

The result of this event was the triumph of the Christian cause.

In the following few words, behold how a converted heathen can die. "Jukai," wrote Mr. Geddie, "the chief of a small village, has just died. He was a great sufferer during his illness, but his mind was composed and peaceful. When he was near death, all the Christian party assembled, and I believe they were in the act of prayer when he breathed his last. A little before his death, Waihit asked him what his hope was now in the hour of death? he replied, 'I rest in Jesus only.'"

A work that produces such glorious and happy fruits, is worthy our earnest contemplation. It is a great work—finer than the highest efforts of human genius. It is imperishable—it is eternal. A. P.

—o—

### Unscripturalness and Perniciousness of Views on the Sabbath.

[CONCLUDING ARTICLE.]

AND now to proceed to the Lord's day. The Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, in consequence of the resurrection of Christ (which has ever since been kept by the Christian Church, and is called, Rev. i. 10, the Lord's day); and the fact of this change is thought to militate against the argument for Sabbath observance. "Now," it is contended, "we are no longer under the Fourth Commandment. It is a different institution from the Christian Sabbath, and we are no longer obliged to observe it. We are at liberty now to keep the day, or not, as we please; he that regards it to the Lord, does well; he that does not, may not be censured. Each is to be persuaded in his own mind."

This argument proceeds on the assumption that the Sabbath of the Fourth Command and the Christian Sabbath are entirely different institutions, and that the requirements of the former do not attach to the latter. But where do our opponents learn, that whereas the one had to be kept strictly, the other may or may not be observed? Surely the text in Rom. xiv. 6 is sadly perverted, and was never intended of the divinely-appointed day, but of a day of human institution and convenience. But the Sabbath of the first coming in place of that of the seventh day, as the Lord's Supper in room of the Passover, and Baptism of Circumcision, obliges us, and is to be observed no less than that from the beginning. If objectors think otherwise, they are bound to shew that the change of the day makes a change of the requirement (or that the Gospel discharges us from precepts of the Decalogue, which last article shewed to be absurd and unscriptural). Unless they do so, we must conclude that we are bound to observe the first day of the

week as the Fourth Commandment requires, and to sanctify it accordingly. Let us take an analogous case. Infant Baptism comes in place of Circumcision, and receives its warrant from the Abrahamic covenant in Gen. xvii. In the New Testament, no particular injunction is to be found requiring children to be baptized. But we plead the practise and rules of the Church from first, and hold that because these are unrepealed, the infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized. And so with the Sabbath. The day of the resurrection has come in place of the day of creation; but we are not, on that account, thrown loose from the obligation of the command, any more than we are compelled to give up the Church membership of infants because the New Testament enacts it not: but what we do, in both cases, is to take our stand upon institutions and commands already given and never repealed, and to act as the Church has ever done. If we do so, we are safe, because we keep ordinances and precepts divinely appointed and never abrogated. If we do not, then must we be prepared to renounce Infant Baptism and every institution whose warrant is in the Old Testament, and which is not cancelled in the New. Then we should have no Sabbath and no Church membership. But we keep the Sabbath because the Fourth Command is unrepealed, and because the change of the day makes no change of the requirement, just as we receive infants into the Church is because Baptism has come in place of Circumcision, and the Old Testament warrant is not abrogated.

Now, that the *change of day* affects the merits of the question, will be readily seen. It was a seventh portion of time that was exacted, and it is one day in seven that yet obtains. The particular day does not affect the requirement. It is still "one day in seven to be a holy Sabbath," although changed to the first. Nay more, as the particular day could not be observed in all parts of the globe,—since, in China, for instance, time is so far in advance of what it is in California, that the Sabbath is well nigh over in the former before it is fairly begun in the latter,—it follows that it is not an identical day, but one day in seven, that is to be observed; and when that day is made to all people the first day of the week, the requirements of the command are satisfied, no less than when it fell on the ancient seventh. We keep the Sabbath now on the day of resurrection, no less than Old Testament believers kept it on the day of rest from creation. It is still "one whole day in seven to be a holy Sabbath," and the injunction is still in force, "Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy." But now it is contended that "our Lord has altered the institution, since He did certain things not lawful on that day, and declared that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; and that Himself is