppose, a Sabbath whose origin was in death, could but end in death. The first-born of the Egyptian was an appropriate symbol of the whole Adamic nature, and the First-born of God, having assumed that nature, dies in it.

But the history of that terrible night in Egypt is not an old story. It is a terrible reality whose solemn shadow falls upon us now. Egypt is all around us to-day. The solemn hover of the wings of the death angel is wafted to us by every breeze. The world is perishing around us. The mother, as she sits by the cradle of her dying first-born, watching for its last breath; the daughter soothing the fevered brow of a dear father while undergoing the agony of the last hour; the husband clinging with the grasp of despair to the loving wife as he sees her borne away in the jaws of the terrible monster; a sister in awful agony watching for the last gasp of a loved brother—are all passing through that solemn night of Egypt's profoundest darkness. And does not the fate of these

dear ones, as they are torn away from our embrace, reveal to us our own death sentence? Who can look upon the face of the dying, and not read there the sentence of his own condemnation? And who can stand among the dead in the midst of Egyptian darkness, and not repeat the echo, "We be all dead men"?

But the first Christian Lord's day, made glorious by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the grave, is a symbol of life. Life from God, through the grave on that day, and confirmed to the Church of the First-born on the day of Pentecost in the descent of God's Holy Spirit, gives to the world a day of spiritual rejoicing the exact counterpart of the Old Covenant Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath belongs to the law, whose beginning and end are death. The Lord's day belongs to the gospel, whose beginning is life eternal. The Jewish Sabbath ends with the death of the Son of man. The Lord's day begins with the resurrection of the Son of God. The Jewish Sabbath ends with the Son of David, and in fact the last of David's carnal seed reposing in the tomb. The Lord's day begins with David's risen Lord, and the day of Pentecost confirms him upon his throne in the hearts of all true believers. Our Lord's day is not a feast of unleavened bread, eaten in hot haste and burning desire to escape from a carnal bondage; but a feast of light bread, in commemoration of eternal liberty through Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. Our Lord's day is not a symbol of the gloom and terror of the grave; but of life—life eternal.

Judaism, from beginning to end, contained but the lifeless form of a carnal Christ. If any Jew, from Abraham to Christ, ever obtained eternal life, it was only through a risen and glorified Saviour, a reflection of whose image was carried back into the Old Covenant by the writings of the prophets and the images of the ceremonial law, just at the moon and planets reflect the light of the sun into the darkness of the night. But now the night has passed, and the day has come. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and Christ shall give thee light."

THE JEWISH SABBATH A SYMBOL OF DARKNESS; THE LORD'S DAY
A SYMBOL OF LIGHT.

It has been observed that the Jewish Sabbath commenced with the setting of the sun on Friday night, and ended with the setting of the sun on Saturday night. It is evident, then, that the Jewish Sabbath commenced with the night, the first half being night and the latter half day. If we turn to the history of creation, as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, we will read that "the evening and the morning" were the "first day," "second day," etc. This idea corresponds beautifully with the Old and New Covenants. The dark tempestuous night of Egypt being illumined only by the angry flames of Sinai. After the dark clouds of Egypt and the desert have passed away, the bright stars of Canaan break forth in the light of its kings and prophets, reflecting back the image of the coming Sun of Righteousness; and even when the sun rises and the New Covenant comes in, there is still a shadow of the Old Covenant accompanying every object that intercepts the sun's rays. It was in memory of a dark and terrible night when Israel went out of Egypt, that resulted in the institution of the Jewish Sabbath. It was amid the wail of a nation mourning for its first-born, that they packed up their goods and hastened away, lest the avenging angel of death should overtake them also. And then the morning finds them wandering in the desert: homeless, sad, and dreary, not knowing whither they were going. It was also in the night time that they passed through the Red Sea, and on the morning they stood upon those barren shores and beheld the corpses of their enemies wafted to the shore by the impetuosity of the overwhelming waves; and many commentators suppose—from an inference to be derived from Deut. v. 15, when the Angel of the Covenant in the fiery pillar ceases to be their leader and now becomes their protector, they having been driven into the sea by Pharaoh's army, just as Christ was forced into his grave at the commencement of a Jewish Sabbath by his enemies—that Israel passed through the Red Sea on a Sabbath day also.

The Christian Lord's day commences with the morning. It was early morn when Mary came to the Saviour's tomb. It was early

in the morning when the news of a Saviour's resurrection broke upon the ears of his astonished disciples. Glorious morning, that gave the world a Saviour! A morning whose light reflected back into the depths of Old Testament prophecy, reveals the mystery hidden from the ages under shadow and symbol, and now clearly brought to view by the gospel; a morning revealing to our race the life and immortality which is the heritage of the righteous; a morning to be closed by no night to those who are sons of God by faith, but at the same time revealing to the wicked a night more terrible than the darkness of Egypt. Now, if the Old Testament night was a long period symbolised by the Jewish Sabbath, then the morning of the New Covenant is a long rest most appropriately symbolised by the Lord's day. Away back in the middle of the Jewish night, one of the disciples of Moses, groaning under the heavy burden of the law, exclaims: "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" (Isa. xxi. 11, 12) and then a voice comes back through the still darkness: "The morning cometh;" and then, as though echoing from the profoundest depths of Egyptian dungeons, to seal the destiny of those who love the "darkness rather than the light," and who "will not come to the light lest their deeds should be reprov'd," comes the solemn announcement, "*and also the night.*" Night of eternal wrath to all who reject him who is the light of the world.

But when the morning had come, and the Jewish nation, with all its ordinances, was about to crumble into dust, one of the "sons of the morning" cries, "Love is the fulfilling of the law; . . . awake out of sleep; . . . the night is far spent, the day is at hand." (Rom. xiii. 10-14.) And then he says to those who are in Christ, "Ye are all the children of light and the children of the day: we are not of the night nor of darkness." (1st Thess. v. 1-7.)

THE PROPER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY MAY BE LEARNED FROM THE PROPHETS AS WELL AS FROM THE MOSAIC LAW.

As has already been observed, in the gospel as presented to us in the New Testament we find no rules for the observance of the

Lord's day. Such rules would be out of place in the gospel. Christ, while teaching those who were still under the old dispensation, enjoined the most strict observance of the moral law, including the Fourth Commandment. This we observe in the answer given to the lawyer who came to him tempting him (Matt. xxii. 34-40) as well as elsewhere; and the plain inference is, that this commandment, made free from the typical, was to extend down into the new dispensation. Besides this, all we have in the New Testament relative to the matter is the example given us by the the apostles, and even this example is not always to be relied on, the apostles themselves varying as they were influenced more or less by Judaism, as we find in the case of Peter, as recorded in the tenth chapter of the Acts, refusing even at that late date to associate with Gentiles and partake of their food, giving as a reason that nothing unclean had ever passed his mouth, although his Lord had told him ten or twelve years before this, that it is not that which entereth the man that defileth him. Now we have already seen that the Mosaic economy, consisting of types and shadows, has been fulfilled in the New Covenant, and in it the Jewish Sabbath, as a type of the rest of grace "which remaineth for the people of God." But Moses and the New Testament do not comprise the whole of the Bible. There were *two* witnesses before the New Testament was in existence, which were often quoted by our Lord—"Moses and the prophets"—and as one of these has been fulfilled, we naturally turn to the other. The prophets, then, being an introduction to the gospel, must, if carefully examined, afford us all the rules we require to know on this subject; and as we are especially told that the New Covenant Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself (in whom Moses is fulfilled) being the chief corner stone." (Eph. ii. 20-22.) But as these prophecies were given to the Jewish or typical kingdom, and, as their name (prophecies) indicates, refer to the spiritual kingdom of Christ, they must be taken in a spiritual and not a material sense. Let us, then, examine in detail the prophecies relative to the Lord's day. One of the most important of these is to be found in Jeremiah xvii. 19-27:

"Thus saith the Lord unto me, Go and stand in the gate of

the children of the people, whereby the kings of Judah come in, and by the which they go out, and in all the gates of Jerusalem: and say unto them, Hear ye the word of the Lord, ye kings of Judah, and all Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that enter in by these gates; thus saith the Lord, Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers. But they obeyed not, neither inclined their ear, but made their necks stiff, that they might not hear, nor receive instruction. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the sabbath day, but hallow the sabbath day to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall remain for ever. And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and meat offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise, unto the house of the Lord. But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."

Now here let us note several things which do not appear on the surface of this passage to a superficial reader:

1st. This is not merely an historical sketch of events transpiring in the days of Josiah and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah. If it were, it would be of but little value to us. In fact, it would not be what God's word claims to be, a communication from God to fallen man concerning his soul's salvation, and which deeply concerns every member of the human family throughout all ages.

2d. It is a *prophecy*, and, as a prophecy, given ostensibly to a

typical nation is virtually to be fulfilled in all the nations of the world, of which that nation is a type, according to God's own words to Jeremiah: "I ordained thee a prophet unto *the nations*." "See, I have this day set thee over *the nations* and over the *kingdoms*, to root out and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." (Jer. i. 5 and 10.) This prophecy, then, has its fulfilment in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and not in the material type. 3d. As the language is addressed to the type to be fulfilled in the antitype, the Jerusalem spoken of is "that Jerusalem which is from above" and not the material Jerusalem, and the "sabbath day" referred to is the Lord's day, and the "burdens" which are not to be carried into the spiritual Jerusalem on the Lord's day are not packages of rice and sugar, but mental burdens—worldly affairs—all thoughts of worldly business and worldly cares. 4th. That view which would make this prophecy to be fulfilled literally in the future in the restoration of ancient Jerusalem, betrays such ignorance of the prophecies that it requires no refutation. Ancient Jerusalem is not to be rebuilt. The type having been fulfilled in the antitype, has accomplished its purpose and has passed away for ever. 5th. This prophecy is having its fulfilment to-day. The "princes sitting upon the throne of David" are those who occupy high positions in the gospel kingdom; Jerusalem being none other than the gospel Church.

A similar passage is to be found in Isaiah lvi. 1-8: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant, Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the

stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar: for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for *all people*."

Isaiah above all other prophets has been most appropriately termed the evangelical prophet; the latter portion of his prophecies, especially, referring to the gathering of the spiritual seed of Abraham (not the carnal Jews) from among all nations. This passage, then, like the former from Jeremiah, is to be interpreted as referring to the proper observance of the Lord's day, although ostensibly addressed to the type, as are a majority of the prophecies, to be fulfilled in the antitype. This view is still more clearly seen in the following passage: "For as the new heavens and the new earth (the gospel kingdom) which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." (Isa. lxvi. 22-23.)

And still more decisive is the following: "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day: and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isa. lviii. 13-14.) Here, then, we have in the prophecies of the Old Testament, being an introduction to the gospel, all the commands necessary for the observance of the Lord's day; commands which would not be proper in the gospel itself, which deals with a purely spiritual kingdom. Not discarding Moses, but considering him as purely typical of the gospel, we will find in the prophecies all that we need to know concerning the dedication of one-seventh of our time to the Lord, and just how this time should be observed.

We have, then, as a guide to the proper observance of the Lord's day:

1st. *The Fourth Commandment*; not to be taken in its material typical sense as given to the Jews through Moses, but in its application to the antitype as given through Christ to the world.

2d. *The Commands given to the Jews in regard to the observance of the Pentecost*; also to be taken in a spiritual and not material sense.

3d. *All Commands given by the Prophets concerning the Jewish Sabbath*, having passed through the prism of the cross, and applied to the Lord's day in the light of the New Covenant.

4th. The practice of the apostles.

All scripture prophecies become perfectly plain, if we remember the simple rule of substituting the name of the antitype in the place of the type. Let us try that rule on some of the prophecies relative to the Lord's day and witness the result. Take, for instance, the passage in Isaiah just referred to: Isa. lviii. 13.

THE PROPER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

1st. *We are not to turn from the day by seeking our own pleasure.*

All our business affairs are to be laid aside on this day. We may legitimately occupy the six intervening days in the pursuit of worldly treasure necessary for our own comfort and that of our families, but this day is especially to be dedicated to God's work and not to our own. On this day our own fortunes, or in other words our own petty kingdoms, are at rest. We are not to think of them this day, but to spend the day in laboring for the advancement of God's kingdom, and the building up of his cause in the world. On the Lord's day the merchant should be as faithful in the Lord's field of labor as he has been in his store or counting-room during the other six days of the week, and the clerk must be as diligently engaged in the Lord's service as he has been during the six days in his employer's business. It is not to be a day of idleness, but of intense activity; in fact, we should be more active on this day than on others, for we serve a higher master, and engage in a far more noble employment. We

well know that if a book-keeper or clerk were engaged during five days of the week in the employ of an ordinary merchant, and on the sixth in the employ of some rich nobleman, he at least would be as faithful on the sixth day as he would on any of the five, and the probability is that he would be even more industrious on that day; but the reverse is almost the general custom in regard to the Lord's day. Even the great mass of professing Christians rise late on the Lord's day; and with the exception of spending an hour or so in the Sunday-school and listening to one or two sermons, they spend the day in idleness, looking upon it as a rest day for the body, while many use the day as a time for making a sort of review of their own personal duties during the week that has passed, or in laying plans for the coming week, none of which are in accordance with the requirements of these prophecies.

The Mosaic law required that no beast should be compelled to labor on the Jewish Sabbath; but nothing in these prophecies indicates any such prohibition in regard to the Lord's day. Not only every beast, but every successful instrument that can be brought to do faithful service for God's kingdom, is to be used for that purpose. There is nothing said here about remaining stationary in one place, as was the case in the wilderness, but we can go in and out of the gates of Jerusalem on that day, provided we carry no worldly mental burdens. Nothing is said about a Sabbath day's journey, which it appears was permitted at a later age in the history of Judah, but we may go ten Sabbath days' journeys, or even twenty, if by so doing we can "visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction," or aid some erring brother in an effort to keep himself "unspotted from the world," or to bring a lost soul to Christ. The prophecy is not to be understood in the typical as a prohibition to bear material burdens through the material gates of the typical Jerusalem, but in the New Covenant rest we are to "bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law [not of Moses, but] of Christ." On this day our pleasure is not to be in doing our "own ways" or speaking our "own words," but in delighting ourselves in the Lord.

But the bearing of burdens on the Lord's day through the

gates of the antitypical Jerusalem, has a deeper significance still. It means that no mental worldly burdens are to be carried into the Lord's house on that day. It means that on the morn of that day we are to so consecrate our hearts to God by prayer, that we shall go to his house fully prepared to perform the duties which he requires of us ; for we cannot do his work and carry our own baskets full of provisions too. And oh, how many burdens are carried every Lord's day through the church door into God's presence. Here is a man with a big roll under his arm. He arranged with his architect on Saturday to build him a new house, and he has brought the plan with him, and as soon as seated he unrolls it and commences making changes and improvements. He does not hear a single word of the sermon. Here comes another with a whole wheel-barrow full of troubles. And a lady, too. Her mother-in-law has slandered her, and she can think of nothing else. The minister's labor is in vain, as far as she is concerned. Several young men and young women carry heavy parcels, labelled "love affairs," and the water of life flows all around them, but they catch none of it, for their vessels are already filled. A medical student has brought a patient with him, and is trying hard to study the nature of his disease, but learns nothing about the nature and cure of that terrible malady—the leprosy of sin. This man has brought his farm with him, but learns nothing about the "inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." A judge is busy with a case—a peculiar case—and is busy in considering what decision he should render, and although having an ear on each side of his head, he hears not the text, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." There are some, strange to say, come empty-handed and go away heavily loaded. One has a great bundle of criticisms. He has caught up what he supposes to be the weak points in his minister's sermon, but he has allowed all the rest to pass by like the waters of the Jordan on their way to the Dead Sea. How truly Christ said of such, "Having ears ye hear not." And another boasts as he passes out of the church door, that he came to hear the gospel, but heard nothing but the minister eulogising himself.

What a bundle he carries ; and how different the case would have been if he had closed his eyes to the carnal and opened his eyes to the spiritual ! The Jews saw a Samaritan with a devil where others saw the Son of God. "Having ears they hear not ; eyes, they see not." One carries away the choir, but has left the spirit of the hymns that were sung ; another rejoices in an impression of the costumes, the hats and ornaments ; while one youth bears away an album of portraits. Only here and there one who came in "the spirit on the Lord's day" has done the Lord's work and received the Lord's reward—an enlightened understanding and a purified conscience. These, having washed themselves at the fountain of gospel grace, are now prepared to carry the water of life to the perishing.

2d. *We are not to speak our own words.* We do not find any prohibition in the Mosaic law for restraining a man to the use of certain words on the Jewish Sabbath day. But here we find a restriction as to what language we are to use on the Lord's day. In this, the Christian Lord's day is more strict than the Jewish Sabbath. Our language on this day is to be that of prayer and praise ; or, in other words, to be employed strictly in God's service, in whatever way we can make ourselves instrumental in building up his kingdom, whether by reading and expounding his word, or by our conversation leading sinners to Christ, and making his merits and beauties known to others. As our whole time on this day belongs to the Lord, so our whole conversation should be about his business. What would we say of a clerk who should employ the whole or even a part of his employer's time, in talking to his employer's customers about some private business of his own ? Would not his employer soon begin to suspect him to be a rival, and dismiss him from his employment ? The clerk's conversation with his employer's customers must be about his employer's business. In the history of Israel, we read of a prince who stood by the side of the gate of Jerusalem, and whenever any one came in with any important business for his father, the king, he commenced talking to them "*his own words,*" instead of delighting himself with that which was to the king's interest : and we are told that "Absalom stole the hearts of the

men of Israel;" and not long after this, we learn that he excited the people and raised a rebellion, placing himself at the head of it, where he ignominiously lost his life.

3d. *We are to call the Lord's day a delight.* We all know the pleasure we experience when we are successful in some business enterprise. How cheering it is to shake hands with some old friend who is engaged in some business enterprise, and hear him exclaim in response to our inquiry in regard to his worldly success, "Oh, my business is very good now. I have all I can do." How happy he appears. Even his health appears to be benefited by his success, and no doubt his wife and children are joyful partakers of his prosperity. But on the other hand, how often do we hear in answer to some interrogatory touching a man who looks sad and troubled, "Oh, business is so dull—times are so hard." How sad and dejected he appears. Even his health fails in consequence, and dyspepsia and nervousness seize upon him. His wife and children also bear the same haggard look. But let business revive. Let the times become easy and money plenty, and he is filled with life and contentment. Joy over-spreads his countenance, and he becomes happy. Every day we have evidence of the interest men take in the success of their own affairs.

Now, if we love our friends, we cannot but be interested in their welfare. If they are successful, we rejoice with them, and if they are unfortunate, we feel that their misfortunes concern us. But suppose that we are in the employ of one of these friends; that we are engaged by him as a clerk, for instance; would we not take a much deeper interest in his success? If a clerk is honest, loves his employer, and becomes deeply interested in his employer's success in business, he will sympathise with him in his trials, and participate in his joys. But suppose we find a merchant looking sad and troubled, and we inquire the cause of his affliction and he should answer, "Business is good, times are easy, but my men do not attend to my business. They do not care anything about it. They neglect my customers. They take no interest in my success." "Why, how is this?" we inquire. "Do you not pay them regular salaries for attending to your business?"

He answers, "Yes, I pay them every week, but they have so many little private affairs of their own to attend to, and that occupy their whole attention, that they actually have no time or inclination to attend to my affairs. When a customer comes in, they at once seize upon him, and draw his attention away from the purchase of my goods to their own private affairs, and then they appear to be vexed when I suggest to them that my business is going to ruin." What would we think of such a lot of employees as these? Would we not say that they were a lot of knaves and should be harshly dealt with? But do we not too often do the same thing when we allow our thoughts and perhaps our conversation to be centred on our own petty affairs on the Lord's day, and not upon the Lord's important transactions on his own day, chosen above all others to be spent in his own service? God's world is going to ruin. He has placed us here to attend to it. He has given us this day to be employed in bringing the world to a knowledge of a Saviour. He pays us for our services, and if we occupy this precious time in thinking our own thoughts, speaking our own words, and attending to our own dolls and tops and other mundane playthings, are we not robbing God just as much as the clerk who occupies his employer's time in attending to business of his own?

4th. *We are to esteem it as a holy day.* Holy means sacred. We are to value it as a sacred day, a rich treasure; more valuable than all other days. A day to be devoted to the Lord by reading his word, making ourselves acquainted with his law and gospel, and holding spiritual communion with him. We know what interest a son or daughter, who is away from home, takes in the day that he is permitted to visit his father's house, and converse with his brothers and sisters, and especially with his beloved parents, about those things which are of mutual interest to both. This, to him, is a sacred day. He looks forward to it with deep interest, and longs for its coming. How much more, then, should we long for the coming of the Lord's day, a day exclusively devoted to spiritual communion with our heavenly Father, and to be occupied in his service?

5th. *We are to call it honorable.* That is, we are to honor

the day; respect it as a binding obligation. Wherever you find a man who has no respect for the Lord's day, *mark that man*. Brand him as you would a thief. If that man can get his hand into your till unknown to you, he will steal your money. We repeat, that he is already a thief, and worse than a thief. He robs God. God has placed him in this beautiful world and given him a home and food and clothing, and he exacts one-seventh of his time in pay, and he refuses to pay it. He is living in God's world and refuses to pay his rent. If he will rob God, he will rob you. If he will steal God's time, he will steal your money. Watch that man. Beware of the Sabbath-breaker. There is no crime in the decalogue that a Sabbath-breaker will not commit, if he has an opportunity and imagines that it will not be known to men. Trust no habitual Sabbath-breaker. It is an unfailing test of character. If he refuses to congregate where God's law is studied, he will most certainly trample that law under his feet. The man who will not recognise the laws of his country, is a traitor, and only wants the opportunity to engage in open rebellion. The man who will not give that portion of time which God requires to the study and teaching of his laws, will most assuredly betray you if you trust him. The man who will not devote a portion of his time to the interests of God's kingdom, imperfect as the service may be, is a villain. He is destitute of all true morality. Shun him as you would the plague.

God demands one-seventh of our time: not as a gift, but as a right; he being our landlord and we the tenants. We owe it to God just as much as we owe to our neighbor the money we borrowed from him: and we owe it until it is paid. "Remember the Sabbath day" is a due bill for value received, and no man who refuses to pay it can be an honest man. During the six days before, we received from our heavenly Father the manna, and our shoes and clothing are not waxen old; and now, on the Lord's day morning, God asks us to pay the bill by employing the day in his service. If any one refuses to pay, we again say, Brand him as a thief and a robber. Should any Sabbath-breaker complain that this is harsh language, we answer him, Pay your honest debts, and then we will recognise you as an honest

man. You owe God one-seventh of all your time; pay it by hallowing this day.

6th. Then, in these prophecies we find rich promises to all those who hallow the Lord's day. "*Thou shalt delight thyself in the Lord.*" See that miserable, cowardly, sneaking debtor who will not pay his honest debts, as he hides around the corner to avoid meeting his creditor in the street. He takes no delight in his creditor. How can he? His creditor's presence is odious to him. His own conscience convicts him of robbery. We cannot delight ourselves in the Lord, if we rob him of that which is his just due. But the man who pays his debts can face his creditor with a smile, and enjoy his company; and just so, the man who promptly pays to God what he owes him, can rejoice in the Lord his God with a clean conscience and a pure heart. Pay the Lord what thou owest him, and then thou shalt delight thyself in him. This is what is meant when the Scriptures say, "The pure in heart shall see God."

Then, the Lord's promise comes to him who fulfils this obligation. "I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father." He that has been faithful over a few things shall be made ruler over many things. Our time on earth is but a state of probation to test our character as to the destinies of eternity. If we are honest before God and pay him all our just dues, then he will take us into his employment in that world of which Christ's Sabbath of rest here on earth is but a foretaste. "The heritage of Jacob" includes all the blessings of the New Covenant. This is to be our food for ever, even the fulness of God in Christ.

THE LORD'S DAY A DAY OF INTENSE ACTIVITY.

The Lord's day is not a day to be spent in idleness and sloth. Some people imagine that if they abstain from all manual labor on this day, they have complied with all that the day demands. They sleep a part of the day, and a part of it they occupy in telling idle tales or reading works of fiction, and the result is that the day is completely squandered, and no good results from it.

The Lord's day was given by Christ to the world, and is intimately connected with the world's redemption. It is not a day of idleness, but a day of work, of busy, active life. It is the symbol of the dawning of a new era in the history of our race. The old Jewish Sabbath was but a shadow of the Lord's day, and was given by Moses to the Jews, and not to the world. It was a day that God hallowed in remembrance of the creation of the world, and was given to the Jews as a rest from bondage, and was but a carnal rest; the last day of which, the carnal nature of Christ rested in the grave. The dawn of the resurrection morning was a new era in the history of our world. When Christ was laid in the grave, the redemption of the world was complete as far as Christ's atonement was concerned; but now the world was to be saved by the preaching of that atonement. The foundation had been laid, and now the building was to be erected. When God laid the foundations of the earth, "the morning stars sang together," and is it reasonable to suppose that they were silent when Christ laid the foundation for man's redemption? Oh, that first Lord's day was a busy day, both in heaven and upon earth. It was certainly a busy day among the angels, nor was it a less busy day among the disciples. Christ's friends did not by any means spend that day on which he arose from the dead in idleness. We read that certain women came "early in the morning," "as it began to dawn;" and then, they were commanded to "go *quickly*" and tell the disciples that he was risen from the dead. "And they departed *quickly* from the sepulchre;" and Peter came *running*, and then we read of two of them who went into the country where they meet with their risen Lord, and that same night they return to inform the other disciples. From early dawn to late that night we find them busy. Most assuredly that was not an idle day to the disciples, whatever it may have been to others.

Nor was the day of Pentecost one of less activity. Peter preached a thrilling sermon on that day, that resulted in the conversion of three thousand persons. This was no mean day's work; and if there is any truth in the views of our Baptist friends, that these converts on that day received an immersion of

their bodies in water at the hands of the disciples, we may rest assured that those disciples were excessively tired when night came. That was anything but a Jewish Sabbath to them.

The Lord's day is not a day of bodily rest. A world is to be saved by the preaching of the gospel, and God has appointed this day as the day on which it is to be done, and it is not going to be done by *resting* on this day. The word Sabbath applied to this day is a misnomer. It is a day of work—hard work, and of intense activity. If every professing Christian would work as hard on the Lord's day for God's kingdom, as he does on other days for himself, within ten years the world would be turned upside down. It is a grievous error into which many Christians have fallen, of supposing that they keep the day holy when they spend it in idleness. There is work—a world of work—to be done on this day, and not an hour of it can be lost without committing sin. We repeat that it is not *a Sabbath* in the sense of bodily rest. The apostles never called it by that name. They ever designated it as the "Lord's day" or the "First day of the week," either of which indicates the very reverse of the Jewish Sabbath. It is not a Jewish Sabbath, but a Lord's day of busy, active work. The early Christians did not call it *the Sabbath*. It is a modern error that has given the name to a day just the reverse of what the etymology of the word means. We do not approve of changing the name given to the day by the apostles to one belonging to another day pertaining to the system of Moses. If any change is made, let it be one that is appropriate, introduced by usage, and not by a false taste.

"SUNDAY" AN APPROPRIATE NAME FOR THE LORD'S DAY.

We observe that many good men, especially ministers of the gospel and officers of churches, are careful to call the Lord's day "the Sabbath." Ask them why they do so, and they will answer you that the name *Lord's day* is more appropriate, but less convenient and but little used; that *Sunday* is a pagan name, the day formerly being dedicated by heathen nations to the worship of the sun, and consequently to call the day *Sunday* favors pagan idolatry.

This reasoning would be valid, did we still consider the day as consecrated to the sun. But Paul's reasoning in regard to consecrated meats (Rom. xiv. ; 1st Cor. viii.) utterly annihilates this argument. Meat consecrated to an idol may be eaten by a Christian with perfect impunity, if eaten to satisfy hunger and not to worship the idol ; unless some weak brother (and alas, how many weak brothers there are, who persist in being weak and puny, rather than drink deep of the gospel medicine !) should through his ignorance be caused to stumble.

Sunday, we say, is a proper name. We care nothing about the origin of the word. It may have been pagan before it was baptized by Christian usage. Cornelius was a pagan, yet when he was baptized a Christian, no one ever thought of changing his name. The changing of names in religious rites is a practice of the Roman Catholic Church, and is practised on all ecclesiastics from Pope Leo XIII. down to Fra Benito and Sister Agnes, who sweep the floor and whip the dogs out of the most humble convent. Why, then, should we ape the Romish Church in this ? We honor no idol by eating consecrated meat when we are hungry, and we do no dishonor by calling the Lord's day *Sunday*, unless we entertain in our minds the pagan superstition of consecrating the day to the worship of the sun-god.

The Jewish Sabbath was in memory of a night—of the hours consecrated to rest. The period to which it most appropriately belongs is that period commencing with the night on which the pascal lamb was slain in Egypt, and it ended with the rising sun on the morning of our Saviour's resurrection. The Christian Sunday begins with the rising sun—most appropriate symbol of light. It commenced on the morning when the "Sun of Righteousness" arose from the grave, and, scattering the dark shadows of the long Jewish night, ascended triumphant in the full splendor of the New Covenant, to give light not only to the Jew, but to all who sit in heathen darkness. Sunday, then, is a proper name to designate a day whose refulgent light already encircles the globe, and before whose dissolving beams the ruins of Judaism and Paganism are fast crumbling back to dust.

Sunday, a day whose *morning light* found in the sepulchre of

a risen Saviour nothing but his grave clothes, appropriate symbols of all carnal shadows, to be for ever buried in the grave of the Old Covenant, while the kingdom of light, illumined by the celestial Sun, fears no night and no grave.

Sunday, a day whose *noonday splendors* cheer the pilgrim in his onward march towards the celestial world, undimmed by any cloud of sin, unwearied by any labor in the Lord's service, as he presses forward "toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Sunday, a day whose *evening shadows* entrance the believer's eye as he beholds the golden towers and battlements and pearly gates of the New Jerusalem, all aglow with the refulgent splendors of the Sun of Righteousness. May we all spend an eternity in his light!

Sunday, a day of active Christian effort here, whose evening glories will fade into the eternal day when all the people of God shall be gathered home to enjoy the blessings of his kingdom for ever. "And in the city of the living God we shall behold with the eyes of the immortal nature, the light which beams forth from the eternal throne." "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it." "And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever."

REVIEW AND CONCLUSION.

The foregoing article was prepared for publication over four years ago (being intended as part of a larger work), and has been given to the REVIEW with but few unimportant changes. Of all the works on this subject, defending the views here opposed, that which appears to contain the most solid reasoning is by Prof. Fairbairn of Glasgow.—*Fairbairn's Typology*, Vol. II., Sec. 3. But the defects of his system are so evident, that a few quotations will serve to show, we think, beyond the shadow of a doubt that the plan we have presented is the right one.

Dr. Fairbairn maintains that a seventh day of rest was given to the world at the creation, and that it was "engrafted" into the Jewish system, which gave it a "symbolical and typical value," and that from thence "the original ordinance" was *transferred* to the Christian system, with a new day and a new name, and yet he contends for "a strict and literal obligation of the Fourth Commandment."

We have nowhere maintained that God gave the world no weekly rest until he gave the manna to the Israelites in the desert. We have admitted that from inference we understand that God's preachers of righteousness did teach the people to observe a weekly rest. We think there can be no doubt about this, and we should consider it a great error to say that the antediluvian world had no seventh day rest. We can form no idea of the vast amount of knowledge that some of these preachers may have possessed, when we consider that father and son associated with each other through a period of several hundred years, and imparted their wisdom and knowledge to each other; while the Angel of the Covenant walked with them as their Teacher and Guide, instructing them in divine truths much as he did with his disciples at a later period on the hills of Galilee. To preach righteousness was to preach the moral law, and that law includes the Fourth Commandment—the dedication of one-seventh of our time to God's service. But what we contend for is, that the JEWISH TYPE was *not* given to the world. The Jewish type was given to the Jew, and to the Jew only, with the exception of the proselyte or stranger within his gate. It was never given to the Gentile world. Dr. Fairbairn says of the Sabbath: "Having been engrafted into a religion so purely symbolical as the Mosaic, it was unavoidable that the bodily rest enjoined in it should acquire, like all the other outward things belonging to the religion, a symbolical and typical value." *Typology*, Vol. II., p. 126. Until this engrafting process was accomplished, it was neither type nor symbol to any Gentile nation. Dr. Fairbairn also confirms this when he admits (p. 129), "so little depended upon the exact day, that on the occasion of renewing the sabbatical institution in the wilderness, the Lord seems to have made the

weekly series run from the first giving of the manna. His example, therefore, in the work of creation, was intended merely to fix the relative proportion between the days of ordinary labor and those of sacred rest, and with that view is appealed to in the law." In this we believe Dr. Fairbairn to be right. We certainly can obtain no inference from Gen. ii. 3, that bears the faintest shadow of a command. The only inference we derive from this passage is, that God blessed and sanctified the seventh period of creation by making it the period in which the great drama of man's earthly career was to be enacted—his fall and redemption; otherwise it would have been stated as it was of the other six days: "the evening and the morning" were the seventh day; but the "evening" was yet to come in the Old Testament dispensation, and the "morning" of the New Covenant was far away in the distance of future ages. Nor is the seventh day anywhere called a Sabbath until the Jewish type was given to the Israelites. Until a written law was given, God's commands were taught by word of mouth, by men whom he called for this purpose as he did Abraham. The Patriarchal age was probably to some extent typical of that work which is now in progress in missionary fields, where Christian ministers (preachers of righteousness) are busily engaged in instructing unlettered men by word of mouth—imparting an imperfect knowledge of that law which their children will be able at some future time to read for themselves. Those who have labored as missionaries in the foreign field can understand this perfectly well.

In regard to Col. ii. 16, Dr. Fairbairn presents precisely the same view that we have given, which is undoubtedly the correct one. He says: "The apostle discharges Christians from the observance of Sabbath days, not in a false and improper sense, but in that very sense in which they were shadows of good things to come, placing them on a footing, in this respect, with distinctions of meat and drink. It is needless to say here that certain feast days of the Jews, being withdrawn from a common to a sacred use, were called Sabbaths, and that the apostle alludes exclusively to these. There can be no doubt, indeed, that they were so called and are also included here; but not to the exclusion of the seventh

day Sabbath, which, from the very nature of the case, was the one most likely to be thought of by the Colossians. Unless it had been expressly excepted, we must in fairness suppose it to have been at least equally intended with the others."—*Typology*, Vol. II., p. 125. Can anything be plainer than this? The Jewish Sabbath was abolished, and could by no manner of means be *transferred* to the Christian system. Again, Dr. Fairbairn says: "When another state of things was introduced, it became necessary to assign to such Sabbath—the Jewish seventh day of rest—a place among the things that were done away, and so far to change the ordinance itself as to transfer it to a different day, and even call it by a new name. But as baptism in the Spirit is Christ's circumcision, so the Lord's day is his Sabbath; and to be in the Spirit on that day, worshipping and serving him in the truth of his gospel, is to take up the yoke of the Fourth Commandment."—*Typology*, p. 127. Here in a nut-shell we have precisely the ground we advocate. The Jewish Sabbath is abolished. The "ordinance itself" becomes a new day—the Christian Lord's day. No one will for a moment pretend to say that Christ's circumcision by the Spirit is a transfer of Jewish carnal circumcision into the New Covenant system. Then, why contend that the Lord's day is a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath? There is no transfer about it. The one is a type of the other, and as such cannot be *transferred*. And yet Dr. Fairbairn maintains that the Fourth Commandment is to be observed literally. Why, we doubt very much if the good Doctor ever observed it literally himself—keeping Saturday instead of Sunday. The Fourth Commandment is no more to be understood literally than is the preface to the Ten Commandments, or the promise affixed to the Fifth, to be understood literally. "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," is applicable to every baptized child whom God has chosen from the bondage of the great heathen world (the true Egypt), by giving him his birth in a Christian land, of Christian parents, and with Christian privileges, in accordance with the covenant made with Abraham, that he would bless the infants of his spiritual seed. This is an election by birthright which no man can deny, and yet not the

election to eternal life in Christ from before the foundation of the world. "That thy days may be long in the land (Canaan) which the Lord thy God giveth thee," does not mean that every child who is obedient to his Christian parents shall be entitled to a homestead in modern Palestine, but that he shall be entitled to a long life of blessing and usefulness in the Christian Church, comparatively free from the vices and temptations to which his neighbors' children are continually exposed, hastening them on to an untimely grave.

Those who contend that the Fourth Commandment was literally given to the world from the beginning, would do well to stop and think a moment. If the Fourth Commandment, as it stands in the Decalogue, was literally given to the world, then the preface to the Ten Commandments was given literally also. Now, we know of no sense in which it can be said that God brought every child of Adam born into the world out of Egypt before he had learned the first table of the law, or even the First Commandment; unless the atonement of Christ was universal: that is, that Christ made atonement for Adam's sin for the whole race. Now this is a measure of New School doctrine which none of our Old School friends are going to accept. Nor is it literally true. Pharaoh and his hosts were not "brought up out of Egypt." The Canaanites destroyed by Joshua were never "brought up out of Egypt." The facts of the case are, that God brought his Church out of Egypt, including their infant children. Christ died for his Church, including the children of believers. The latter are redeemed from Egypt, or the pagan world, by birthright, inheriting the promises made to the fathers. If we are wrong on this point, we would thank any one who would put us right.

The Lord's day is a new day, in memory of Christ's resurrection; a day in which we are not to worship God by carnal ceremonies, but in spirit and in truth. The State can only enforce the outward observance of the Ten Commandments, but the gospel requires of its adherents their spiritual observance as well. The Jews observe the day in which Christ lay in the tomb, and rightly, too, as they reject the Saviour. We observe the day he arose. The Jewish system enjoined not only rest of the body on

the Sabbath, but also strict meditation in the law—a state of discipleship: but the Christian system requires the teaching of the gospel—a state of apostleship. Herein consists the great difference between the two days; hence the Christian Church cannot be too strict in the observance of the Lord's day, "spending the whole time in the public and private exercise of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy." We repeat, then, that we cannot be too strict in its observance. It is better for us to err on the right side, if we err at all, doing too much than too little; and when our summons comes to call us into the next period of rest—the rest in the New Jerusalem—may we hear with it the welcome reception, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

ARTICLE IV.

THE EVANGELIST AND CHURCH WORK.

In the present circumstances of our Church there are few matters of more interest, and which deserve to be more prayerfully considered, than those indicated in the title of this article. Doubtless, each one has some general idea as to what "the evangelist" is, and what his work should be. But have we the right idea? The writer does not pretend to be better informed nor more capable of correct judgment than others. Here is simply an expression of belief that in many cases wrong ideas are held as to evangelistic work; or if the *theory* is right, that the *practice* is wrong. Thank God for every conviction that the time has come when the evangelist is a much needed, if not an essential, factor in Church work. We are realising that we cannot keep pace with the work as it opens rapidly and widely on every side of us. The means used hitherto do not, as we are finding, suffice for meeting the demands made upon us. Our destitute regions seem to be enlarging rather than growing less. And now we are awaking to see that some extraordinary efforts and plans must be