

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE ARTICLE ENTITLED “A THOROUGHLY EDUCATED MINISTRY” EXAMINED BY THE AUTHOR OF “AN INQUIRY INTO THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF PRESBYTERIANISM.”¹

In essaying an answer to the criticism of our views contained in the April number of this REVIEW, we are aware that we undertake no light task. There are in the criticism elements of extraordinary strength. Judging from the admiration it extorts from a mind already satisfied to the contrary, it must have proven irresistible to others. As *a priori* reasoning, the argument amounts to a demonstration, but the strongest presumptive demonstration must yield to obstinate fact; and here, we think, lies the weakness of this otherwise strong paper. Its author has ignored some of the most conspicuous developments of the last half century; he has hung his votive tablet in the shrine of Logic, and right royally has the divinity responded to her devotee. We invoke the aid of her less brilliant sister, History.

Conviction is always strong; that of our author is so absolute

¹ It is due to the writer of this article to say that it was received in time for publication in the July number of the REVIEW, but our space was already fully occupied with previously accepted articles.—EDITORS SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

ARTICLE VI.

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

It is with extreme reluctance that we enter upon a review of the articles that appeared some time since in two consecutive numbers of this REVIEW, on "The Lord's Day, and not the Jewish Sabbath," by the late Rev. John Beveridge, as the hand that penned them now lies cold in death, and therefore utterly powerless to defend itself. But as so many of the positions of our tract on the "Holy Sabbath" have been assailed, and its very orthodoxy seemingly questioned, though with the *imprimatur* of the Church upon it, ; and as the views presented in the above mentioned articles are in so many important particulars so radically different from the commonly received opinions of the Christian world, and, in our judgment, so unscriptural and hurtful in their tendencies, that we cannot allow them to pass unchallenged. The interest clustering around the Sabbath is of no ordinary character. The foundation of this institution lies coördinate with the foundation of the Church and the structure of society, and the overthrow of the one means simply the overthrow of the other. It is impossible, therefore, for its friends to stand idly by and see any of its impregnable bulwarks undermined, either by the false positions of its friends or the open assaults of its foes, without lifting the voice in its defence. Whilst we shall endeavor to deal with all tenderness with the memory of our departed brother, we must be allowed to point out any error into which he has fallen, and show the dangerous tendency of some of his positions.

Our reviewer contends for what he terms the Lord's Day in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath. He maintains that there was no express command to observe a day of weekly rest before the exodus ; that the Jewish Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness in connexion with the giving of manna, and having nothing whatever to do with the creation as to its origin ; the fact of God's resting only being confirmatory of the appointment, and not the ground of it, that ground being the giving of the manna ;

that the Jewish Sabbath being a part of the Mosaic ritual, it was fulfilled with the rest of that ritual, and abolished with it; that the Christian Sabbath is not a transfer of anything from the old covenant—"not a patch on the old garment," as he expresses it—but something entirely new, being an outgrowth of the new covenant, and no more a transfer than the gospel ministry is a transfer of the Levitical priesthood; and we must therefore look to the New Testament teachings, as confirmed by the Old Testament types and the teachings of the prophets, for our warrant for its observance.

Before entering upon the consideration of his arguments, we must be allowed to take exceptions to his method of putting the question. He states it thus: "The Lord's Day, and not the Jewish Sabbath." - With all due deference, we must assert that this is not the issue. The alternative is not between the Lord's Day and a Sabbath that originated with the Jews. No one, that we are aware of, holds to the transfer of the Jewish Sabbath as such. The orthodox view is that the Christian Sabbath is not the transfer of a Jewish, but of the *original ordinance*, instituted at the creation, and which was temporarily ingrafted into the Mosaic ritual, as Fairbairn expresses it. The writer has correctly stated our view when he says: "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." P. 92. That this is precisely the position of the Holy Sabbath, appears from the following: "As the day existed previously, it could not have originated with the Mosaic ritual, and not having originated with that ritual, it could not in any way depend upon it for its perpetuity. Like the law of murder and the ordinance of marriage, having a previous and independent existence, and being of universal application, it was only united to the Sinaitic laws in a temporary union, and together with them formed the statutory code of the land; the after-dissolution of that union could only leave it where it found it. The only part that strictly belonged to the state was the

death penalty which was afterward added, and which has been repeated, being no part of the original law." P. 30. It seems strange, therefore, that with this interpretation of Fairbairn, and this clear and emphatic utterance of the Holy Sabbath before him, he should endeavor to confine the issue to a choice between the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's Day. If the real issue be the transfer of the original ordinance, then all that he has said about the death penalty, warm dinners, and our obligation to keep the day as the old Jews did, at once falls to the ground, being wholly irrelevant; and we might dismiss the further consideration of the subject, were it not for the many untenable and erroneous assertions and positions assumed in the course of the argument.

1. Before anything can be done towards upsetting the orthodox view, some disposition must necessarily be made of that first seventh day rest; for there it stands in its isolated grandeur, a Gibraltar of strength, upon the very opening pages of revelation. Naturally, therefore, our reviewer makes this his first point of attack, and his weapon the periodic character of God's resting. He argues that as God did not enter again upon the work of creation on the eighth day, that the seventh could not be a day of ordinary length, but a period, and reaching, as he defines it, "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." P. 617. The point of the argument is simply this, that as the seventh day was a period, and wholly disproportioned to the other six days, and extending to Christ, when the Creator begins to work again, but in another field, the field of redemption, the only solution is, that it must be a type of the gospel rest; and if so, then it furnishes no foundation for a seventh day rest of twenty-four hours.

In reply, we have to say, the Scriptures make no such distinction between day and period. They apply the same term alike to both. They say day each time. If you make the seventh day a period, why not the other six? To use the same word in such different senses, when in such close proximity, is a freedom in the use of the sacred text which seems wholly unwarrantable.

Further, if the Sabbath day of Genesis be a period extending

to Christ, then the conclusion is irresistible that the sacred period is past; for the blessing and the sanctifying which impart the sacredness are to be coextensive with the day. When it stops, they will also cease. But why stop with redemption? Did God then cease to rest? Is he not now resting? Can any one see any reason why the first four thousand years only of the world's history should be blessed? If the simple ground of resting be the ground of blessing, then all future time must be blessed, for God is now resting, and will ever continue to rest. And not only so, but as a question of fact, is it true that God waited four thousand years before he commenced the work of redemption? If he did, what became of the inhabitants of the old world? Are they all lost? If saved, upon what ground? We have always been accustomed to think that initiative steps were taken for the salvation of man immediately after his fall. To say that the seventh day is a period, and that period to be limited to the time of Christ, seems arbitrary in the extreme.

Then, if this be the only period blessed and sanctified, in what did the blessing consist, and how sanctified? To sanctify is to set apart from a common to a sacred use. But where is the evidence of God's setting apart this first four thousand years for a sacred use? And for whom? Surely not for himself; for all times are equally sacred with him. And if for man, how was he to observe it? The writer tells us how it was blessed and sanctified. "He blessed it by walking with man at the beginning, and sanctified it by coming himself in human flesh to redeem man from the curse of the fall." P. 617. Thus, according to our reviewer, this period was blessed only at its beginning, and sanctified at its close. But did Moses speak thus? Did he say the blessing was confined to the beginning, and the sanctification did not come till its close? If blessed only at the beginning, we do not see how that could be a reason for the Jews sanctifying the *whole* of the seventh day; and if the sanctification was withheld till its close, we are equally at a loss to understand how a sanctification not yet accomplished could be given as a reason why the Jews should sanctify anything. And even if the whole of the period were blessed and sanctified, we are still unable to see why the Jew or any

one else should keep holy one-seventh of their time because the Lord rested four thousand years; and yet the writer so uses it. He makes the resting confirmatory of the appointment of the Jewish Sabbath in the wilderness. The giving of the manna the ground, the resting the confirmation of the ordinance. They were to rest, because God had rested.

And now we might just as well consider this period difficulty here as at any other time. Let us admit, for argument sake, that the seventh day was a period extending to Christ, and what then? May not the first six days be periods of similar length, and if so, what becomes of the argument based upon the ground of disproportion? Or even extend it to the final consummation of all things, and those first six periods may still also have been periods of similar length. We know nothing about the length of days in the early cosmogony. As God's ways are not as our ways, neither are his days as our days. And no matter how prolonged they may have been, it is very easy for us to see how they could be made to correspond in length with the period of God's resting, though that period may have run through interminable ages to the time when, in his inscrutable wisdom, he may begin the inauguration of a new scheme of readjustment of his works, if not of a new creation. If so, we at once have an answer to the argument of disproportion.

But this idea of seven equal periods, though furnishing an answer to the argument of our reviewer, does not meet the real difficulty in the case, and for the reason that no matter whether we adopt the geologic idea of six indefinite periods or not, the difficulty resting upon the ground of disproportion will remain, since God's resting does not stop with redemption, nor yet with the dawn of heaven, but will continue for ever; and his blessing, instead of stopping, will only deepen and widen throughout the countless ages of eternity. And though the first six geologic periods may embrace millions upon millions of years, there will always be a disproportion between them and the eternal rest of God.

The true and only solution of the difficulty, in our judgment, lies in the typical and prophetic history of the Scriptures and of the world. Any one who has given any attention to this subject,

knows that the prophetic plan is that of a system within a system, a period within a period, and that the last period of any one series includes all the series of the next period. Thus, the seventh seal contained the seven trumpets, the seventh trumpet contained the seven vials; so the seventh day of creation contains the whole of redemption, both in its typical and actual aspects. Like seven concentric circles, these periods lie within each other, the innermost being the Sabbath of creation, interminable in its very nature, and having in its bosom other concentric circles, representing redemption in all its phases, including the rest of the gospel and terminating in the rest of heaven. Even as the bark includes the concentric rings of the enclosed body, showing the growth and development of the tree, and as the court surrounded the tabernacle that contained in its bosom the shekinah of the Lord, so the sabbatic rest of creation includes the entire series to follow. It swallows up in its vast sweep all the other rests, till at last it merges into the rest of heaven. Like the two opposite oceans, the complements of each, these two rests, the rest of creation and the rest of redemption, though distinct, are nevertheless bound together, and after all are one and inseparable. The rest of heaven is but the completion and perfection of the first rest of creation: the seventh day rest, the rest of Canaan, the rest of the sabbatic year, and the rest of jubilee, as well as that of Canaan, being but integral portions of the first, and adumbrations of the second. Hence the expression of Scripture, "Enter into his rest," which clearly began at creation, but stretches illimitably into eternity. The seven days of creation is emphatically the foundation of the whole scheme, giving shape to the whole interior structure, as the rind or bark determines the configuration of the enclosed kernel. To make the rest of the Creator cease with Christ, or to make the scheme of creation simply confirmatory of the Sabbath appointment, instead of the ground of it, is certainly a misconception of the whole scheme.

2. The second step in the argument of our reviewer is the giving of the Jewish Sabbath. Having, to his satisfaction, destroyed all foundation for the ordinance in the seventh day rest of creation,

his next step is to show that the Jewish Sabbath was peculiarly a Jewish institution, and therefore not binding upon us. The argument is this, that as the Jewish Sabbath was given in connexion with the manna, and as the manna was fulfilled in Christ, the true Bread, so the Sabbath was fulfilled in the spiritual rest that Christ brings his people. The force of this argument clearly rests upon these two points: 1st. The implied assumption that the Sabbath is now instituted for the first time. 2d. The indissoluble union of the manna with it, and the fulfilment of the two in Christ.

As the first of these is the main point in the whole controversy, we invite special attention to it. And we at once raise the question, Was the appointment in the wilderness the initial point of the institution? This is what our reviewer asserts with emphasis over and over again, and yet, with the increasing necessities of the argument, he is compelled to modify and even deny the same. "Moses," says he, "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." P. 620. "Counting from the tenth day of the first month, when the passover lamb was chosen, to the twenty-second day of the second month, that on which the Jewish Sabbath was *first instituted*." P. 622. "Now just as the Jewish Sabbath was *instituted* forty-two days after the passover lamb." P. 623. Here in these passages he makes the wilderness the beginning. But in other places, as the necessities of the argument press upon him, he locates the origin even of the Jewish Sabbath farther back. In the January number he says: "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." P. 71. "The carnal first-born lay in the tomb in Egypt on that day which was the *origin* of the Jewish Sabbath." P. 71. "It was in memory of a dark and terrible night when Israel went out of Egypt, that resulted in the *institu-*

tion of the Jewish Sabbath." P. 74. "Just as Christ was forced into his grave at the commencement of a Jewish Sabbath, that Israel passed through the Red Sea *on the Sabbath day* also." P. 74. (The italics in the above are ours.) Here, then, at one time it is distinctly asserted that the Sabbath was instituted for the first time in the wilderness, at another just as distinct mention is made of its existence in Egypt. At one time it is given in connexion with the manna, from which it can never be divorced, at another with the deliverance from Egypt, and as a memento of death, the children of Israel having "passed through the Red Sea on the Sabbath day also." Now which does he mean? Why assert so positively that the ordinance originated in the wilderness, if the necessities of the argument demanded its recognition in Egypt and at the Red Sea? And if its existence be recognised in Egypt, why not at a still earlier period, in that "proper portion of their time," which he had reason to infer that God required of the patriarchs of old? "We know," says he, "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." P. 618. And what would be a more proper portion than a seventh? The very fact that God afterwards by formal statute required that portion, is of itself sufficient to lead to the conclusion that that was the portion then required. And, indeed, this is what our reviewer is forced to admit, though in the face of his argument. Says he, "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 of rest." P. 92. And what was this but the Sabbath? Here, then, according to the admission of the writer himself we have traces of a Sabbath running back far anterior to

the time of Moses, wholly inexplicable upon any other supposition than the existence of an ordinance, traditionally or verbally communicated, as he expresses it; but nevertheless in existence. And what matters it whether verbal or written? A verbal communication would be just as binding as any other. Can we suppose for a moment that there were no sacred rites and sacred times; no Sabbaths of communion with God prior to the flood? Did God thus abandon his chosen seed for fifteen hundred years? No, says the whole analogy of Scripture. No, says our reviewer himself. "We consider it a great error to say that the antediluvian world had no seventh day of rest." God doubtless did communicate his will in this as other things of which we have no mention in the Scriptures. Why, then should it be considered an incredible thing that that should first be communicated privately and verbally to the line of the patriarchs which was afterwards given by Moses publicly with all the formality of statutory law?

But let us look more closely into this proposed origin of the Jewish Sabbath, given in the wilderness for the first time, and given in connexion with the manna. These were unquestionably given together, but in what order? One must have preceded the other. Which, then, the cause, and which the effect? Did the manna give rise to the Sabbath, or the Sabbath to the manna? Our reviewer adopts the former. Says he: "The Sabbath day was given to the Jews because God gave them food from heaven for six days, doubling the supply on the seventh." P. 621. How different this language from that used by Moses will appear at a single glance. Moses says: "See, for the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Ex. xvi. 29. Our reviewer says the Sabbath was given because of the doubling of the manna on the sixth day. We understand Moses to say just the reverse: that the manna was doubled on the sixth day because the Lord had given them the seventh as a Sabbath. Look at the history: with the first promise of manna is coupled the command to gather twice as much on the sixth day. For six consecutive days the people gathered an homer apiece. On the sixth day they gathered two homers. The elders report the fact to Moses, and he explains,

"This is what the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord," and for this reason they were required to gather double. With this explanation is coupled the additional instruction to bake or seethe what they had and keep the remainder for the next day. Then follows the standing command to gather it for six days, with a double portion on the sixth, for there would be none on the seventh, and for the reason already assigned, that "the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Let any one turn and read the history in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus and see if the idea of the pre-existence of a Sabbath does not underlie the whole transaction.

The utter falsity of this manna theory will further appear, not only from the explicit language of Moses, but its utter unreasonableness. An institution that was to occupy such a conspicuous position, and play such an important rôle in the after history of the Church and world, being the adumbration of so much that is grand and glorious, founded in the merest circumstance of gathering a double portion of manna! How natural the inquiry, Why was the quantity doubled on the sixth day more than on the eighth or ninth? and how impossible of explanation, according to the theory of the writer. God has a reason for all that he does. It is not for us to scan his plans and demand reasons of him. But who does not see, with all the luminousness of a sunbeam, his finger pointing to the original rest as the foundation of the appointment, the giving of the manna being simply the occasion of the renewal of the original ordinance, he himself thus showing respect to his own appointment: To make the manna-gathering the foundation, and the rest of creation simply confirmatory, instead of creation the foundation and the rest in the wilderness the after development, is simply to contradict the whole analogy of nature which requires the embryonic cell to contain the germ of all that is future.

Besides, if the original idea of the Sabbath be simply a rest from manna-gathering, how account for the prohibition in other directions? They were not to do work of any kind, and wherefore? Because the manna was doubled on that day? Is that any rea-

son why the people should rest all day and do no other work? The theory utterly fails to explain the universality of the prohibition. It explains why there should be cessation from manna-gathering, but not from other work. And is it not strange, if manna-gathering be the foundation of the rest, that when God so shortly afterwards thundered that law so loudly in the ears of Israel, he said not one word about resting from manna-gathering? Six days shalt thou work and rest on the seventh, not because thou rested from manna-gathering, but solely upon the ground that the Lord thy God rested on the seventh day after six days of labor. In view of the awful surroundings and proximity to Sinai, to make the simple fact of resting from manna-gathering the ground of the appointment is irrational and unsatisfactory in the extreme.

This brings us to the second part of our reviewer's argument, the typical character of the manna, and its indissoluble union with the Jewish Sabbath. These, we are told, were bound together in a union "from which they can never be divorced." And as the one was fulfilled in Christ, the true Bread, so must the other likewise be fulfilled in the rest that he brings, and this, of course, brings the termination of the Jewish Sabbath, it being merged in that rest to which it pointed, and in which it was fulfilled.

One would suppose, from the prominence given this argument, that surely there was no doubt in the mind of the writer as to the true typical character of the manna. But let him speak for himself. Speaking of Christ, he says, "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." P. 623. Again, "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 the rest of his kingdom?" P. 625. Here, then, we have an argument based upon an assertion, the truth of which is afterwards doubted, if the assertion itself be not retracted. If the typical

character of the manna be the thing that limits the fulfilment of the Jewish Sabbath in the gospel rest, and that be surrendered, then what becomes of the limitation? Furthermore, can any one see any reason why things so diverse as the manna and the Sabbath should be indissolubly bound together? Besides, as a matter of fact, that union was not indissoluble. The manna gave out in Canaan and the Sabbath continued. They can never be divorced, says the writer, and yet they were divorced. What, then, becomes of the argument based upon the indissolubility of the union? And still further, if the Sabbath survived the manna, why may it not in its essential features still and ever continue to exist? And this must necessarily be the case, unless fulfilled in something. What, then, did it represent? and in what fulfilled?

And here again our reviewer seems particularly unfortunate. For at one time he makes it mean one thing, and at another quite another. At one time, "the type of Christ," p. 54; "a shadow fulfilled," when Christ the body comes, p. 637. At another, the Christian Sabbath, "the first day of man's redemption," p. 63; the Sabbath day fulfilled in the Lord's day, "the antitype," p. 78. Then at another still, the "type of that rest of the soul from the bondage of sin, which our Saviour introduced." P. 57. Thus at one time it is made the type of a definite, at another of an indefinite, period. At one time the type of the Christian Sabbath, and at another of the whole Christian era! Furthermore, whilst making it the type of the Christian Sabbath and gospel rest, he at the same time argues that it differs from the former, inasmuch as whilst the Christian Sabbath was the "symbol of light," the Jewish was the "symbol of darkness," and yet one the type of the other! That which is the symbol of darkness the type of that which is the symbol of light!

But we must insist upon knowing what has become of the Jewish Sabbath. "That a type is a prophecy that cannot be abolished until fulfilled in the antitype, is a truth which no one can question," says the writer, p. 56. Again: "The Jewish nation may be considered a type of the world from the death of Christ to the end of time." P. 621. Of what, then, was the Jewish Sabbath a type? What has become of it? Was it fulfilled in

the Christian Sabbath, or the rest of the soul? Or if not, in what? It is a very easy matter to say fulfilled in Christ, and therefore abolished. But how, wherein, and according to what law? In the formal delivery of the law, but a few days afterwards at Sinai, not one word was said about manna. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," etc. Now, we would like very much to be told wherein this law of labor of working six days and resting one has been fulfilled in Christ. Go, read and see what Jeremiah and the prophets, when speaking of gospel times, say about working on the Sabbath, and calling it a delight, and tell us where the same has been fulfilled in Christ. We simply deny the allegation that the law establishing the Sabbath at Sinai has been fulfilled in Christ, and challenge the world to show wherein the Fourth Commandment has been fulfilled in Christ, any more than the Seventh or Eighth or Ninth. If the Fourth Commandment has been abolished because fulfilled, so has the Sixth and Seventh and Eighth, and man is for ever absolved from the sin of murder, adultery, and theft. Christ has distinctly laid down the law that nothing has been abolished save what was fulfilled in him. Now, if a part of the law requiring a seventh day of rest has been abolished by reason of the fact that Christ has substituted another rest in the place of it, and into which it merges, then tell us wherein the other part, requiring six days of labor has been fulfilled by him in the substitution of labor for the six days of work required of the Jews. We simply assert it, without any fear of contradiction, that Christ has never kept that part of the law requiring six days of work, so that he has released the Jews, or any body else, from the duty of manual toil and labor.

We are now in the very heart of this controversy, and therefore invite special attention to the points involved. If the Jewish nation is to be considered the "type of the whole world from the death of Christ to the end of time," as our writer asserts, then the rest of Canaan is to perform a very conspicuous part in the system of typology, being its fulfilment, and therefore its termination. If the land of Canaan be the "type of God's kingdom," as he also asserts, then its rest must be the type of the rest of

that kingdom, begun on earth and completed in heaven. But here is the astounding fact, that whilst the manna gives out, the Sabbath from which it "can never be divorced" continues on. The sabbatic year and the year of jubilee, having their origin in Canaan, according to the law of types, must find their fulfilment in the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the prophetic unfoldings of the Apocalypse. But not so with the Sabbath. That originated anterior to the rest of Canaan, and as part of the typical system ought to have been fulfilled, and, like the manna, ceased upon entering Canaan, especially according to the argument of our reviewer, who insists that the rest of the Sabbath bears the same relation to the rest of Canaan, that the Christian Sabbath does to the rest of the gospel. The latter, therefore, is clearly the earnest, prophecy, and pledge of the final rest which is but the completion of that which begins on earth. So the other must have been the earnest, prophecy, and pledge of the rest of Canaan. If so, why did it not cease upon the entering upon that rest, just the same as the other is to cease when it merges into the everlasting rest of heaven? How explain its continuance? "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." P. 623. But what law? Why did he not tell us? It was indissolubly bound with the manna, but the manna had ceased. The manna clearly pointed to the corn in Canaan, and found its first fulfilment in the ample provisions made for the support of Israel in Canaan. Hence it ceased as soon as the corn was reached. These, again, to a higher fulfilment in the true Israel feeding upon Christ, the true manna, in their pilgrimage through this world to the heavenly Canaan. For the same reason, the Sabbath ought to have had its fulfilment in Canaan, and merged into its rest. Here, then, are the only alternatives. If the type of the rest of Canaan, it ought to have ceased on entering Canaan. If the type of the Christian Sabbath, as he asserts, then it simply gives place to that Sabbath. If of the gospel rest, which our reviewer so strenuously maintains, then, as the rest of Canaan was the type of the gospel rest, and the Sabbath rest did not cease on entering upon

that rest, neither should it now cease until we enter upon the higher rest of heaven. The truth is, our reviewer is completely at a loss to know what to do with the Jewish Sabbath. Hence, at one time he makes it the type of the Canaanitic rest; at another, of the Christian Sabbath; and still at another, of the gospel rest; and in the midst of all this confusion, and with the general statement "fulfilled in Christ," he leaves it wholly unexplained. The truth is, there is but the one simple, scriptural, rational explanation, and that is, that the original law indelibly stamped upon the whole creation at the beginning, and reiterated at Sinai with such tremendous emphasis, can be the type of, and fulfilled in, nothing less than the everlasting rest of heaven, and therefore must continue to bind to the end of time.

3. Having disposed of the seventh day rest of creation and the Jewish Sabbath, the next step of our reviewer is to show the true foundation of the Christian Sabbath. This he asserts to be the new covenant, it being simply an outgrowth of that covenant, having its germ, however, in the Pentecost. But where is the evidence of this? The Pentecost was an annual feast, the Sabbath a weekly rest. How could the one grow out of the other? The very enunciation of the proposition is enough to show its unreasonableness. A weekly rest the outgrowth of an annual feast! How much easier to make it the outgrowth of a former Sabbath, to which it stood in the relation of "antitype," according to the writer's own statement. Further, if the Christian Sabbath be something entirely new, and "not a patch on an old garment," how can it have its germ in the Pentecost? An outgrowth of the new covenant, and yet the Pentecost its germ. If the Pentecost be its germ, is it not rather the outgrowth of the old covenant?

We have here, indeed, a strange bridging over the chasm between the old and new covenants. We followed the Jewish Sabbath to the close of the old dispensation, when it suddenly disappeared like some of those rivers that so mysteriously sink out of sight in the earth. Then at the beginning of the new, we find the Sabbath again springing up as a full grown river out of the ground, and yet no connexion, but entirely new; a Sabbath on

one side, and a Sabbath on the other, and yet no connexion ; the latter a new outgrowth ! Although entirely new, and not a patch, yet strange to say, he finds it necessary to use the old as illustrative and explanatory of the new, and which simply means that the one, if nothing more, must be the shadow of the other, and if so, the same in essence. It is idle to talk of anything being entirely new when it is necessary to go back to the old for its germ. The river phenomenon could easily be explained upon the supposition that it was precisely the same river with a new name and in a new bed. But not so here. Our reviewer attempts a different explanation, "The new covenant rest," says he, "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." "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 then become perfectly plain." P. 62. But why the rest of Canaan ? We had thought all along the analogy was between the first long period of creation and the second long period of grace ; that the Christian Sabbath was the outgrowth of the one, as the Jewish was of the other ; and on this principle, according to the law of the first fruits, the separation of a part being a pledge of the consecration of the whole. "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." P. 63. Thus the second Sabbath was the outgrowth of the second rest, as the first the outgrowth of the first. But if so, why overleap that first long period altogether, or wait till the rest of Canaan to draw the analogy ? And how can there be any analogy between the rest of grace and the rest of Canaan, when the Sabbath was not its outgrowth, being in existence before the entrance into Canaan ? And here we have another illustration of the loose and illogical theory of our reviewer. At one time the Sabbath is the outgrowth of the manna ; at another, the

rest from Egypt; at another, the rest of Canaan; at another, the first long period of creation—and all this confusion clearly the legitimate outgrowth of that fundamental error which denies the true origin of a day of rest. The truth grows upon us as we proceed, that the Sabbath rest is the outgrowth of none of these, or anything else than the first rest of creation, when the Creator, at the conclusion of his work, pronounced his approving benediction, "that all was good," and proclaimed from his high throne in the listening ears of the universe, that the seventh period was for ever to be the hallowed period to the end of time.

Having thus hastily sketched the general outline of the theory and the arguments of the writer, we proceed to point out some of the more obvious and serious difficulties connected with the same.

1. In the first place, it utterly fails to give anything like a satisfactory explanation of that first broad fundamental statement that God rested on the seventh day, and therefore blessed and hallowed it. There is manifestly a creation of a day of rest at the very beginning. The question naturally arises, What ever became of it? Any theory that fails to answer that question, must be fundamentally defective. We think we do our reviewer no injustice when we say that his theory completely ignores the existence of such a day of rest. No such divinely-appointed day of rest based on the fact of creation till the time of the exodus. The Jewish Sabbath a new institution, the outgrowth of the manna-giving, and the Christian Sabbath a new institution, the outgrowth of the new covenant. The old patriarchs required to give a proper portion of their time, but not the original seventh day rest; thus that original rest day is completely ignored in his theory, though such prominence is given it by Moses in his history.

The only explanation he gives is, that this statement was historical, not mandatory. Admit it, and what is gained? Is it not the history of a command? Is it not an inspired statement, setting forth the fact that such a day was then appointed, though the special command to the old patriarchs omitted through brevity of the record? If such a day was sanctified and set apart at the beginning, for whom if not for man? Surely not for God

and the angels ; nor yet was it simply sanctified in the abstract ; that would amount to nothing. So the sanctifying a day and setting it apart for a use, and yet no command connected therewith, would be a strange anomaly. The very appointment of the day carries with it the idea of command. Besides, if this statement be simply historical, where did the writer get his authority for his first long sabbatic period ? If a period could be sanctified by it, why not a day ?

That a Sabbath day existed at the beginning is obvious, from the fact that God himself observed it. Moses says, God entered upon the rest immediately after the creation. So does Paul, Heb. iv. 4. The writer himself says the long period was blessed at the beginning, immediately after creation, and sanctified at its close, at redemption. To delay the sanctification to the close of the long period, is simply an unwarrantable separation by a space of four thousand years of things closely conjoined by the pen of inspiration. It is completely to ignore the example of God in keeping the day himself. Besides being a simple contradiction with the fact that the sanctification existed in the wilderness and the land of Canaan, as the writer asserts. He simply contradicts himself when he declares that the long period was sanctified at its close, and then turns round and argues for the existence of a Jewish Sabbath, from the fact that the period was already sanctified, the Jewish Sabbath being simply the first fruits or pledge of the sanctification of the whole of that period. The fact of a sanctified time at the beginning, settles the whole question. The historical statement and example of God prove the existence of the ordinance. The simple absence from the record of a formal statute to observe the day has no force. It is a very easy matter to understand how that, in the early history of the race, in the absence of all written law, God made known his will to his creatures concerning this thing by verbal communications, as he did with regard to sacrifices and other things of which we have no mention.

Not only does this theory fail to explain the fact of creation, but also degrades it to a secondary place. The theory is that the giving of the manna was the ground of the appointment,

the resting of God simply subsidiary and confirmatory. "The law confirmed," says the writer. The doubling of the manna the reason, the example of God the confirmation. Now we submit, if this be not a marvellously strange grouping of first and secondary causes? The manna first, and creation last. A complete transposition of events in the order of time. And not only so, but the making the less the cause of the greater; the boy the father of the man; creation projected with reference to the manna, and not the manna given with reference to creation. God must create the world in six days because the Israelites were to gather manna for six days, and not the Israelites must gather for six days because the Lord had wrought for that many days. The example of man the model for God, and not the example of God the model for man. God's rest made to suit the after-history, and not the after-history to suit the rest. The theory of the writer simply does violence to all reason, in thus degrading the sublime and stupendous facts of creation to a secondary and subordinate place, in making them merely confirmatory instead of the very foundation and origin of the original ordinance.

2. The theory fails just as signally in accounting for the septenary cycles, with which the whole scheme of revelation and providence are so completely interlaced. We meet with the number seven and its multiples on every side; seven days, seven weeks, seven years; so forty-two marches, forty-two years, forty-two months. Is the giving of the manna the foundation of all this? How unreasonable the supposition that all these hebdomadal divisions and typical arrangements that run all through the Scriptures, its history, its types, its prophecies, should all grow out of such a comparatively unimportant event as the gathering of manna! How much more reasonable that the giving of the manna itself, as well as all these others, should be made conformable to the first general plan sketched out at the very commencement, and made the foundation for all future operations!

The first seven days of creation were unquestionably prophetic days, even as every germ and every seed contain the prophecy and pledge of the future plant, and as the last seven periods of revelation were prophetic of what was to be to the end of time.

The seventh seal, as we have already seen, contains seven trumpets, the seventh trumpet seven vials, and the seventh vial the destruction of the beast with seven heads. So the seventh day of creation contains seven millenary periods, the last being the millennium of the Apocalypse, and this millennium, in turn, may, for aught we know, contain the seven periods, the last of which is the everlasting rest of heaven.

Then, going back again to the first, as there is always a creation within a creation, the one natural, the other spiritual; the one the shell, the other the kernel enclosed within its enfoldings, and receiving all its configurations therefrom, and beginning with the seven typical periods of Israel, marked by the forty-two stations and forty-two years of toil, we meet with another seventh period of rest in Canaan, and this period comprehending seven other periods; the seventh day bringing on the weekly Sabbath; the seventh Sabbath the Pentecost; the seventh Pentecost the Jewish year; the seventh year the sabbatic year, and the seventh sabbatic year the jubilee; and all prophetic of the forty-two months of the Apocalypse, embracing six other periods of the churches' toil, and again terminating in the millennium of rest, and all showing the entire misconception of those who think the first long period of rest upsets the foundation for the Christian Sabbath. Instead of overthrowing, it only confirms. The first long period, like the seventh seal that embraces the seven trumpets and seven vials, instead of stopping with the time of redemption, as our reviewer would have us believe, takes in its vast sweep all times till the end of time. It includes the hebdomadal divisions in nature, in the wilderness, in Canaan, in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and likewise all rests; the seventh day rest, the rest of the patriarchs and of Israel, the seventh year rest, and the rest of jubilee, or the seventh seven years of rest of Canaan, and the millennium or seventh thousand year rest of the world; and merging at last into the everlasting rest of heaven. God the Creator resting after six periods of toil; God the Redeemer resting after six periods of toil; Israel resting after six periods of toil; the Church, the true Israel, resting after six periods of toil; and all terminating in the everlasting sabbatism of the skies! Now surely

the giving of the manna is not the foundation for all this mysterious symbolism. Nothing gives the key to it but the broad philosophic statement in the opening chapters in the Book, that God rested on the seventh period, and therefore the seventh period is the blessed and hallowed period, and the foundation for all the other holy periods, patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian, and how much beyond, we are unable to say. The Sabbath is laid deep in nature and in the very constitution of the universe; and those who are endeavoring to overthrow it, are endeavoring to upheave the very foundation of the universe itself.

3. But the most serious defect and greatest objection to the theory is, that it utterly fails to give any rational and satisfactory account of the Christian Sabbath. If there be no command to observe a seventh day rest previous to the Exodus, and if the Jewish Sabbath was given entirely to the Jews, and now done away with, because fulfilled and no longer obligatory, then where is your authority for asserting its claims? If a new institution, it can be maintained only upon the supposition of a new and positive command. The teachings of the prophets are good as far as they go, but are not enough, nor yet the practice of the apostles. The writer himself admits this to be too vague, and therefore claims higher authority than even that of the apostles or Moses, even the Lord of the Sabbath. But why did he not produce the authority? If it were a transfer simply of something already existing, no such command would be necessary; but if new, it demands such authority. He tells us it was an outgrowth of the new covenant as the gospel ministry. But the cases are not at all analogous. We have an account of the direct appointment of the ministry, but not so of this. He tells us it is a new institution, but goes back to Moses and the prophets, and even the moral law, for his authority.

Now, we lay down this broad axiom: Before he can go back to the old dispensation for authority, the things must in some way be connected, and this in one of two ways. The things must be identically the same, or one must be the type of the other. Our reviewer adopts the latter, and therefore, in arguing from the prophets, declares that what they said literally, must be under-

stood spiritually, concerning the Christian Sabbath, which he asserts is the antitype of the Jewish, though elsewhere he makes the latter the type of the gospel rest. He also tells us that the former bears the same relation to the rest of the gospel that the latter did to the rest of Canaan. If so, then as the latter existed previously to the rest of Canaan, the former must also have existed previously to the rest of the gospel; and if so, then, according to his own position, it becomes a simple transfer, notwithstanding his assertion and argument to the contrary.

Now, the objection to this whole interpretation is this, that if you reject the orthodox position, which is, that the Christian Sabbath is not the antitype or simple transfer of the Jewish, but the coming down or flowing through of the original institution, then you are completely barred from the use of all arguments from the Old Testament, unless you adopt the typical character of the Jewish Sabbath, as the writer did, without being able to say of what it was the type, and in what fulfilled; whether the Christian Sabbath, or the gospel rest. Make it the type of either, and what then? Why, simply this, that the physical rest is all abolished. According to the law of types, the antitype must have the same meaning with the type, only in a higher sense. In other words, the Jewish Sabbath being a rest from physical toil, the Christian must be entirely a spiritual rest. This is precisely the position of our reviewer. Driven by his logic, he was compelled to assert that the Christian rest was not a rest of body, but of soul; that the burdens of which Jeremiah speaks were not "packages of rice and sugar, but mental burdens." In other words, that there is now no law forbidding physical toil and labor. What an admission, and what an argument to support it!

But the strange thing is, that notwithstanding all this, he still insists on quoting the Fourth Commandment as authority. And wherefore? If the institution be a new ordinance, why go to the law at all? According to his position, the Pentecost was the germ of the institution. If so, what had the law to do with it? Did it escape him that the law was given before the Pentecost, and the Jewish Sabbath even before that? How, then, can these things be authority for that which had its germ, its initial point,

after them ? Besides, if the old ordinance be abolished, what becomes of the law that controls it ? If the Jewish Sabbath be overthrown, then is not the Fourth Commandment too, which was given with exclusive reference to that Sabbath, according to the theory of the writer ? And if the fourth, the other nine also. To overthrow the Jewish Sabbath, is simply to overthrow the law that supports it, and with the overthrow of the one comes the overthrow of the entire code of which it forms an integral portion.

But to avoid this difficulty, our reviewer divides the law into that which is typical and that which is moral. "We do not deny," says he, "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." "The Ten Commandments spoken in an audible voice from the summit of a typical mountain, etc., are vastly different from the moral law given by God to the universe." P. 629. The Ten Commandments, having a typical and moral meaning, and yet not the moral law written on the tablets of the heart ! We are at a loss to know either what he means or what his authority for these distinctions. Whether we understand him or not, we think we know this much, that if this distinction exists in the Fourth, so also in the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth ; and if the typical be abolished in the one, so in the others. And when the typical is abolished from adultery and theft and murder, we would like very much to know what will be left.

Indeed, the position of the writer on this whole subject of the perpetuity of the moral law, seems to us remarkably strange and confused. Says he: "We read of the everlasting gospel, but nowhere of the everlasting law." P. 629. "Christ kept the law for man through life, and annihilated it for him through eternity." P. 630. The moral law eternal, and yet annihilated through eternity ! Written once upon tablets of stone, now on tablets of fleshly hearts, and yet under no law hereafter, or else under a new moral law entirely ! Is this revelation ? Is it reason ?

That he is speaking about the moral law, appears from the following quotation: "Is that throne which is to shelter us to be based on the Ten Commandments ? Does not probation end

when we pass from earth to heaven? Of what use the Ten Commandments in a world where there can be no sin?" P. 629. To our ears all this sounds very strange in a leading Presbyterian journal. We were always taught to believe that the essential principles of morality were eternally the same, everywhere in God's boundless empire; that the moral law was but the transcript of the divine nature itself, founded in the very nature of things, and having for its basis the unchanging will of an unchanging God; and therefore unchangeable and eternal, and that when translated to heaven, the law will be translated with us, not written, however, upon outward tablets, because then written upon our very hearts and stamped upon our very natures; and therefore in all its essential principles will be our rule through eternity. And yet we are told the law is annihilated for ever! Why, if annihilated in heaven, it is annihilated in hell, and the lost are for ever absolved from its future demands, and will be held responsible only for transgressions that are past. And, indeed, if Christ is to do the work of annihilation, has he not already done it, and the law already annihilated, and we, therefore, for ever freed from it?

The law has, indeed, been abolished as a condition of justification, but never as a standard of duty. Christ did not come to abolish any law, but to uphold, establish, fulfil. Instead of annihilating the law, the very object of his mission was to enable us to keep that very law. This is precisely what we understand the apostle to assert when he says: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. viii. 3, 4. The problem was to secure obedience on our part. Two things were necessary to this end. The first was our justification, or, in other words, our deliverance from the judicial condemnation of law. This was effected by Christ's paying the penalty of death, and furnishing the perfect righteousness required. The other part of the problem was our sanctification, so that we would sin no more. This is effected by his blood and Spirit, two of the most

powerfully cleansing agencies in the universe. The Spirit renews, and the blood cleanses from all sin. And now being sanctified, the redeemed shall hereafter be able, in their own strength through Christ, to keep the law of God perfectly, even as the angels do in heaven. And there shall be no more sin; not because there shall be no more law, but for the better reason, that, being sanctified, they will ever be able to keep that law.

And now, so far as the Sabbath is concerned, being the type and first fruits of the everlasting rest, it will hereafter be merged into that rest; and instead of being annihilated, will only become universally and eternally established.

The position of our reviewer seems to us, if not entirely abolishing the Sabbath, to place it at least upon a very precarious foundation. If there be no command to observe a weekly rest before the manna; if the old Sabbath was exclusively for the Jews, and abolished in Christ; if the practice of the apostles be "too vague," as he asserts, and there be no positive precept in the New Testament, then upon what does the institution rest? Once admit that the Fourth Commandment was part of the Jewish ritual and abolished, and it will be idle afterwards, as he does, to appeal to that Commandment as furnishing any ground for observing the Christian Sabbath. Tell the world that the Fourth Commandment was exclusively Jewish, and abolished with their ceremonial law, and then tell them to keep the Christian Sabbath because the Jew was commanded to keep it, and they will laugh at you. Tell them that it is the type of gospel rest, and therefore they should keep it, and you need not be astonished that they will contemptuously curl the lip at such sophistical reasoning. The little reverence for the Christian Sabbath in Continental Europe to-day, is but the legitimate fruit of the lax teachings of the old Reformers upon the subject. And let those teachings be revived in this country, and the result will be the same. Do away with the original ordinance and the binding obligation of the Fourth Commandment, and our main defences are gone. And how, after virtually surrendering both of these, our reviewer could use such severe terms concerning the Sabbath-breaker as he does, we are at a loss to know: "Brand him as you would a thief." "The man

who will not devote a portion of his time, . . . is a villain." "Brand him as a thief and robber." P. 86. Such denunciation and such reasoning are wholly incongruous.

We place this institution upon far higher, stronger ground, and just where we think the Scriptures place it. Our position is, that its foundation was laid in the scheme of creation, and made the basis of all subsequent arrangements; that it was orally delivered to the patriarchs, and afterwards formally incorporated in the moral law, which was given to the Jews, but not intended for them alone, but for the whole world. Antedating and forming no part of the ceremonial law, it could not be abolished with that law. Not being the type of anything in Canaan, nor in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, it was neither abolished when the Jews entered Canaan, nor can it now be upon the establishment of Christ's kingdom; but rather as the first fruits or pledge of the heavenly rest, it can only be fulfilled in that rest. Being clearly foretold by prophets of old, who make distinct mention of its existence in gospel times; recognised and established by the Master himself, in his lucid expositions of the law and the manner in which he would have the day observed, and also confirmed by the practice of the apostles and primitive Church, it must ever stand unshaken in its position till the end of time. And we here express the decided opinion that no moral and religious duty is more clearly and lucidly set forth in the Scriptures than this.

There are several minor points in the articles before us we would like to notice; but as we have already exceeded the limits we intended, we must here arrest the further consideration of the subject.

JAMES STACY.