

bath unto the Lord." We have here no formal, solemn declaration of a new law, but an incidental, informal reference to a law already recognized to be in force. The birth place of this institution of the Sabbath is not the wilderness of Sin. The events which occurred there refer back to an earlier appointment. Now the argument from these facts is clear and direct. The law of the Sabbath was in force before the Mosaic legislation was received. It is admitted by all that the ceremonial portion of the Mosaic legislation has been abolished. But if this law existed before the legislation of Moses was enacted, its authority cannot be affected by the abolition of the later legislation. The authority of the Sabbath law was recognized but not created at Sinai. We cannot infer from the repeal of ceremonial laws given at Sinai, that the law of the Sabbath has been repealed. This institution existed before the Levitical types and shadows, and it survives while they have perished.

2. I go on to a second argument to prove that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment. The Sabbath law is found among the moral precepts of the Mosaic Legislation. There is a clear distinction between the law of the ten commandments and the laws of the Judaic ritual and polity. The ten commandments were uttered by the great voice of God and written with His own finger. The other laws were spoken in the ears of Moses alone and the hand of Moses wrote them. The decalogue written twice on tables of stone was deposited in the ark; where it was preserved by the incorruptible Shittim wood, the gold overlaid, within, without and above, and the over-shadowing Cherubim and Shechinah. The laws intended for the Jews only were written on parchment and placed, not in, but beside the ark, as being of less value and ready to be removed. Now the law of the Sabbath has its place among the ten commandments. This law was uttered by the divine Voice. Its words were written by the finger of God. It was inscribed upon the table of stone. It was intrusted to the ark for safe keeping. There is nothing to warrant the belief that this law was intended for the Jews only. There is no reason to suppose that it belonged only to a covenant which was to be abolished.

It may be shown that the fourth commandment is necessary to the completeness of the first table. We are not to look upon the laws of this table as merely negative. Their requirements are not satisfied by not setting up any object of worship in the place of God, or by not worshipping idols or by not blaspheming. The second commandment promises mercy to "them that love Me." But love is not satisfied with abstaining from evil. It must be busy doing good. Love does more than refrain from disobedience. It expresses itself in active obedience. How can love express itself when its object is God. If He were hungry He would not tell us. The creature cannot add to the ineffable blessedness of the Creator. Love to God finds an outlet in worship, in communion, in shutting out worldly things and fixing the attention upon Him. Now, in order that there may be opportunities for worship, for communion, for with drawal from worldly concerns, it is necessary that there should be such a provision as is made in the law of the Sabbath. There must be some time set apart for the religious duties which are imposed by the first three commands of the decalogue. If it be admitted that the first and second and third commandments are moral and perpetual, it follows that the fourth Commandment also is moral and perpetual. For it prescribes the means by which the duties required in the other commandments may be performed, and when a work is obligatory, the means necessary to its performance are also obligatory. Worship is obligatory. Then the setting apart of a portion of time for worship is also obligatory. Thus the fourth Commandment is seen to follow naturally the first three. They command a work to be done. It prescribes the means by which this work is to be performed.

That this law is moral and not positive is shown further by the fact that the penalty of death was attached to the breach of it. This penalty was not inflicted upon an offender against any law of ritual.

3. A third argument in support of the position maintained in the paper, is that the law of the Sabbath rests upon a universal and permanent ground. It is true that in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, the deliverance from Egypt is mentioned as the ground of the command, and that this text has been used to support the position that for the rest of God's people, who did not share the Exodus from Egypt, there is no ground for observing the Sabbath. But it is to be observed that both in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the whole decalogue is prefaced by reminding the people of their deliverance from Egypt. The argument against the universal obligation of the Sabbath law derived from the mention in Deuteronomy of the deliverance from Egypt as its ground, if it proves anything, proves that the whole decalogue has no authority over us, because we did not share in the Exodus. The fact that this deliverance was spoken of as a reason why the Hebrews should keep the Sabbath does not prove that this was the only reason why it was binding upon them. Again, the command as given in Exodus is based on a ground which has validity for the whole human race, namely the fact that in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth and rested on the seventh day. In Exodus a ground is assigned to this command which is valid for all men. In Deuteronomy we find in addition, a ground valid for the Hebrews alone. The less general ground does not exclude the more general.

It is said that God made the Sabbath a sign between Himself and the Hebrews (Ex. xxxi. 13-17; Ezek. xx. 12, 20). And hence it has been inferred that the Sabbath was a mere Levi-

tical type destined to pass away when Christ came. But although the Sabbath was a sign, it was more than a sign. Israel was commanded to make the first great law of love announced in Deut. vi. 6, a sign between God and His people. No one argues that the law of love is abolished because it was a sign of God's covenant with His people. Again the decalogue itself is spoken of as a witness to God's presence with His people. The ideas of "a sign" and "a witness" are similar ideas. No one argues that the decalogue is obsolete because it was "a witness." There would be as much force in such arguments, as there is in the argument that the Sabbath was a temporary institution because God made it a sign between Himself and His people. Might not a permanent institution be selected as a sign as well as a temporary institution?

4. A fourth argument is that the prophets treated the law of the Sabbath as a moral and perpetual commandment. The prophets were the enemies of mere ceremonialism. Isaiah condemned in scathing words the false religion that made much of fasting and afflicting the soul, but did not loose the bonds of wickedness or undo the heavy burdens, or let the oppressed go free or break the yoke, or feed the hungry or house the outcast, or clothe the naked. Now if the Sabbath law were merely a positive and ceremonial command, we would expect to find the prophets laying comparatively little stress upon Sabbath observance. As a matter of fact, however, what we do find is exactly the opposite of this. Isaiah declared that the eunuchs, who keep the Sabbaths, will find in the house of God a place and a name better than of sons and daughters. They shall have an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. The sons of strangers who keep the Sabbath shall be brought to the holy mountain and be made joyful in the house of prayer. Again, the same prophet says, "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 thy Father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Jeremiah said to the people of his day that the prosperity of the city depended upon the hallowing of the Sabbath and warned them of danger from the divine displeasure if they disregarded the observance of the holy day. Ezekiel reproached his nation for having polluted the Sabbath which God had established as a sign between Himself and His people. These instances may suffice to show that the prophets treated this matter of Sabbath observance, not as if the Sabbath law were on the same footing as ritualistic requirements, but as if it were upon a level with the moral precepts of the Mosaic legislation.

5. A fifth argument is that Christ recognized the authority of the Sabbath law. The authority of our Lord is often claimed by those who oppose the position maintained here. It is alleged that when Christ defended His disciples against those who accused them of Sabbath breaking because they plucked corn to satisfy their hunger, He used His authority as Messiah to repeal the Mosaic law and to introduce a freer and more lenient law for the new dispensation. But this assertion involves a misunderstanding of the whole case. Our Lord and His opponents agreed in regarding the Mosaic law of the Sabbath as still binding. It is incredible that the Saviour who observed the Mosaic law scrupulously up till His death, whose last free act was the keeping of the Passover should here be setting aside the old Sabbath law. The dispute was not about the authority of the Mosaic law, but about its interpretation. The Pharisees interpreted the law to require a man to go hungry rather than put forth his hand to pluck a few ears of corn. Our Lord denied the correctness of this interpretation. He did not relax the law. He explained it. According to the explanation of the Pharisees, the disciples were Sabbath breakers. According to our Lord's explanation they were not exposed to that charge. But Christ did not claim for His disciples exemption from the law of the Sabbath given by Moses.

Again, from the teaching of Christ, that the observance of the Sabbath must give way to deeds of mercy, it has been inferred that He looked upon the Sabbath command as ceremonial. The principle, it is said, on which this teaching of our Lord rests is that positive and ceremonial commands must always give way to those which are moral and perpetual. Since, then, mercy takes precedence of Sabbath observance, the former must be a moral, and the latter a ceremonial duty. But it is also a recognized principle that some moral duties must give way to others. For example, worship is a moral duty, but it must be set aside to save a drowning man from his peril. So that even if our Lord subordinated Sabbath observance to deeds of mercy, that would not prove one of them to be a moral and the other to be a ceremonial duty. They might both be moral duties and yet one of them might be subordinated to the other. But Christ does not subordinate Sabbath observance to mercy. What He teaches is that the performance of deeds of mercy is proper Sabbath observance.

It need scarcely be said that our Lord's declaration, "The Sabbath was made for man," is perverted, when it is quoted in support of the relation or abrogation of the Sabbath law. These words simply declare that the design of the Sabbath is a humane one; that it ministers to man's true welfare. Before the advocates of greater license in Sabbath observance can gain any legitimate support from these words, they must prove that the law of the Sabbath as given by Moses and properly interpreted does not advance human welfare. Then they would be entitled to say that the Sabbath of Moses and the Sabbath of Christ are two different things. But it is precisely this proof which is not forth coming.

Our Saviour's concluding words in this Sabbath controversy, as recorded by Matthew, have been misinterpreted. The words are these, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." They have been thus paraphrased. "The Son of man, agreeably to His authority, is able to relax the Sabbath day just as the other legal ceremonies." And again, "Here He saith that power is given to him to release His people from the necessity of observing the Sabbath." But observe that our Lord is here giving the reason for declaring His disciples innocent of the charge of Sabbath breaking. They are innocent "for the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." He would not have allowed them to break this law without rebuking them. The fact that he did not reprove them shows that they had done nothing wrong. The examination of this Sabbath controversy makes it clear that Christ recognized the authority of the Sabbath law.

6. A sixth and concluding argument may be put in a negative form. The writings of Paul furnish no objection to the position that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment. Three passages in the Pauline epistles, are held by some to teach that the law of the Sabbath is positive and ceremonial and therefore temporary. These passages are: (1) Romans xiv. 5-6, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemed every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth it not unto the Lord, he doth not regard it. (2) Gal. iv. 10, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years." (3) Col. ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is Christ."

Two answers have been given to the objection against the perpetual authority of the Sabbath law based on these passages. One is that the condemnation pronounced by Paul applies to the observance of the Sabbath days and other days prescribed under the Mosaic economy. The Sabbath day referred to is the seventh day Sabbath. Judaizers held and taught that the observance of this and other days, and of Levitical rites was essential to salvation. According to this view, the first day was not at this time called the Sabbath. For this reason and because its observance was not looked upon as an essential condition of salvation, the words of Paul do not apply to the Christian Sabbath.

The other answer is that the term Sabbath does not mean the weekly Sabbath, but Sabbatic periods or days connected with the ceremonial law. According to this view, the whole discussion has to do with ceremonial observances commanded by Moses and not with anything commanded in the decalogue.

I present this imperfect summary of the evidence in favor of the position, that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment, in the hope that it may in some measure be helpful to the discussion of this most important subject.

Books and Magazines.

THE JESUITS: Their History, Constitution, Moral Teaching, Political Principles, Religion and Science. By Dr. Otto Henne Am Rhyn, author of a "General History of Civilization," etc. 12mo. Paper, 15 Cents (4 Copies, 50 cents). Cloth, 30 cents. J. Fitzgerald & Co., Publishers, 28 Lafayette Place, New York.

The occasion which called forth this at once scholarly and popular work was the persistent agitation in Germany for the recall of the Jesuit Order, banned by the May Laws enacted at the urgent instance of Prince Bismarck. The author is a resolute opponent of the Jesuits and their aims, and his book is designed to show what the effects of Jesuitism have been in all countries since the Order was founded. The material of the history is drawn almost exclusively from authentic Jesuit and Roman Catholic sources—the constitutions of the Order, writings of Jesuit theologians and moralists, decrees of Popes, and acts of Catholic governments. The chapter on the Moral Doctrine of the Jesuits is specially noteworthy. Dr. Am Rhyn quotes from a long array of the foremost Jesuit writers on moral theology, passages which indubitably support the opinion that "the end justifies the means." The teaching is also cited of many great Jesuit theologians regarding the lawfulness of the use of equivocation, even by witnesses under oath in a court of justice. The Jesuit principle of "Probabilism" has very full treatment.

THE WAY OF LIFE MARKED OUT. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, Ill., U. S.

This is No. 7 of Volume I of Mr. Moody's Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago—a new one of his many methods of doing good. Its aim is to displace injurious literature by supplying good literature in its place at as cheap or a cheaper rate. The volumes are published semi-monthly at a subscription rate of \$2.25, or at 15 cents per copy. This one consists of 127 pages on fair paper and clear readable type. It contains eight sermons, two by the late Mr. Spurgeon, two by Rev. John McNeil and one each by J. Wilbur Chapman, B. Fay Mills, D. L. Moody and T. De Witt Talmage. The characteristics of these writers are too well known to need notice. The undertaking is well worthy of support.

The September *Methodist Magazine* begins with a subject of perennial interest, "Savanarolo, the Martyr Monk of Florence." After this follows an interesting variety of articles among which we may mention as chief "City, Rice Swamp and Hill or Missionary Triumphs in India," "In a Sledge through Famished Russia," "The Early English Drama," "Am I My Brother's Keeper," a sermon by Dean Farrar, "Florence Nightingale," and the two continued stories, "Airlie's Mission," and "The House on the Beach." It contains besides poetry, original and selected. [William Briggs, Toronto.]