

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

their bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and that as they have been bought with a price so they ought to glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits which are His. It is from this decree of the Council at Jerusalem that Hooker, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," illustrates the truth that though commands be Divine, they are not of necessity perpetually binding, inasmuch as they can only be regarded as of obligation so long as the circumstances continue under which they were originally given.¹

Among those who would promote conciliar action in Church affairs in our own time, are some who would never stir a step without a solemn precedent. There are others who regard all such reverence for precedent as ecclesiastical red tapeism. Whilst to the one we admit that it well befits a great Church to move cautiously and claim with the other that our Church can well afford to make precedents, so that the changes introduced are not contrariant to but based on the lines of great historic principles,—we would say to both that the four lessons which the Council at Jerusalem thus illustrates can never be safely overlooked by those who, through conciliar action, would strengthen the foundations and enlarge the functions of our English Church.

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

ART. IV.—THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH:

OR,

IS THERE NO SABBATH DAY DIVINELY PROVIDED FOR
CHRISTIANS?

DIFFERING views upon any point cannot, it will be admitted, be all equally near to the truth. One of the points upon which Evangelical Churchmen differ from the Ritualists (not from the Old High Churchmen) and from the Broad Church School, is, regarding the sanctity, under the Divine authority, of one day in every seven for Divine worship. The Ritualists, in particular, would convert the Sunday from a Holy Day into a holiday, after the example of the School of Laud, and of their prototypes in the Church of Rome. The Broad Church School esteem the Sunday as no more sacred by Divine sanction than any other day of the week; only they would observe it on the ground of expediency, though not as of Divine authority. Are either of these parties borne out by Scripture, rightly interpreted? We think not.

¹ See Bishop Ellicott's Commentary on the whole passage.

But though it should be proved, as we think it can be, that the Sabbath Day is still obligatory in its *principle*, it is fairly open to question, we admit, whether it is to be a Puritanical Sabbath, or an Evangelical Sabbath, under the Gospel; a Jewish Sabbath, with its rigid restrictions and bondage, or a Christian Sabbath, to be observed in the spirit and in the liberty of the new Law of Love.

Our object in this Paper is to investigate the question, and to endeavour to put it in its true light; also to bring forward proof that a Sabbath Day has been provided for Christians in the New Testament. It may be that we shall advance some positions respecting it which will appear to be new; but a thing may be new, let it be remembered, without its being a novelty; and at all events, we hope to show that we have given the whole question our thoughtful consideration. We will first examine the Scripture grounds upon which the modern opinion about the non-obligation of any special day for religious worship professes to be founded.

The only two passages in the New Testament upon which either of the before-mentioned parties can ground their opinion, are Romans xiv. 5, and Col. ii. 16. In the first of these we read, "*One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike.*" In the second the words are these: "*Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.*"

The important point to be observed, in regard to the interpretation of the first of these passages, is, that it must, by every rule of reason, be ruled by the general principle laid down in the first verse of the chapter, namely, that we are "*to receive him that is weak in the faith,*" but not to judge him for his doubting thoughts about such indifferent things as meats and drinks and days. This determines all the matters here intended to be included to be questions in which there existed doubtfulness of obligation, giving rise in the minds of weak Christians to differences of opinion between them and others. The primary question, then, in relation to it is, Was there any such doubtfulness with the Jew about the obligation of his seventh day Sabbath, or with the Christian about the Lord's Day, which had become his day of sacred rest? There is no evidence of anything of the kind: and before the passage can be applied to subvert the obligation of one day in seven, as set apart for religious observance, he who would make use of it for this purpose must first prove that what we term "the Sabbath" was intended to be included. For, to quote the words of Robertson, of Brighton, only for a different end, "We may be sure that St. Paul would never have risked so certain a misconstruction of his words," as not to have specified the Sabbath or

Lord's Day, had he meant us to understand that that day was included, and was not obligatory upon a Christian's observance. On the other hand, if it was known to be obligatory, that alone would render it unnecessary that he should tell the Roman Christians expressly that that day was excepted. St. Paul was wont to deal in broad general statements, like the one before us, and to leave it to others to supply the exceptions. The best interpreter in all such cases as this is common sense. If, for example, we heard anyone say, "Here is one man who judges it right to fast every Friday; and there is another man who thinks it not necessary to fast on any day, esteeming every day alike;" should we take the Sunday in the latter case to be included, that being known to be always, and in every case, an excepted day? That day is, in fact, excluded, by the very definition the Apostle gives of the questions that he supposes to be matters of doubt. He is speaking here *avowedly* only about things that are matters of *indifference*; but the observance of one day in seven, as set apart for Divine worship, was most certainly not one of these matters of indifference in the eyes of the Apostle, for he himself observed the Lord's Day, as *κατ'ἕξοχόν*, sacred—a day standing apart from all other days, and to be observed by all believers in Christ. Unless, then, we would make the Apostle contradict himself about all days being "*alike*," including the Lord's Day, we cannot, with reason, put the construction upon his words which some now put. The wish must with them have been father to the thought. There were other days known to be open to questionable obligation, just as there are such days among ourselves, and these were, obviously, the days to which the Apostle referred, without including the one day in seven known as a day of sacred rest. At all events, the contrary is all *assumption*, not *proof*.

But let us not be guilty ourselves of prejudging: there is the second passage touching the matter to be considered.

The first point to be observed in respect to this is, that there is a manifest reference in it to Isaiah i. 14. The very words, "new moons and Sabbaths," and "appointed feasts," answering to "holidays," are there in a similar manner denounced. If, therefore, the seventh day, or Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment were included in this, as by parity of reason it would be, then it would be God denouncing the very day, the strict observance of which, He had elsewhere, in this very Prophet, commended and enjoined (see Isaiah lvi. 2-4, and lviii. 13). Similar injunctions occur in Ezekiel xx. Even if *the Sabbath Day* was included in the words of Isaiah i. 13, it would be only as denouncing the abuse of its observance as made a covert to iniquity; just as our Lord afterwards denounced the misapplication of the law of the Sabbath by the Pharisees; and, at the utmost, all that the Apostle intended in

the two passages referred to, might be to guard Christians against laying too much stress upon days, and other periodic observances, as he had done also in Gal. iv. 10. To infer more than this from the Prophet's words would be to prove that the Sabbath Day was not obligatory, even under the Old Testament; and just the same kind of argument applies to the inference which some would draw from the similar expressions of the Apostle (supposing them to relate to the Lord's Day) under the New Testament—namely, that it would prove too much.

To our view, the inference sought to be established from the two passages referred to in St. Paul is broader than the premises. It is, in fact, begging the question. It is even false reasoning. At all events, it exhibits reasoning without reason. For what man, in the true exercise of his reasoning faculties, would ever, if he heard the counsel given, "Let no man judge you in respect of vestments, or of postures, or of Saints' days," infer from this, that no vestment of any kind was obligatory to be worn, when the surplice, in the "ministrations" of the Church is known to be obligatory; or that it was not obligatory to kneel in prayer when receiving the Holy Communion, though it is ordered to be received "kneeling;" or that even the Sunday, being, like the Saints' days, a Feast day, might be set aside as of no obligation to be observed! Would not the man who drew such an inference from the words be set down as deficient in logical acumen? And such reasoning as this, if reasoning it could be called, would carry us even further into the region of absurdity. For the Apostle includes "meat and drink," as things by which we are not to judge others, nor to allow others to judge us. If, then, the words "Sabbath Days," as falling into the same category, justified the conclusion that no Sabbath Day, in any sense of the word, need be observed, then, by parity of reason, the words, "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink," would justify no kind of eating or drinking, not even to the partaking of the Lord's Supper! A conclusion for which, I suppose, no Christian would be prepared.

In neither of the two passages relied upon is *the* Sabbath ($\tau\omicron$ $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\rho\nu$) of the Jews mentioned, much less can the Lord's Day be included. It is of "Sabbath *days*," $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\nu$ (without the article, in Col. ii.) not of that which the Jews, by way of distinguishing it from all other days, commonly designated distinctively by the definite article $\tau\omicron$ ($\tau\omicron$ $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\rho\nu$); and the plural form, it cannot be denied, included a number of other less sacred days observed by the Jews. "Judge no one by the observance of these," the Apostle seems to say; which is as if he should say to us, "Judge no one by the observance, or the non-observance, of the Saints' days of the Church."

The very different way in which the Apostles and their Lord

speak respecting things that were to be abolished or superseded, such as circumcision, the Temple, the Priesthood, the sacrifices, &c., under the Law, as compared with what they do *not* say respecting the Sabbath, ought to be particularly noticed. Here there is no want of explicitness, or of decisiveness: we are not left here to doubtful or negative grounds for our conclusions.

If we go direct to what the "Lord of the Sabbath" has Himself said upon the subject, we do not find the case of the All-days-alike-party in any degree confirmed, provided we restrict ourselves to just inferences alone from His words. It is true, He put a different construction on the Commandment respecting the Sabbath Day from what the Pharisees had done, and He vindicated it from their abuse; but how He could, with any consistency, have vindicated, as He frequently did, the right observance of the Sabbath, if He knew that the obligation of its observance was altogether to cease under the Gospel, we must leave others to explain. The very fact, that He vindicated it from its *mis-use*, is, to our mind, one of the strongest arguments for its *use*, as of perpetual obligation in its *principle*. Nor can we understand how our Lord, and His Apostles, could have so frequently referred to the Decalogue *as a whole*, and quoted some of its Commandments separately, without making an express exception of *any one*, if any one of them had ceased to be morally binding upon Christian men. They never give the slightest intimation that the Fourth Commandment was to cease to be part of the Ten Commandments or Law for Christian people. In speaking of the Law *as a whole*, as well as in mentioning most of the Commandments separately, without making an express exception of this or that one, they recognise all its parts, just as a person quoting any parts of an Act of Parliament recognises the whole as being, unless expressly repealed, the law of the land. The principle, indeed, in this matter is the same as that laid down by St. James in its *consequence*: "He that offendeth in one point, is guilty of all" (he is speaking of the Law of the Ten Commandments), because, as he adds, "He who said, Do not commit adultery, also said, Do not kill:" he might have added, said also, "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath Day."

The reason why the Fourth Commandment is not quoted separately (it is referred to several times) by our Lord and His Apostles, or included with the other commandments in their quotations, probably is, that this was not one of the points in which the Jews needed correction, except in the matter of over-strictness: and to correct this over-strictness in the observance of the letter to the neglect of the spirit, all their rebukes were directed. Our Lord, in fact, did not quote the Commandments of the First Table at all, except as they were included in His generalisation of the First Table. Was the second, or the third,

then, of these Commandments void in consequence of this? or, was not the Fourth Commandment also included, as a part of the whole? That our Lord never contemplated its cessation, as long as man exists upon the earth, is plain from His Own declaration, "*The Sabbath was made for man.*" From this it clearly follows that, under the present conditions of man's nature, the Sabbath rest is necessary, and is to be enjoyed.

Even Robertson, of Brighton, though he asserts that "there is not in the Old Testament a single trace of the observance of the Sabbath before the time of Moses" (an assertion the truth of which we utterly deny), yet he maintains most strongly that the Sabbath "was made for man *as a necessity of his nature*;" and if so, why, we may ask, was it not necessary for man before Moses as much as after? That the Sabbath existed from the time of the Creation is evident, without any other evidence, from the reason given for it in the Fourth Commandment. It was re-enacted to the Jews after they were brought out of Egypt, for reasons having special respect to them, and with restrictions added that were to be peculiar to themselves: it was made a part of their national law; but, so far as its *principle* is concerned, it is as much binding upon Christians as ever it was upon the Jews, in so far that one day in every seven is to be observed as a sacred day of rest. All this follows by just inference, we submit, from the proofs which we have advanced in the way of argument.

Very few persons, however, can be made to see that negative evidence is, in some cases, much more conclusive than positive. Where a practice has existed before, and has become generally recognised, it is usually taken for granted, and not named. So it has happened with respect to the Sabbath Day. Its observance having been enjoined as a command, in the Moral Law, it needed no fresh enjoinder. Seeing that the thing had been long before ordained, and observed, express *abolition*, and not renewed *enjoinder*, is what we ought rather to look for, if its observance was to be discontinued, as a thing no longer obligatory.

But though, on these grounds, no direct mention or enforcement of the Sabbath Day was to be expected, yet we might expect to meet with it incidentally somewhere in the Epistles of the Apostles, in the way of allusion, or of argument, supposing its continued observance to be obligatory. And one instance of this we are prepared to adduce.

It is quite possible, let it be remembered, that we, like the Jews of old, may have suffered ourselves to adopt views of some passages of Scripture which, upon a closer or more critical examination, may be seen to involve a mistake. One such passage we conceive to be Hebrews iv. 9. The well-known words, "*There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of*

God," have come to be generally, if not universally, assumed in our day to relate solely to the future, the celestial condition of God's saints. We think we shall be able to show that, to prove this, was not the writer's object; and that, in these words, taken in connection with the Apostle's argument, we have proof of a Divinely-provided and a *present* Sabbath rest for us as Christians.

This fourth chapter to the Hebrews is, confessedly, one of the most obscure and difficult in the whole of the New Testament. All the commentators show themselves at a loss for a connected and conclusive exposition. It seems, indeed, almost impossible to make out what the writer is aiming to prove. His quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures are so brief, his transitions of thought so sudden, that it is hard to follow him with the clue of any guiding sense. It is not my intention to be dogmatical upon the point; my aim will be only to examine, both the argument of the Apostle, and the terms he uses, with a view to discover, if possible, and to show his true meaning and object.

Let it be borne in mind, then, in the first place, that the writer was addressing *Jews*, who certainly could not need to have it proved to them that there was a future rest in Paradise, or Heaven, for the people of God; for this was what the faithful among them already fully believed. This fact alone might suggest to any thoughtful mind that the inference here drawn by the Apostle has some other relation. To discover his meaning, we must carefully observe the object and drift of his argument in this whole Epistle. What, in the other parts of the Epistle, is he seeking to establish? His object is to show these somewhat unsettled Jewish converts that everything of a ceremonial nature in the Mosaic economy was typical, and that, for everything done away in Judaism, or changed, as being only type, there was the anti-type—the reality, in a substantial substitute in Christianity. He begins by showing them the superiority of Christ, as a Lawgiver, to Moses; and then he goes on to show the superiority of His Priesthood to their High Priest; the superiority of His sacrifice to their sacrifices; the superiority of the Temple of His Body to their Temple; the superiority of the Christian Covenant to their Covenant; the superiority of the Christian's Altar to their Altar; "Your Lawgiver," he says, in effect, "was human, ours is Divine; your High Priest is done away, but we have a permanent High Priest in God's Own Son, who ever lives; your sacrifices are done away, but we have a better sacrifice in the Lamb of God, who actually takes away sins; your Altar is done away, but we have an Altar, at which they have no right to eat who serve the Tabernacle; your Temple service is done away, but we have a truer Temple in the human heart, consecrated by the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit; your Sabbath is done away, which was the

type of a *real* rest to come." Is there to be a hiatus here, by the absence of any substitute for that, we might ask, if it be not filled by the better Sabbath denoted by the word *σαββατισμὸς*, "that remaineth," not "*for*" (this is the gloss unconsciously put upon it by those who have become possessed with a wrong idea) but "*to the people of God.*" This is evidently the line of the Apostle's argument. It is of a thing to be realised *now*, though never realised before, he speaks; for, as he had just before stated (verse 2), "We which have believed *do* (not *shall*) enter into rest." Of the heavenly state he does not speak at all, till he comes to chapter xii. 22; and there, even of that, he speaks, not as a state *to come*, but as already *present* (as in its commencement it is in "the kingdom of heaven," the Christian Church), and as it is in its *σαββατισμὸς*, and other spiritual and supernal advantages. And if there were not, in some sense, and that a higher sense, a present keeping of a Sabbath, and enjoying it, Christians would, obviously, be in a worse condition than the Jews, and the Apostle's argument would fail in one particular.

The question now is, How far do the terms, the writer makes use of, bear out this interpretation. First, there is the Greek verb used, to be noticed, which is here translated "*remaineth.*" In what sense remaineth? Is it in the sense of something *to come in the future*, or is it in the sense of something *left behind from and after* some other thing has been done away, and that is now existing to be enjoyed? The Greek verb *ἀπολείπεται* means, beyond question, *left behind*, as a thing now existing; for it is the very verb used by St. Paul, when he writes (2 Tim. iv. 13), "The cloke that I left (behind) with Carpus, bring with thee." This is also its frequent sense in classical authors. According to the verb used then, "*the keeping of a Sabbath,*" *σαββατισμὸς*, is a thing *left remaining from* something that is gone, as a present blessing to the people of God.

There is another point which appears not to have been noticed in connection with this verb. In the first verse of this chapter the writer had used the compound *καταλειπομένης*, in relation to the rest *to come*; and here, in the ninth verse, he changes the preposition from *κατα* to *ἄπο* in the verb *ἀπολείπεται*, as he had also done in verse 6. Now, there must be some reason for this change. What is the difference? When he uses the form *καταλειπομένης*, he is speaking of the *promise* of the rest in question as a thing left to come *down* (*κατα*), as an *heirship* to us; but when he comes to speak of the *inheritance itself* as a thing to be entered into, and possessed, then he changes *κατα* to *ἄπο*; it is then *ἀπολείπεται*, *is left remaining*. This sense here, it is also to be observed, is borne out by the necessary sense of *ἀπολείπεται*, in verse 6; for there this verb is used

in relation to what was *left* for others *actually* to enter into now; consequently, the same verb in verse 9 must have relation to an *actual entering now into* the kind of rest denoted by the substantive *σαββατισμὸς*.

What the kind of rest is intended to be expressed by this new-coined term will appear on a careful examination of the word used by the writer in this chapter for "rest;" and also by the use he makes of the word "day." Throughout, the word for rest is *κατάπαυσις*, expressive of *ceasing from* one thing, and *resting down upon* another. It is applied by the writer to God's rest on the seventh day at the Creation, when He ceased from all His works and rested. This rest of God is made the ground of all the Apostle says about "rest" in this chapter. This being so, do not they who deny a Sabbatical rest "from the foundation of the world" (verse 3) leave no foundation for his argument, nor occasion for what the Psalmist afterwards says about a *κατάπαυσις*, a rest to come, and to be really enjoyed? They do, in fact, take away the foundation-stone in the building, and make the Apostle's argument a "baseless fabric." For, if there were no Sabbath rest from the foundation of the world, as some assert, on a special day, what need was there for him to prove that the rest foretold in David was not that which, upon this assumption, never had any existence at all? He is arguing, it appears to us, from what the rest was at the Creation, to what the Christian's (not the Jew's) rest would be. It is contradistinguished by him from that proposed under the Law. For the Apostle proves from the Psalmist that there is *another* rest yet to come, under the Gospel—the rest of faith. This rest the Jews entered not into, as a Body, in the wilderness, as he shows, nor in Canaan, nor under the Jewish economy at any time. It is another than the Mosaic Sabbath rest the Psalmist intended, when he spake of "a certain day." And the Apostle's argument goes to prove, on this ground, that the Jews had no true ground for continuing in Judaism. He meets one of their assumed objections to Christianity by saying, in effect, "Do not suppose that, because your seventh day Sabbath is abolished, there remaineth no Sabbath rest to the people of God, there remains a Sabbatism, a better rest than yours—a rest not for the body only, but for the soul, through faith in the work Christ has now finished; and this intended better rest, I prove to you, out of your own Royal Prophet David."

This view of the Apostle's argument is strengthened by the application he afterwards makes of the word "day" as used by David. He observes that David does not say, "There is to be another rest," but only that "another day" was determined, the rest being included in the day (v. 7, 8). And in speaking of it,

not as a *rest*, but as a "*day*," it is worthy of notice that he makes the antitype correspond to the type, which, without a special day for it, it would not. The other day of rest referred to was the seventh, both from the foundation of the world, and also under the Law. But the Psalmist speaks of "*another day*" than this, and what day could that be but the Lord's Day?" "*Another day*" is of itself an intimation of another *rest*, or *keeping of a Sabbath*," to come. As there was a *day* for the one, so it seems to follow there must be a *day* for the other. If this were not so, the introduction of the seventh day rest into his proof, and then going on to designate the Christian's rest by the term "*a day*," would only have confused the Apostle's argument; there would have been no *parallelism* had he not designed to prove that there was to be a *day* for rest, as there had ever been before. There was a particular *day* for the *κατάπαυσις*, so there must be a *day* for the *σαββατισμὸς*. The word *σαββατισμὸς*, in fact, includes both a spiritual rest and a day for this Sabbatism, or enjoying of rest.

What this new kind of rest, implied in the word *σαββατισμὸς*, is may be thus defined, as distinguished from the Sabbath of the Jews under the Law. The Jew could rest only *after* working, the Christian rests *before* working. His six days of labour *preceded* his Sabbath or day of rest; whereas the Christian's Sabbath, or day of rest, comes *first*, and he works afterwards. The Jew *worked in order to rest*, the Christian *rests in order to work*; the one sought rest *in* working, and found it not, the other finds rest *without* working, or in ceasing from his own works.

In this change of the day from the last to the first of the week, a very important principle is involved, for it involves the grand distinction between the Law and the Gospel, and was designed, we may believe, to teach it. To observe the seventh day now would be to put ourselves under the Covenant of Works. The "*another day*," as the Apostle terms it, (verse 8,) let it be noticed, immediately precedes his inference, "There remaineth *therefore* a rest (*a keeping of a Sabbath*, as it is expressed in the margin) "to the people of God," and implies that it is not the same rest as the first—a rest *after* works—but "*another*," namely, a rest *from* works. And in the very next verse he gives this, as the very reason why there is a new Sabbatism introduced and established: "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His." Whether we take the pronoun "*he*" here to mean Christ, or the believer in Him, the principle is the same. Christ, as the Redeemer, has ceased from working, as the Father ceased when Creation was completed. The expression here, "*his rest*," not *our* rest, seems to imply what we know to be a fact, that

our rest comes through His. We have still a Sabbath ensured to us, in the best and highest sense of the word. If there is to be a rest to the Christian, in body as well as in soul, there obviously must be a day for it, for any time would be no time. A known day for it is evidently implied in the exhortation to these Jewish Christians, further on in this Epistle (chapter x. 25), "not forsaking," literally, not *utterly leaving off* (*ἐγκαταλείποντες*) "to meet at the synagogue" (*τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν*), or, as we should say, to meet at Church. Then follows (verse 26), "for if we willingly sin" (meaning, evidently, as the first step to apostacy, in the leaving off to assemble for Divine worship) "after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth (*ἀπολείπεται*, again), there is *left behind* for us no more sacrifice for sins" (chapter x. 27). *Ἀπολείπεται* must have this sense here, because he has already told them (chapter ix. 26, 28) that the sacrifice offered has been offered *once for all* (*ἅπαξ*), and that there is no other to come. Had he intended to say that there was another to come *καταλείπεται* would have been the verb required.

It is remarkable, as confirming our view of chapter iv. verse 9, that the Syriac version renders it, "wherefore it is certain that the people of God ought to keep a Sabbath." The day of the Resurrection was the day on which Christ rested from all His works of Redemption and entered into His rest, and consequently this became the day appointed for the Christian's Sabbath or rest. The best evidence of this is that Christ observed it Himself in all His appearances to His disciples afterwards, which must be viewed as giving it His sanction. Christ sent the Spirit on that day also (Rev. i. 10). In the post-resurrection period, too, *μία σαββάτων* *one*, or *the first* day of the week was the notation adopted for what we term now "*the Lord's Day*." (See Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; also Rev. i. 10.) The conclusion, therefore at which I arrive from all this evidence is, that there is still a day provided, ordained, and "that remaineth to the people of God" in which for them to observe and enjoy a *Sabbatism*, or period of sacred rest.

But if this be so some may think, What is the difference between being under the Law and under the Gospel? If the observance of one day in seven be obligatory, is not this the very principle of the Law? The difference, I conceive, lies in this—that the one kind of Sabbath was to be observed as a matter of *Law*, and the other is to be observed in the spirit of *Love*. To the ungodly, even this is to be, and will be; viewed still as a *law* (see 1 Tim. i. 9); but to them that believe, it is not so much a *law* as a *principle*. We, as Christians, are not under the law of bondage, but the law of liberty; it is in the *spirit* of the commandment we are to act, and not merely in the letter. The

believer, indeed, enjoys this rest in his spirit every day, but his body can have the rest only one day in seven, and, by the Divine provision, is still to have it. This sufficiently vindicates for the Fourth Commandment the place which it still occupies in the Decalogue, as maintained by the Christian Church.

Our condition now may be thus described:—It is as if a father should say to his children, when come to full age, “Hitherto I have required you to observe my commands as a matter of law; henceforward I shall trust you, as you are no longer children, to observe what you know to be my will out of love.” To put ourselves into bondage to the letter of the Law now, would be to fall into the very error of the Jews, with far less excuse for it. We have been called unto liberty, only we are not to abuse that liberty. We should abuse our liberty, if we devoted the Sabbath to somnolent sloth, secular occupation, or the chase of worldly pleasure; but, on the other hand, we are not required to make it a day of gloom and moroseness, under self-imposed restrictions; rather, it is to be a day of restful action, in the exercises of devotion, in holy joy and realised freedom in Christ Jesus. This, in our view, constitutes what we may term the *Evangelical Sabbath*. That the Jewish ordinances were only shadows (their seventh day Sabbath included), and that the “body is of Christ,” we should contend as earnestly as the broadest Broad Churchman. But with us it is the shadow of a reality, not of a nonentity. It was a shadow, according to our own interpretation of Hebrews iv., of the Christian *σαββατισμὸς*, and this, again, we believe to be a further shadow—a type and pledge of an eternal Sabbath or rest to come. The rest, in short, of which the Apostle speaks here, of which the original Sabbath and the rest in Canaan were the foreshadowing, may be viewed as consisting of two parts—spiritual and eternal; the rest of *faith* here, and of *fruition* hereafter; the one a rest *in* trouble, the other a rest *from* trouble; the one *in* Christ on earth, the other *with* Christ in Heaven.

Not to pursue this question any further, I may observe that, if my exegesis of Hebrews iv. stands good,¹ it settles the whole question of Sabbatism; it proves that a Sabbath is provided for us under the Gospel; it shows also what the Christian Sabbath is, as distinguished from the Jewish Sabbath; and I submit my arguments in its support to thoughtful men, not because I wish to restrict their liberty of opinion, but only in the hope that it may help to ascertain truth.

STEPHEN JENNER.

¹ Lest any one should hesitate at my view of the import of Hebrews iv. 9, under the idea of its being entirely novel, I may state that the same interpretation is given of it by the great Dr. Owen, in his learned and voluminous work on the Epistle to the Hebrews; only that even he has missed the evidence latent in the Greek terms used by the Apostle, and also several other points of importance.