

that love him? It is also said, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, nor many called, but few are chosen." These poor people who are rich in faith are addressed, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy." It therefore speaks of hypocrisy, and not of philosophy to comprehend it: for the Pharisees did not greatly swell themselves with philosophy, but with the law. The Pharisees were in unravelling of rather remarkable things, and this may appear evident, let us now examine his letter. He says, "as he calls it). The very first sentence of his letter reads as follows: "My sixth position is that a distinct antitype or doctrinal equivalent has been assigned for the literal Sabbath of the Old Testament." What that 'antitype' is, his letter informs us, namely, "resting in Christ by faith." Now admitting, for a moment, that the "Sabbath of the Old Testament" was the Type of the antitype which he has given us—namely faith—then where does his position land him? All agree that the antitype swallows up the type—or in other words the type immediately ceases to be a type, and disappears the moment the antitype is come. What then is the conclusion from his premises? Why simply this, that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel and the prophets, David, and all the Old Testament Saints, whose faith is recorded in the New Testament, and both the type and the antitype existing harmoniously together in social concord—had both the "equivalent" and the thing for which they held that equivalent—for they had both faith and the Sabbath! This is a most singular position—it has two legs quite dissimilar—as "diverse" from each other as Pharaoh's "lean and fat cattle;" a type and an equivalent rendered synonymous. One of them has no existence in Theology, the other is opposed to the rules of justice and equity; no just man would take and persist in holding an equivalent, and yet hold on to the thing for which he had received that equivalent—and no man ever saw or ever heard of such a thing as the other leg—namely a type and antitype existing together. The type implies the non-existence of the thing for which it is given, and the holder of it to give up that thing while it is so held. What an unjust man David must have been, when after having been "encompassed by the sorrows of death," he could thus address his soul, "return unto thy rest O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee." Had he had Wishart's equivalent for the "Sabbath of the Old Testament," and had he ever entered his mind to give up honestly the thing for which this rest was equivalent—but persisted in holding on to both most tenaciously. Yet he would even assert, that the obtaining of the antitype and equivalent would hold on more firmly to the type, the thing for which he had received that equivalent—and that the possession of this equivalent produced a stronger attachment upon the mind of its possessors to this day—and so on. He says, "it is the want and not the possession of this antitype and equivalent that leads to giving up the type or Sabbath. However, probably he thought that faith was only an entrance upon that rest which he had in mind. Hebrews iv. chap. 3rd verse, "We which believe, do enter into it, and still finding himself encompassed with many troubles, having "fears without and fightings within," rejoiced in this faith, as the earnest and foretaste of that rest that "remaineth to the people" of God, where the "wicked cease from troubling" and where the weary have an eternal and an uninterrupted rest. His view of the subject seems to be in strict accordance with what the Lord hath commanded John to write:—Revelations xiv. chap. and 13th verse, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, and they that will come unto the Lord, and will keep his commandments, that they may rest from their labours and their works do follow." What means this? says Wishart, the living rest from their labours (they have to labour) as God did from his" (whose work was finished).