









THE
SABBATH AND THE DECALOGUE.

A REPLY

TO THE

SPEECH OF THE REV. DR. NORMAN MACLEOD,

DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW,
ON THURSDAY, 16TH NOV., 1865, AND SINCE
PUBLISHED BY HIM.

BY

HENRY STEVENS, M.A.,

MINISTER OF THE EPISCOPAL CHAPEL, SYDENHAM; AND SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY
FOR PROMOTING THE DUE OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

SEELEY, JACKSON, AND HALLIDAY,
54, FLEET STREET.

1866.

Price One Shilling.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON & SON,
GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

THE SABBATH AND THE DECALOGUE.

“The vacation of the Lord’s Day is the moral part of the Decalogue in the time of grace, as the seventh day was in the time of the law.”
(*Anselm.*)

“We are bound to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty, which God’s immutable law doth exact for ever.” (*Hooker.*)

THE law of the Sabbath is one question ; how we ought to observe it, is another. The former question should be decided upon its own merits before we enter upon the consideration of the latter. For the dwelling upon the history of men going to extremes, whether in observing or profaning the Lord’s Day, but excites the feelings, and prejudices the judgment, and incapacitates the mind for arriving at a sound conclusion.

It is therefore to be regretted that the Rev. Dr. Macleod, in his late speech before the Presbytery at Glasgow, should have introduced a question of so much gravity as the consideration of the present position and authority of the Ten Commandments, by narrating anecdotes, many of them grotesque, concerning the way in which certain of his countrymen observed the Fourth.

“It is an easy thing,” said Lord Bacon, “to call

“for the observance of the Sabbath Day; but what
 “actions and works may be done on the Sabbath,
 “and what not;—to set this down, and clear the
 “whole matter with good distinctions and decisions,
 “is a matter of great knowledge and labour, and
 “asketh much meditation and conversing in the
 “Scriptures and other helps, which God both pro-
 “vided and preserved for instruction.”*

In these pages the law of the Sabbath alone is considered. Nor has it been possible, in so limited a space, to go beyond the consideration of the present authority of the Decalogue, and the right of the Fourth Commandment to a permanent place in it.

The wide-spread consternation caused by the publication of Dr. Macleod's views on the Sabbath and the Decalogue cannot have arisen from the fact of their being altogether new, although they do not seem ever to have been popular, nor to have gained a wide following. It is the fact of Dr. Macleod's teaching, as he confesses, being on these doctrines opposed to the plain declaration of the formularies of the Church to which he belongs, as of other Christian Churches, that has startled men of all grades, and has deeply excited the lower classes of his countrymen, less practised in self-government than those above them. Dr. Macleod's teaching shall be given in his own words. They are these:—“Now it is the
 “Decalogue, viewed in this aspect, as written on ‘the
 “tables of the Covenant,’ and including necessarily

* Works (1855), vol. ii. p. 230.

“ its Sabbath law as the sign of the Covenant, which I
 “ presume to think has been abrogated by being nailed
 “ to Christ’s cross, with the whole Mosaic economy, and
 “ buried in the grave with Jesus.” On this side the
 Tweed, too, this conclusion is equally opposed to the
 general belief. For Christians generally, in this country,
 hold and teach that the Decalogue is our rule of life.
 Take, for example, the formularies of the Church of
 England. The position the Decalogue has from the
 first held in the Church of England is most prominent
 and distinct. The Ten Commandments appeared in
 the earlier forms of our Book of Common Prayer,—
 the “ Bishop’s Book,” and the “ King’s Book,”—thus
 showing the views of those who first sought to reform
 our Church. From generation to generation, the
 Ten Commandments, upon the walls of our churches,
 have confronted the congregations which worshipped
 in them; the Apostles’ Creed, or doctrines to be
 believed, being set forth on the tablet on one side,
 and, on the other side, the Lord’s Prayer, telling us to
 ask God for grace both to believe the Creed and to obey
 the Commandments. From generation to generation,
 Sponsors at the Font have been called upon to promise to
 teach the child, so soon as he shall be able to learn, “ the
 Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Command-
 ments.” In our Church Catechism we are told to
 ask our children, concerning the Commandments it
 was promised they should keep, “ How many there
 be?” And they are taught to answer—not nine—
 but “ Ten.” We then ask, “ Which be they?” And

the answer is, "The same which God spake in the twentieth chapter of Exodus."

Sunday after Sunday, for hundreds of years, the members of our Church have knelt while the Ten Commandments have been read; and after the reading of each one, the Fourth included, they have been taught to pray, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law." And, finally, "Write *all* these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee." Thus the Ten Commandments are set forth at length twice in the Book of Common Prayer, once in the Catechism, and again in the Communion Service.

Finally, we have a very early exposition, in our Church of England formularies, of the nature and authority of the Fourth Commandment. The Thirty-fifth Article of our Church declares that the Homily entitled "Of the Place and Time of Prayer," as also the other Homilies enumerated with it, contain "godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." Now, in the Homily "Of the Time and Place of Prayer," we read—

"As concerning the time which Almighty God hath appointed his people to assemble together solemnly, it doth appear by the Fourth Commandment of God; 'Remember,' saith God, 'that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.' . . . And therefore, by this commandment, we ought to have a time, as one day in the week, wherein we ought to rest, yea, from our lawful and needful works. For like as it

“ appeareth by this commandment, that no man in
 “ the six days ought to be slothful or idle, but dili-
 “ gently *to labour in that state wherein God hath set*
 “ *him* ;* even so, God hath given express charge to all
 “ men, that upon the Sabbath-day, which is now our
 “ Sunday, they should cease from all weekly and work-
 “ day labour, to the intent that like as God himself
 “ wrought six days, and rested the seventh, and
 “ blessed and sanctified it, and consecrated it to quiet-
 “ ness and rest from labour ; even so God’s obedient
 “ people should use the Sunday holily, and rest from
 “ their common and daily business, and also give
 “ themselves wholly to heavenly exercises of God’s
 “ true religion and service.* So that God doth not
 “ only command the observation of this holy day,
 “ but also by his own example doth stir and provoke
 “ us to the diligent keeping of the same. Good
 “ natural children will not only become obedient to
 “ the commandment of their parents, but also have a

* Who can compare these words with the words of the Catechism, in the exposition of our duty to God, “and to serve Him truly all the days of my life,” and not see that they point to the Fourth Commandment, and that the Puritans were wrong when they said that the duty towards God in the Catechism implied nothing concerning the Sabbath? And who does not see here, too, that in the exposition of our duty to our neighbour, in the Catechism, the Fourth Commandment also is referred to: “To do my duty *in that state of life in which it shall please God to call me*,” being almost identical with the words quoted in the preceding page, “*To labour in that state in which God hath set him* ;” the Fourth Commandment teaching us to work six days, as well as to keep holy and to rest on the seventh ; teaching us our duty to one another,—master to servants, for example, as well as our duty to God?

“ diligent eye to their doings, and gladly follow the
 “ same. So, if we will be the children of our Hea-
 “ venly Father, we must be careful to keep the Chris-
 “ tian Sabbath-day, which is the Sunday, not only
 “ for that it is God’s express commandment, but also
 “ to declare ourselves to be loving children, in follow-
 “ ing the example of our gracious Lord and Father.”
 (Homily on the Time and Place of Prayer.)

And it will be seen that our Reformers were not, in thus teaching, so widely opposed to the Continental Reformers as Dr. Macleod supposes. It is granted that the opinions of the latter on this doctrine often appear to be confused and contradictory. Indeed, the same writer seems to overturn in one place what he had said in another. This, however, only shows us that on this question the Reformers are not an infallible authority. Dr. Macleod has given copious extracts from their writings. But he has omitted to give other equally important extracts from the writings of these same Reformers, which modify, if they do not set aside, the views Dr. Macleod attributes to them.

How clearly Calvin, in opposition to Dr. Macleod, believed in a primeval Sabbath, may be seen in his commentary on the opening verses of the second chapter of Genesis. There is room here but for portions of the passage.

“ Wherefore that benediction (‘And God blessed the
 “ Seventh day’) is nothing else than a solemn conse-
 “ cration, by which God claims for himself the medi-
 “ tations and employments of men on the seventh

“ day. This is, indeed, the proper business of the
 “ whole life, in which men should daily exercise them-
 “ selves, to consider the infinite goodness, justice,
 “ power, and wisdom of God, in this magnificent
 “ theatre of heaven and earth. • But, lest men should
 “ prove less sedulously attentive to it than they
 “ ought, every seventh day has been especially selected
 “ for the purpose of supplying what was wanting in
 “ daily meditation. First, therefore, God rested ;
 “ then he blessed this rest, that in all ages it might
 “ be held sacred among men, for he dedicated every
 “ seventh day to rest, that his own example might be
 “ a perpetual rule. . . . Therefore, the Lord the more
 “ frequently testifies that he had given, in the Sab-
 “ bath, a symbol of sanctification to his ancient
 “ people. Therefore, when we hear that the Sabbath
 “ was abrogated by the coming of Christ, we must
 “ distinguish between what belongs to the perpetual
 “ government of human life, and what properly be-
 “ longs to ancient figures, the use of which was
 “ abolished when the truth was fulfilled. Spiritual
 “ rest is the mortification of the flesh ; so that the
 “ sons of God should no longer live unto themselves,
 “ or indulge their own inclination. So far as the
 “ Sabbath was a figure of this rest, I say, it was but
 “ for a season, but inasmuch as it was commanded to
 “ men from the beginning that they might employ
 “ themselves in the worship of God, it is right that it
 “ should continue to the end of the world.”

How far, likewise, Dr. Macleod is at issue with

Calvin respecting the present authority of the Decalogue and of the Fourth Commandment, appears from the following extract from Sermon 34, on Deut. v.:—

“ Most certainly what was commanded concerning
 “ the day of rest, must belong to us as well as to
 “ them [the Jews]. For, let us take God’s law in
 “ itself, and we shall have an everlasting rule of
 “ righteousness. And doubtless, under the Ten
 “ Commandments, God intended to give a rule that
 “ should endure for ever. Therefore, let us not think
 “ that the things which Moses speaks respecting the
 “ Sabbath-day are needless for us ; not because the
 “ figure remaineth still in force, but because we have
 “ the truth thereof.”

Indeed, on this latter point we have evidence clear as the light. For Calvin himself produced a Liturgy of his own, which he published at Geneva, for the use of that Church, in 1545. “The substance of Calvin’s
 “ work was afterwards printed in London by Valler-
 “ andus Pollanus, his successor at Strasburg, then
 “ a refugee in England, with some additions of his
 “ own.” Now, to Calvin’s Liturgy “we are in-
 “ debted for the supplement to the Communion
 “ Service of the Ten Commandments, with the
 “ responses, the latter of which, indeed, are very
 “ nearly translations from Pollanus.”* So that as the belief of our own Reformers was shown by their placing the Ten Commandments in our Catechism of

* Blunt (late Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge) on the Reformation, p. 213.

the Church of England, the belief of the Continental Reformers is equally shown in the fact, that to the Liturgy of their leader Calvin we owe the presence of the Ten Commandments in our Communion Service also, as well as the prayer we repeat after each of them, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law."

Nor can Luther be claimed by Dr. Macleod as a disciple of the belief that the Sabbath was not known to Adam, and that the Decalogue was given to the Jews only.

Luther wrote his Commentary on Genesis a short time before his death. His maturest and latest views, therefore, may be seen in it.

Luther, in explaining Genesis ii. 3, says:—"It therefore follows from this place, that if Adam had abode in innocence, he should yet have kept holy the seventh day—that is, he should have instructed his descendants concerning the will and worship of God, and rendered to Him praise, thanksgiving, and offerings. On other days, he should have cultivated the soil and tended his flocks. Nay, after the Fall, he sanctified that seventh day; in other words, he instructed his family on that day, as is testified by the offerings of his sons, Cain and Abel. Wherefore the Sabbath was, from the beginning of the world, set apart to Divine worship."—(Lutheri Opera (M.D.L.), tom. v. p. 23.)

"If the law be thrust out of the Church, there will no longer be anything recognized as a sin in this

“ world, since the Gospel defines and punishes sin
 “ only by recurring to the law.”—(Michelet’s Life of
 Luther, Book iv. chap. ii.)

And again, “ Let us leave Moses to his laws, ex-
 “ cepting only *the Moralia*, which God hath planted
 “ in Nature, as the Ten Commandments.”—(Ibid.
 Book iv. chap. iv.)

“ It is good, and even necessary, that men should
 “ keep a particular day in the week, on which they
 “ are to meditate, hear, and learn ; for all cannot
 “ command every day ; and Nature also requires that
 “ one day in the week should be kept quiet, without
 “ labour either for man or beast.”—(Quoted in Fair-
 bairn’s Typology, vol. ii. p. 467.)

Luther also wrote the following, being a portion of
 one of his hymns on the Decalogue :—

“Hallow the day which God hath blest,
 That thou and all thy house may rest ;
 Keep hand and heart from labour free,
 That God may have His work in thee.”*

Peter Martyr says (on Genesis ii.) :—“ This com-
 “ mandment of the Sabbath was no more then first
 “ given when it was pronounced from heaven by the
 “ Lord, than any other of the moral precepts.”

If from the Reformers we go to the Fathers, we shall
 find that the Rev. Dr. Macleod has been equally par-
 tial and hasty in his exposition of their opinions.

The Fathers, like the Reformers, often appear

* Geistliche Lieder, Lond. (1845), pp. 53, 56 ; and Massie’s Trans-
 lation, &c., pp. 53, 55.

contradictory when they speak of the nature and observance of the Sabbath ; and the same Father sometimes appears to contradict in one place what he has said in another. Two considerations, however, will make clear much in the writings of the Fathers on this question, which otherwise is inexplicable. First, that, when speaking of Sabbaths, they are witnessing against the error, in their time so widely prevalent in the Christian Church, that both Saturday and Sunday should be observed as holy. So widely did this practice prevail, that Bingham tells us, by the end of the fourth century the observance of Saturday, like Sunday, prevailed generally throughout the East, and the greater part of the Christian world. (*Antiq. Book xx. c. 3, sec. 1.*) And the Church of Abyssinia, to this day, observes both Saturday and Sunday.* So that often, when the Fathers are speaking of Sabbaths, they mean the Saturday Sabbaths of the Jews, not the Lord's Day, or Christian Sabbath.

A second reason, which explains much of this apparent contradiction in the writings of the Fathers, is, as is stated by Holden, that they often "assert that " we are to worship God, not by a mere hebdomadal " service, but continually—not on one day in the " week alone, but at all times ; which has been sup- " posed irreconcilable with the notion of a Sabbath." (*Holden on the Sabbath, p. 327.*) And then, after giving the strongest passages that can be found in the

* Stanley's *History of the Eastern Church*, p. 11.

Fathers in proof, Holden says, "These passages, though by far the strongest that I have met with in the ancient Fathers, are by no means hostile to the Christian Sabbath. The context, of which they form a part, plainly shows that they are directed against those who confine their religion to certain times and seasons." (Holden on the Sabbath, p. 329.)

The Fathers could never have intended to put forth the childish notion, that before the coming of Christ men were only required to serve God on the Sabbath; but that since Christ came, men are expected to serve God on all days alike. Both before Christ came and since, that we may serve God on all days, we must have the religious privileges and services of the Sabbath.

But it is unaccountable how Dr. Macleod could have ventured upon this unqualified dogmatic assertion,—“While *not one* of the Fathers, in a single instance, connects this sacred day with the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.”

Why, even his great authority Mr. Cox, notorious Sunday-league advocate as he is, who, even in a professed literature of the Sabbath, can hardly ever quote a passage that bears against his own anti-Sabbath views but he stops to argue against it like a hired special pleader,—even Mr. Cox, Dr. Macleod's great authority, gives him, at page 326 of his first volume entitled “Literature of the Sabbath Question,” the following passage from Irenæus, (A.D. 178,) one of the earliest Fathers:—

“Preparing man for a life of holiness, the Lord himself, with his own voice, spoke the words of the Decalogue alike to all; these Commandments, therefore, continue with us, extended and enlarged,—not abolished by His coming in the flesh. But the ordinances of bondage He gave to the people separately by the voice of Moses, as Moses himself says, ‘And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments.’ These, then, which were given as a yoke of bondage, and as a sign to them, he has blotted out by the new covenant of liberty. But what are natural, and becoming men who are free, and common to all,—these Commandments he has enlarged and extended, ungrudgingly, bountifully granting to men through their adoption to know God as their Father, and to love Him with all their heart, and without unwillingness to follow His word, abstaining not from evil deeds alone, but even from the desire of them.” (Adv. Hæres. lib. iv. c. 31, quoted by James, p. 78.)

Well may Mr. Cox say, “What does Irenæus mean by the ‘enlargement and extension’ of the Decalogue in its application to Christians?” Well may Mr. Cox also ask, “Is the Fourth Commandment, literally understood, one of the precepts which he includes among those that are natural, and becoming men who are free, and common to all.” As if the “Decalogue” could mean either ten or nine Commandments; and as if Irenæus had not said, “The

“ Lord Himself with his own voice spoke the words
 “ of the Decalogue alike to all ; these Commandments,
 “ therefore, (i.e., the Decalogue) continue with us,
 “ extended and enlarged,—not abolished by His com-
 “ ing in the flesh.” Well may Mr. Cox refer to another
 passage of Irenæus—which, however, he does not
 quote—in order to object, that the Father does not
 mean what he here plainly says.

Again, Clemens Alexandrinus (A.D. 194), (as quoted
 by Holden, p. 298,) speaking of that part of the
 Decalogue which we call the Fourth Commandment,
 describes it as “ indicating that the world was made
 “ by the Almighty, who gave to us the seventh day
 “ for rest, on account of the afflictions to which life is
 “ subject. For God is never tired, is not subject to
 “ passions, neither is he in want of anything ; but
 “ we, who bear about an earthly body, have need of
 “ repose ; the seventh day, therefore, is called a rest,
 “ a cessation from evils, constituting the chief of days,
 “ OUR rest indeed,” &c.—(Strom. 6, p. 682, c. D.)

Tertullian, too (A.D. 150—200), (as quoted by
 Holden, p. 300,) in his refutation of Marcion, has “ an
 “ argument too long to quote, but the scope of which is
 “ to show, that Christ did not design to abrogate the
 “ sabbatical law, but to explain and amend it, and in
 “ the course of which he asserts that neither Christ
 “ nor the Creator have destroyed the Sabbath ” (Ad-
 vers. Marcionem, lib. IV. § 11, p. 423, c.);—“ that Jesus
 “ is called the Lord of the Sabbath, because he main-
 “ tained it, *ut rem suam* ” (Ibid. p. 424, B.);—“ that as

“ the Lord of the Sabbath he did not altogether abolish it” (Ibid.); “ and that he did not wholly rescind the Sabbath, the law of which he observed, proving by his actions that he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it;” for even here (says Tertullian) he fulfilled the law, whilst he interprets the conditions of it, whilst he illustrates the difference of works, whilst he does those things which the law declares to be exceptions on the Sabbath holy-days, whilst by his own benefaction he rendered still more holy the Sabbath-day, which was sanctified from the beginning by the benediction of the Father.” (Ibid. p. 424, c.)

Origen, too (died A.D. 253), observes (see Holden, pp. 302, 303), — “ Leaving the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be observed by a Christian. It is by abstaining from all worldly actions and labours. If, therefore, you cease from all secular works, and execute nothing worldly, but give yourself up to spiritual exercises, repairing to church, attending to sacred reading and instruction, thinking of celestial things, solicitous for the future, placing the judgment to come before your eyes, not looking to things present and visible, but to those which are future and invisible, this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath.” (Homil. 23 in Numeros, vol. ii. p. 358, D.)

Chrysostom (A.D. 398) says (Holden, p. 316), — “ God hath from the beginning taught man to separate one entire day in the weekly revolu-

“tion to spiritual exercises.” He also says,—“The first day of the week is called the Lord’s-day, because on it our Lord returned from death unto life.” And again, he styles it, “the royal day, in which our Master and King ascended from the grave.” (Chrysostom, Homil. 10 in Gen. in Psalm 118, Hom. 5 de Resurrect.)

St. Augustine (died A.D. 430), says the late Rev. J. T. Baylee, “expresses no doubt whatever of the sanctification of the Sabbath at Creation, and of the transference of the day of its observance from the seventh to the first day, which first day he considers was always designed to be superior to the seventh, as indicated by the memorable events which had taken place thereon. Speaking on the subject of the Lord’s-day, he (Augustine) says, ‘Which is for this reason called the Lord’s-day: that men, refraining from worldly occupations and earthly pleasures, may wholly devote themselves to the service of God.’ It appears, even in Sacred Scriptures, that it was a solemn day; for on it the elements of the world were made,” &c. And again he says, “And therefore the inspired teachers of the Church decreed that all the glory of the Jewish Sabbath should be transferred to it; that what they celebrated in a figure, we should celebrate in reality.” Again, saith Augustine, “Let us therefore observe the Lord’s-day, brethren, and set it apart to holy purposes, in the same way as was of old time commanded concerning the Saturday—according to the precept of the Lawgiver: ‘From even-

“ing even to evening you shall keep your Sabbaths.’
 “Let us take care that our freedom from business be
 “not for indulgence in vain pursuits; but abstaining
 “from all rural employment, and all business, from
 “the evening of the Saturday even until the evening
 “of the Lord’s-day, let us devote our time wholly to
 “the service of God.”*

The same writer (Baylee)† adds, “We here insert the very conclusive and important testimony of Eusebius confirmatory of the various points proposed to be proved, being an extract from his Commentary on the Ninety-first Psalm, the Ninety-second of our Version :”—

“The Word, through the new covenant, changed
 “and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the
 “rising of the sun, and gave to us the image of the
 “true rest—the day of salvation—the Lord’s-day—
 “even the first day of light, in which the Saviour
 “of the world, after all his exploits among men,
 “obtained the victory over death, and passed beyond
 “the gates of heaven; having accomplished a work
 “excelling the six days’ work of creation, he took
 “possession of the Divine Sabbath, and the thrice
 “happy rest of the Father, who said to him, ‘Sit thou
 “on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy
 “footstool.’ . . . And everything (Eusebius says) which
 “it was usual to do on the Saturday, these we have

* August. de Tempore Sermo. dom. XXVI., post. pent. tom. x. p. 396 and 397.

† Word of Warning, p. 22.

“ transferred to the Lord’s-day, as being more suited
 “ to the Lord than it, and being the chief day, the
 “ first, and more honourable than the Jewish Sabbath ;
 “ for on this day, at the creation of the world, God
 “ said, ‘ Let there be light,’ and there was light ; and
 “ on it the Sun of righteousness arose upon our souls.
 “ For this cause it has been delivered to us to
 “ assemble on this day.”

Hilary (died A.D. 367) says, (see Holden, p. 317,)
 “ Though the name and observance of the Sabbath
 “ were first appointed on the seventh day, yet we on
 “ the eighth day, which is also the first, rejoice with
 “ the joy of a true Sabbath.” (Prolog. in Psal. p. 637,
 B. edit. Paris. 1652. fol.)

Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 371) says (Gilfillan on the
 Sabbath, p. 382),—“ Behold the Sabbath, blessed for
 “ thee from the beginning ; mark by that Sabbath, the
 “ Sabbath of the present day, the day of rest, which
 “ God hath blessed above other days.” (Orat. 38.)

Alexander of Hales says, (see Gilfillan, p. 382,)
 “ Because the Sabbath-day, taken indeterminately, is
 “ called the day of rest, or vacation to God ; after this
 “ manner the Lord’s-day may be called the Sabbath-
 “ day, without any prejudice of the Christian name, or
 “ scandal of Christians.” (Cited in Dr. Young’s “ Dies
 Dominica,” p. 25.)

These passages from the Fathers are selected from
 a much larger number more or less agreeing with
 them. They all, with more or less distinctness, iden-
 tify our Lord’s-day with the Sabbath of Creation and

the Decalogue. In these passages the Fathers do not teach that the Sabbath is abolished, and that the Lord's-day has been instituted in its place. They do not forbid, but they sanction, the looking back to the Sabbath of the older Scriptures, when speaking of the Sabbath of the Christian Church. They flatly contradict Dr. Macleod's words, that "*not one* of the Fathers, in a single instance, connects this sacred day with the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment."

But from the Fathers we travel up to the final court of appeal, the Holy Scriptures themselves. For, after all, the law of God is the only foundation of the Sabbath. Neither the law of the Legislature, nor the command of the Church, can make that to be really wrong on Sunday which is lawful on other days. Whenever, therefore, a nation has ceased to believe God's law demands the hallowing of the Sabbath, the Legislature and the Church have been impotent to enforce it. In our time there is a denial of the present authority of the Ten Commandments. Seeing that the Fourth Commandment is embedded in the Decalogue, and must stand or fall with it, men seek at once to get rid of the Fourth Commandment by declaring that the Decalogue is repealed.*

* I here refer to the fact, that there has been widely circulated in this country a pamphlet, urging the "Discontinuance, by Act of Parliament, of the Ten Commandments in the Church Service."

In the preface to the pamphlet, the author informs us that his chief object is to get rid of the Fourth Commandment. The same opinions had been before set forth, with some caution, in later numbers of the now defunct "National Sunday League Record."

It will, then, be well to see whether the Holy Scriptures do not show, First, that the Decalogue is a code of laws intended to remain in force throughout all time ; and then, whether the Fourth Commandment, from its nature, has not rightly a place in the Decalogue, and likewise remains in force throughout all time.

I. The Decalogue, as a code of laws, was, then, from the first, kept distinct from all other. This is made plain by the way in which the Ten Commandments were first given. The revelation of God contained in Holy Scripture was mainly made through the intervention of man. God spoke to one man ; and, for God, man spoke, or wrote, to his fellows.

A small part of the Old and a larger part of the New Testament Scriptures are, however, exceptions to this rule. The words Christ addressed to the living people of His day, were the words of God the Son speaking to men without any intervention whatever. And the words of these Ten Commandments are a parallel exception in the Old Testament Scriptures. God Himself spake these words to the tribes of Israel, with a voice that at once reached the ears of each man, woman, and child. No one came between. Moses was but a listener with the others. Moses no more gave these Commandments than any man now living did. To make these Commandments more plainly distinct from all other, Moses was not allowed to write them, any more than to

speak them. But God Himself engraved these ten statutes on two tables of stone. "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness; AND HE ADDED NO MORE. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and he delivered them unto me." (Deut. v. 22.) And to make this distinction yet more plain, when written, this law was placed by itself. In the holiest of all, alone and separate from all other, in the Ark of the Covenant, overshadowed by the glory of God, was enshrined this the heart of God's will, this core and marrow of His legislation. It is, then, ignorance and error to speak of these Commandments as the laws of Moses, since Moses neither spoke them nor wrote them, but God did both.

Thus, then, the design of God was to make these Ten Commandments to remain distinct from, and supreme above, all other, as being the heads and principles of His moral government; and this design is plainly revealed in the words, "He added no more."

And this design of God was fulfilled. The Ten Commandments from the first held a distinct and supreme place in the estimation and literature of the Jews. *The Law, the Commandments*, are the terms by which they are distinguished. They "meant the same, with reference to other commands, as the Bible means with regard to other Books."*

* Bishop Wilson's Sermons on the Lord's Day, p. 56.

Let us examine the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles on the authority and perpetuity of the Decalogue. On the Mount of Beatitudes we hear our Lord expounding certain of the Commandments Jehovah had spoken on the Mount of Horeb. He removes from them the glosses and additions of the Scribes and Pharisees. He says, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these Commandments, and teach man so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." With the solemnity of the Jewish oath, "Verily," He declared that He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil; that, "till heaven and earth should pass, one jot or tittle of the law should in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." He accused the Pharisees of making the Commandment of God (not of Moses) of no effect through their traditions; "for God," said our Lord, "commanded," &c.

When the young lawyer said, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" our Lord replied, "Thou knowest the Commandments; if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments." What our Lord meant by the term, He at once shows by quoting from the second table of the Decalogue, thus revealing to the lawyer his heart, and convicting him of sin.

We may see, too, when the Levitical system was declared by the Apostles to be abolished, they still

quoted from this Code, thereby showing that these Commandments were still in force.

Saith St. Paul, in Romans xiii., the eighth and following verses, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." What law? The Apostle, to show us, quotes from the Decalogue. He is not now speaking of what we owe to God: the Apostle therefore does not quote from the first table. But he is speaking of what we owe to man: he therefore repeats some of the commandments from the second table. But even from this table he does not quote all, for he leaves out the fifth.

For this saith he: "Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Thou shalt not covet. And if there be any other commandment,"—then these are still commandments,—“it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”

To "comprehend" does not mean to set aside, but to include. The Ten Commandments were as truly comprehended in the twofold injunction to love the Lord with all the heart, and our neighbour as ourself, in the time of Moses as in the time of Christ. You will find the former enjoined by God, speaking through Moses in Deut. vi. 5; and the latter in Lev. xix. 18. Some persons have fallen into the error of supposing that the twofold injunction of love to God and man has set aside the Ten Commandments. If this were so, the Ten Commandments would have

been set aside as soon as given ; would have been set aside for Israel, as for us ; would, indeed, only have been given to be set aside.

But let us turn to another place in the writings of the same Apostle—the sixth chapter of Ephesians. Here the Apostle says, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” Now surely here, if ever, there is an opportunity for the Apostle to put us right. If the Decalogue, as a code of laws, is set aside, St. Paul has here put the Fifth Commandment on a new, a New Testament, basis. Not another word need be added. The precept is given in words of simplicity by the inspired Apostle of God. And if anything more is needed to impress this Commandment upon this church of Gentiles and Jews, will the Apostle, to use the words of Dr. Macleod, “lead us to Exodus, or to the Gospels and Epistles?—to Sinai and the Decalogue, or to Calvary and to Christ? Which will most enlighten the conscience? Let the experiment be made by any earnest man.” Let us, however, return to the Apostle Paul; and he, as we shall see, will lead us to the Decalogue. “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” Then, to repeat with authority his monition, he thus quotes the Fifth Commandment, “Honour thy father and mother;—which *is*,”—not which *was*,—“which is the *first*,”—then the numerical series and order remain still,—“which is the first Commandment with promise:” “THAT IT MAY BE WELL WITH THEE, AND THAT THOU MAYEST LIVE LONG IN THE EARTH.” Now these last words are

most remarkable. The only commandment of the Decalogue that seemed, from its phraseology, to apply only to the Jew, is this one. And modern writers have unwittingly quoted this same to show that these Commandments were intended for Jews only. But here we see this Fifth Commandment is mentioned as if on purpose to show that the whole series is still binding. For instead of the original words, "That thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee;" the Apostle says, "That it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest live long on the earth."

And the Holy Ghost, by the Apostle, in effect thus says to us, Whatever special reasons God may have given to the Jews for obedience to these Commandments, these Commandments none the less refer to all mankind. In this Fifth Commandment the injunction seems only given, for the promise seems only given, to the people living in the land which the Lord God gave them—that is, in Canaan. But this Commandment all the while was intended for all mankind; and the promise extends to all that shall ever live on the earth.

And so of all the other Commandments. They open with the special reason, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage." But yet no man may say, "Lord, thou hast not brought me up out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage;" and therefore these Commandments do not apply to me; I am not

bound to have no other Gods but one; nor to refrain from making and worshipping idols; nor from taking Thy name in vain; nor from profaning Thy Sabbaths.

Again, besides the reason given in the Fourth Commandment for obedience to it, Moses elsewhere gives another reason for obeying this same Commandment, namely, that God brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt. But though this second reason had never been given, Israel would have been bound by the reason given in the Fourth Commandment itself. And Israel would not have held the second reason to have set aside the first, but to have been added to it. The first reason is in substance, We worship Thee as our Creator. And the second reason is in substance, We worship Thee also as our Preserver. The two reasons are not antagonistic, but harmonious. Though, then, this reason would seem to limit the Fourth Commandment to the Jew, since he alone was brought up out of Egypt, the reason given in the Fourth Commandment itself for obedience to it equally refers to all men; since God made the world for us, as well as for the Jews, and a debt of gratitude and worship is equally due to Him from us as from the Jew, God being for all alike the Author and Giver of all good things. We bless God on the Sabbath Day for our Creation, as did Adam; for our Creation and Preservation, as did Israel; and now for our Redemption also, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Again, God had by Jeremiah given this promise :
 “ I will put my law in their inward parts, and write
 it in their hearts.” (Jeremiah xxxi. 33.)* Or, in the
 words of Ezekiel, that He would put His Spirit within
 us, and cause us to walk in His judgments, and do
 them. (Ezekiel xxxvi. 27.) Compare these promises
 with what St. Paul says to the Corinthians, in the 3rd
 chapter of his 2nd Epistle, and who can doubt but the
 fulfilment of these promises is there recorded, and that,
 so far from God’s moral law being abolished, it is now
 written by God again, not upon the enduring stone, but
 upon that which is even more abiding, upon the death-
 less, yea, the imperishable nature of the believer’s soul.

“ In verse 6, St. Paul gives us a good key for dis-
 “ covering the true meaning of this chapter, which
 “ was to show the difference between the letter and
 “ the spirit of the law, and their tendencies. ‘ Who
 “ also hath made us able ministers of the New Tes-
 “ tament ; not of *the letter*, but of *the spirit*; for the
 “ *letter killeth*, but the *spirit giveth life*.’ It is mani-
 “ fest, however, that he is speaking here of one and
 “ the same law. At first view it may appear
 “ from this quotation (verse 7) as if the *law* or *com-*
 “ *mandments*, written and engraven in stones, were to
 “ be done away. But, on a little closer inspection, we
 “ find that not to be the case. What, then, is to be done
 “ away? The *glory* which accompanied the former

* “ And write all these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee.”
 —(Prayer after the reading of the Ten Commandments, in our Com-
 munion Service.)

“ ministration. The delivery of the Ten Command-
 “ ments on Sinai was accompanied with supereminent
 “ glory. And even after the transgression and for-
 “ feiture of the blessings of the Covenant by the
 “ Israelites, when Moses a second time brought down
 “ the tables of the Commandments, they were at-
 “ tended by glory ; because, as St. Paul tells us, the
 “ law itself was ‘ holy, just, and good,’ and therefore
 “ in itself glorious ; yet it required perfect obedience,
 “ which the fallen and corrupt nature of man could
 “ not pay, and therefore it tended to condemnation
 “ and death. Let us now consider how that glory
 “ was to be done away. And this was by the revela-
 “ tion of a more resplendent glory, by which the
 “ former was eclipsed. The Commandments were
 “ lit up with a new light ; they still continued holy,
 “ just, and good as before ; but they no longer con-
 “ tinued as inexorable judges to condemn, they held
 “ out the sceptre of mercy ;—they no longer required
 “ perfect obedience, they were changed from a minis-
 “ tration of condemnation into a ministration of right-
 “ eousness.”—(Archdeacon Stopford on the Sabbath,
 pp. 178, 179.)

Surely, too, St. John is speaking of commandments
 distinct from the law of love, commandments by which
 love to God and man is guided, and shown, and tested,
 when he says (1 John iii.),—“ By this we know that
 we love the children of God, when we love God, *and*
 keep His commandments. For this is the love of
 God, when we keep His commandments ; and His

commandments are not grievous." St. John is evidently quoting in substance the Sixth Commandment in the 15th verse of this same chapter, just as St. Paul in substance gives the Eighth in Ephesians iv. 28, and the Tenth in Romans vii.

St. Paul tells us he had not known sin, "except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet." He declares we are still "under the Law to Christ." St. John defines sin to be "the transgression of the Law." St. James tells us, "Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." And what "Law" he means, and what "all" he refers to, the Apostle tells us, by taking us to the Decalogue, and thus quoting from it,—“For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the Law.”

How, then, does Dr. Macleod reconcile this teaching of the Apostles with the assumed fact that the Decalogue "has been abrogated by being nailed to Christ's cross," and that it "is buried in the grave with Christ"?

“Must I”—one of the converts to whom the Apostle wrote might say—“must I” (to use the words of Dr. Macleod) “pass also Jesus Christ and His life as a revelation of duty, and His laws as its expression, and say, there is no rule sufficiently explicit, searching, and directing revealed for me even in Him? And must I search the Decalogue to find rules of life clearer, fuller, and more able to guide me than

“ all I have left behind? If any man means to assert this, or anything like this, or anything approaching to this, then I can only say, that I cannot understand him. Christ’s life is itself a sufficient rule; in Him all God’s moral law, as a rule of life, is summarily comprehended.”

Now, it might be sufficient, in reply, to refer Dr. Macleod to the fact, as above stated, that our Lord and His apostles did not merely refer to Christ’s life, “ as in itself a sufficient rule,” but that they also referred to the Decalogue, and to examples and precepts in the writings of Moses and the prophets. In His spirit, in His influence, in His tempers and dispositions, in all that He was, and all that He said, and all that He did, Christ was *the* light of the world, in which blended all the perfections of Him who was perfect God and perfect man; the only sinless life and spotless example for the study of all men always.

But if the life of our Lord had been intended to supersede the Decalogue, and to be “ a revelation of duty, and His laws as its expression,” so as to show plain and simple men, women, and children, how to act in the relationships and duties of life, is it likely that our Saviour’s behaviour, as a child, as a youth, as a young man, in the house, with father and mother, friends and neighbours, through thirty years, would be hidden from us; and that all we know of that life should be contained in one incident—the going up to Jerusalem, and in one sentence—that he was subject to Joseph and Mary at Nazareth?

In the duty of child to parent, servant to master, husband to wife, what is there in our Saviour's life to supersede the teaching of the Decalogue, and the precepts and examples of the older Scriptures? Take these instances in point, as they would be looked at by any simple and untaught man,—“How is it that ye sought me?” “Wist ye not that I must be about my father's business?” And the overturning the seats of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves; or, “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” Or the fact, that when questioned by the legal magistrates, before whom He stood arraigned, He answered nothing. These instances show how impossible it is that our Saviour's life could have been intended to supersede the plain and simple Commandments of the Decalogue, because, as Dr. Macleod infers, our Lord's life contains rules to take the place of them, rules clearer, fuller, and more able to guide us in the moral duties of life.

“But after all,” says Dr. Macleod, “what is the rule of life to a believer? Is it a series of *rules*? No, it is life itself. It is that which is the true life of the soul; the right condition of the spirit toward God and man, out of which all right thought, right feeling, right action, must come; that life which is derived from and sustained by Christ.” Now, these words mean nothing; or else they mean this, that the life the believer lives forms the rules of his life. That is, what he thinks must prove to him that he thinks what is right; what he speaks must be his authority

that he speaks what is right; what he does, his authority that he does what is right; in fact, that he is to be his own authority; in fact, that whatever he does, or thinks, or says, must be right, because he is convinced that he is a believer, and that he derives his life from Christ, and therefore that the products of that life are right? Does Dr. Macleod think any man on earth so perfect that he does nothing wrong? How, then, can a partially sinful man be an impartial judge of his own mixed life? And how can an imperfect life be life's rule, so as to set aside other rules, as those given us in the Decalogue? Nor must we forget that God's law is intended, and is needed, for the ungodly, as well as for the godly; to restrain evil-doers, as well as to be a rule of life to them who do well; to show the sinner his sin, as well as to quicken the believer to show his faith by his works.

Mark the twofold cause of the error, then, of supposing that the Decalogue is abolished.

One cause of the error arises from confounding this code of moral laws, which is for all time, with the Jewish code of ceremonies, which was preparatory to the coming of Christ, and with the Jewish municipal laws, which were given to the Jewish nation.

The second cause of this error arises from theological confusion.* Men imagined that these Ten Com-

* The confusion of mind in many Christians, in respect of the nature and use of God's law, is almost beyond belief. I remember once, in a clerical meeting, a vicar of position and experience and attainments, quoting the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine

mandments were the old covenant for the Jew, and that faith in Christ is the covenant for Jew and Gentile now. They overlooked the fact, though clear as the day, that no man in any age could ever have been saved by a perfect obedience to this law; that this law was never intended, for Jew or for Gentile, to be the ground of acceptance with God; but that this law was to be to Jew and to Gentile a rule of life, a test of our faith in God, and a proof of our love to Him, as to our neighbour. A rule, like a school-master, to bring to Christ; to show man what was right and what was wrong; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin;" to convince Jew and Gentile alike that they had transgressed and must

enemy," to show the difference between the Old and New Testament dispensations. He was reminded that the words, "and hate thine enemy," formed no part of the original text of Moses, but were added by the Jewish rabbis, and that there were no such words in the Old Testament Scriptures. He then quoted the text, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," to show the difference between the old dispensation and the new. He was now reminded that the error our Saviour here pointed out and corrected was, that the rabbis had made this—one of the judicial laws given for the guidance of the Jewish magistrate, Deut. xix. 16—21—the rule of private life between man and man, so as to gratify private revenge. And that, as the Jewish magistrate was ordered simply to make a man to recompense his neighbour for the injury he had done him—the value of an eye for an eye, and of a tooth for a tooth—this was good law still; and that injustice, not justice, would have been the consequence, had our Lord not allowed this principle to remain for the guidance of the magistrate, for which alone it was ever intended. Nor did the vicar seem quite convinced, till he was reminded that perhaps the hardest precept for a Christian, even now, was that which had formed part of the Hebrew Bible from the time of their third king, namely, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." (Proverbs xxv. 21 and 22.)

sue for pardon. So that Moses himself proclaimed God as "forgiving iniquity and transgression," as the ministers of Christ do now. And the Church of David's time sang, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered," even as the Church does now; and, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us." And six hundred years before the time of Christ, members of the Jewish Church had heard, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Isaiah i. 18.) What, then, is meant by the words, "The Ten Commandments were the covenant for the Jew"? Is it meant, that before the time of Christ, God only admitted from the visible Church into Paradise those who kept the Ten Commandments? Then, whether we look at the lives of the Old Testament saints, or consider that fallen human nature was the same of old as it is now, we should thus see that no one in those days could have been saved. For "whosoever keepeth the whole Law, and yet offendeth in one point, is guilty of all." The term covenant, then, cannot be taken in such a sense as this.

II. But, secondly, is the Fourth Commandment of the same nature with the other Commandments with which it stands; and is it, like them, binding throughout time?

First, then, it belongs to an unabolished code.

If all its other laws remain in force, show us any evidence that this Commandment does not equally remain in force. All the other Commandments are moral in their nature. Why not this? By moral I mean laws which manifestly have their roots in the nature of things—laws that seem as if they must be; and this because of what God is, and what man is in relation to God, and in relation to his fellow-men. This may be put plainly thus. God at the same time was laying down three codes of laws—a code moral, a code ceremonial, and a code municipal. The Fourth Commandment must belong to one of these three. Are we then to suppose—is not even the thought blasphemy?—that God put this Fourth Commandment into the code moral through error, because it is not of the same nature with all the other Commandments with which it stands; but that it ought to have been put either into the code ceremonial or into the code municipal?

Not but that it is a dangerous and unwarrantable distinction to say that the breach of any Commandment God has given is not immoral. For example:—A father, because of disturbance, tells his child to sit in a particular part of the room. There may not, in the nature of things, be any reason why the child, save for the father's order, might not sit elsewhere. But now, should the child disobey, you will say the child has broken the Fifth Commandment, and his act is in its nature immoral. And shall less be said of disobedience to any given commandment of our Father in heaven?

But we can see, in the nature of things, that the Fourth Commandment is moral, and rightly belongs to this code of laws therefore, which is in its essence immutable. God, as truly as man, has rights that are in their nature inviolate. God Himself therefore speaks of the possibility of man's invading His rights so as even to rob Him. And perhaps the oldest and most eternal right of God, is the right of being publicly and collectively worshipped by created intelligences in common adoration, glorification, blessing, praising. Survey the works of this universe, which has no limits. God's is the mind which conceived all; His the power which created all; His the energy which unceasing travails to uphold all; His the love which grants to us the presence and the enjoyment of all. And in return He claims obedience and adoration. We must hold high service to Him. Not always; for the works and cares of life prevent this; yet not capriciously and impulsively. God has the knowledge and the right required to fix the proportion. He has fixed it: "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all that thou hast to do; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,"—it is set apart from thee to me; from thy affairs to mine; from thoughts of thee to thoughts of myself. If, for example, we were to hear of a world of intelligent beings who refused to worship God in the times and seasons He had appointed, we should think of their conduct, not as the mere breach of a ceremony, but as immoral, a wilful and deliberate rebellion against their su-

preme Father and King. I was once asked whether there was morality in the number seven. I replied, Is there morality in the number two? If there is no morality in the number two,—one wife for one husband,—the Seventh Commandment is gone. And if there be no morality in the proportion of six and one, the Sabbath is gone.

But the Sabbath is also moral, if we look at it from man's point of view. Here, too, the Commandment is seen to have its origin in the nature of things, to be necessary to man always and everywhere, while the present state and order remains; to be made indeed for man, as our Lord tells us the Sabbath was. It is necessary for man's bodily nature. For physiologists with one voice tell us that the sleep of night does not fully repair the wear and tear of life, but that man needs the supplementary rest of one day in seven.

Dr. Farre says,—“Although the night apparently “equalizes the circulation, yet it does not sufficiently “restore its balance for the attainment of a long life; “hence, one day in seven by the bounty of Providence “is thrown in as a day of compensation, to perfect, by “its repose, the animal system.” (Evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, 1832, p. 116.)

“Physiologically considered, power saved is power “gained, and the waste of power from every kind of “excitement defeats the purpose of the day. So that “on the Sabbath, the labouring man is expending the “powers of his body, instead of husbanding them for

“the following week, and chiefly if he be engaged in drinking.” (Ibid.)

Lord Macaulay says,—“Of course I do not mean that a man will not produce more in a week by working seven days than by working six days. But I very much doubt whether, at the end of a year, he will generally have produced more by working seven days a-week than by working six days a-week ; and I firmly believe that at the end of twenty years he will have produced less by working seven days a-week than by working six days a-week.”

And again,—“Therefore it is that we are not poorer, but richer, because we have, through many ages, rested from our labour one day in seven. That day is not lost. While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of the nation as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts and Arkwrights are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labours on the Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporal vigour.” (Speeches, 1854, pp. 450, 451.)

No fewer than 641 medical men of London, including Dr. Farre, subscribed a petition to Parliament, against the opening of the Crystal Palace for profit on Sundays, containing the following sen-

tence:—"Your petitioners, from their acquaintance
 "with the labouring classes, and with the laws which
 "regulate the human economy, are convinced that a
 "seventh day of rest, instituted by God, and coeval
 "with the existence of man, is essential to the bodily
 "health and mental vigour of men in every situation
 "of life." (Report on the Observance of the Sabbath,
 from Select Committee of the House of Commons, &c.
 1832. p. 119.)

Here, then, you have the necessity in our very nature, in our bones and sinews. Here is the institution, like the institution of sleep, in our being, common to us as men, live where we will or when we may. A man, then, deprived of his proportion of sleep, unless for a need of his fellow man justifying such sacrifice, is deprived of an inalienable right, and he who for his own gain or pleasure thus deprives him, breaks God's moral law. Exactly thus, too, is it with the rest of the Sabbath.

So, too, man's spiritual nature demands the rest and opportunities of the Sabbath. Without it, man cannot publicly worship God. He cannot renew his spiritual strength. He cannot carry on his education for the life to come, for which this world is the school, and Sabbaths the great school days. Said Montalembert, "There can be no religion without public
 "worship; there can be no public worship without a
 "Sabbath." (Rapport, &c., 1850, pp. 37, 38.) Therefore he who steals the man's money steals trash compared with him who filches from his Sabbath; for to

lose these, may be for man to lose his eternal Sabbath, and to go, a fugitive and a vagabond, out into eternity, crying, "My punishment is greater than I can bear: give me back my Sabbaths."

Of the fact that we find this institution in our very nature—the necessity for the Sabbath being found in man, live when he will or where he will—Dr. Macleod himself bears ample testimony. He expatiates upon the truth, that the Sabbath "is adapted to our whole wants as men physically"; upon the "social" claims for a Sabbath; upon "its intellectual advantages;" upon "its spiritual advantages." And yet Dr. Macleod, at the same time, would have us believe, though we read in Genesis of the blessing and sanctifying the seventh day, that God never legislated for this necessity of men till two thousand five hundred years had passed away; that during these ages, for the dwellers in cities, as elsewhere, there was no Sabbath! In other words, that for four thousand years this legislation merely embraced a speck of the globe's surface about the size of the five largest English counties, leaving the whole earth besides without the Sabbath, which mankind in common needed. Further, that Christ and His apostles took especial pains to expunge the only words in revelation by which servants might now claim the Sabbath—the only words in which secular work, and buying and selling, are forbidden.

Dr. Macleod says he is very much inclined to think that the Sabbath was very much more an end in itself than a means of attaining anything higher

than individual worship and social instruction—not necessarily by Levites—on Divine things. But if it was but a means of allowing each head of a household to be priest to his own family, and to teach his children God’s will and word, as the father was commanded, to the intent that when their children come up they might teach their children the same, who can estimate the value of the “means” as affording an opportunity, whether for public or private worship and teaching? And Dr. Macleod also ignores the repeated exhortations given to the priests to teach Israel God’s law, and the fact that this was impossible unless there had been stated times available for the purpose. The Sabbath even now can be nothing more than this means to an end. But that God, and the thought of God—not man and his rest—was the higher consideration in the institution of the Sabbath, is seen in the fact that in the beginning nothing whatever was said about rest, but simply that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; rest from labour and secular employments following, but as a consequence. And the Fourth Commandment is, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” This is the head and crown of the Commandment. Then, as a means to that end, follows the command to rest; the consideration of God and His glory closing the Commandment; therefore the Lord—because of what He did—blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.

The Fourth Commandment, then, is in its nature moral, as it respects man and his rights.

If, then, this code of laws is in its essence moral, it must be immutable. And there never has been a moment in which it has not been immoral to break one of its laws. To repeal them were idle, for they must be re-enacted the next moment, since in every moment they must be law. God Himself would have His own morality impeached, did He for one moment grant a reprieve from laws moral. And no words can convey the meaning more simply and perfectly than "Thou shalt not," which give the law in eight of the Commandments, and "Remember to keep holy," and "to do no work," and "honour," which give the law in the others. If the Sabbath be then a part of this code, it stands or falls with it. And yet a man in the same breath will tell you that the Sabbath, or keeping holy one day in seven, was abolished, and one day in seven at once by the Church again set apart. But why? Why should the Institution be repealed by God, if it must be re-imposed by the Church because still necessary? The assumption is, God removed the institution from the basis of Law, on which He had placed it; and then the Church, finding the institution still necessary, did its best to repair this misfortune, by reimposing the institution on the basis of expediency. This, however, is rather the view of Dean Alford and Professor Plumptre than that of Dr. Macleod, who implies that our Lord and His apostles both abolished and reimposed the institution; though no reason, from the nature and wording of the Fourth Commandment, can be shown for so doing.

There is no hardship in the Fourth Commandment. That all cease work, is all it asks. Because of what God has done for all, is the only reason it gives. The Fifth Commandment may be modified without being superseded. The Fourth Commandment may keep to the six days and one, while the Saviour's resurrection-day takes the place of God's completion-of-creation day. The breach of the Fourth Commandment might have been visited for a while upon the Jew with heavy penalties; but so likewise was the breach of almost every other Commandment of the Decalogue. But the penalty may no longer be inflicted, though the law still remains in force.

That all these Commandments are moral, and therefore perpetual, is seen in the fact that they are all comprehended in the twofold Commandment of love to God and love to man. That is, you cannot break one of these Ten Commandments without violating the law of love to God, or of love to man, or of both. You cannot have more Gods than one; you cannot degrade God to the form of idols; you cannot take His name in vain; you cannot refuse, because of what God is, and what God has for us done, to remember to sanctify the day He has set apart, without violating the law of love to God. And you cannot steal, or kill, or commit adultery, or bear false witness, or covet, without violating the law of love to your neighbour; while a breach of the Fourth Commandment, which joins the two tables, as we have seen, violates at once the law of love to God and of love to man.

Therefore may we test ourselves by this law weekly—yea, daily; “By this we know that we love God, because we keep His commandments. And His commandments are not grievous.” God’s service of obedience to these commandments is perfect freedom. His law is the law of liberty. Like David, the believer now cries, “Oh, how I love Thy law. It is my meat and drink to do Thy will, O God. Thy law have I hid in that shrine of shrines, that ark of the covenant, my heart; in that holy of holies, in which dwells the glory of the presence of God.” “For know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in you.”

But it may be well to review more at length Dr. Macleod’s objections to the Fourth Commandment. First, in respect of the time, Dr. Macleod insists “that as to its letter, it is clear that it authoritatively binds us to keep the seventh day holy.” Now this assertion, as may be seen below, takes for granted what has to be proved.* But even if

* The Commandment, it is replied, enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, not of the first. How can the day be changed, if the Fourth Commandment is still binding?

It is here that a misapprehension often occurs. *The Commandment does not enjoin the observance of the seventh day of the week.* What it enjoins is this, six days for work, and then a Sabbath, a day of rest for God. The assertion may appear strange at first sight to many, and must therefore be supported by adequate proof.

By a rule of the Hebrew language—a rule, I believe, invariably observed, and which it has in common with our own, with the Greek, and with many, if not with all, other tongues which have a definite article—an ordinal number, following the mention of a cardinal number, takes the article; much on the same principle, no doubt, as fractional parts in Greek, viz., implied previous mention.

this point were proved, still it does not touch the substance nor the end of the Commandment. For the substance of the command is a rest of one day in seven; and the end of the Commandment is the worship of God and the welfare of man's body and soul. Now these are equally secured, whether we rest on the first day of the week or on the seventh. And if, as Dr. Macleod insists, our Saviour and His Apostles had the power to abolish the Sabbath, and to institute the Lord's-day in its stead, they

Thus, in the following examples, the Hebrew has the article where the English has.

Exod. xxii. 30. "Likewise shalt thou do with thine oxen and thy sheep. *Seven* days it shall be with its dam, and on THE *eighth* day thou shalt give it me." Here the eighth day is not the first day of the week, but the eighth, reckoning from the birth.

Lev. xiii. 5, &c. "When a man has a rising, a scab, &c., he shall be brought to Aaron, the priest, or to one of his sons," &c. "The priest shall shut him up *seven* days, and the priest shall look on him THE *seventh* day," &c. And when the leper was to be cleansed (xiv. 8), "he shall tarry abroad out of his tent *seven* days; on THE *seventh* day he shall shave his hair, &c., and on THE eighth day he shall take two he-lambs without blemish."

Num. xix. 11, &c. "He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be unclean *seven* days. . . . He shall purify himself with it [*i. e.* the water of purification] THE *third* day, and on THE *seventh* day he shall be clean."

In these examples the third day, the seventh day, and the eighth day, *have no reference whatever to the days of the week*, but only to the seven days previously specified in the case of the leper, and in the case of defilement, to the day on which the defilement began.

Now wherever the *Sabbath*, *i. e.* the day of rest (for we all know that such is the meaning of the word in its Hebrew derivation) is spoken of as THE *seventh* day, it is almost always, I believe, if not always, with reference to the six previous days of labour.

Exod. xxiii. 12. "*Six* days shalt thou do thy work, and on THE *seventh* day thou shalt rest, that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thine handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed."

surely had the power to transfer the authority of the Fourth Commandment from the observance of the seventh day to the first day, as we maintain.

And it is according to analogy that they should thus do. The Apostle Paul thus did with another of these Commandments, the Fifth. That Commandment has its whole structure changed, instead of being abolished, that a new Commandment might be founded upon it. So we contend in respect of the

Exod. xxxiv. 21: "*Six* days shalt thou work, but on THE *seventh* day thou shalt rest; in earing-time and in harvest-time thou shalt rest." So Exod. xxxi. 15. Again, Lev. xxiii. 3: "*Six* days shall work be done: but THE *seventh* day is the Sabbath of rest, a holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." Exod. xxxi. 13: "Verily MY *Sabbaths* [observe, it is not said, "the seventh day,"] ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you." And again, "Ye shall keep the *Sabbath* day, for it is holy to you. . . . *Six* days may work be done, but on THE *seventh* day is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: . . . for in *six* days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and on THE *seventh* day he rested, and was refreshed."

It is obvious that the principle involved is the observance of a day of rest unto God, following six days allotted to labour; that the stress is laid on that, not on the seventh day of the week; and that, according to the strictest letter of the Commandment, by the usage of the Hebrew, which therein resembles other languages which have a definite article, no more is really commanded than that.

It is true that the day of rest under the law, and indeed before the law, and even before the fall, was, for obvious reasons, the seventh day of the week; but if it had been intended to perpetuate the observance of that day in particular, this could have been expressed, I believe, as easily and distinctly in Hebrew, as it could be in English, thus:—"Remember the seventh day of the week, to sanctify it: on the first six days of the week thou shalt labour, but on the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath," &c.—("The Perpetual Obligation of a Sabbath." By Rev. Edward Biley, late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, pp. 6, 7, 8. Seeleys, 1861.)

Fourth Commandment. For, in the nature of things, whether in the observance of the Sabbath on the seventh or on the first day of the week, God could never have intended that the same weekly period of time should be set apart.

To go back to the Jewish Church.

Heylyn, in his work against the Christian Sabbath, quotes Joshua x. 13, when “The sun stood still, and the moon stayed so that the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.” He also quotes the case of Hezekiah, Isaiah xxxviii. 8, and 2 Kings xx. 9—11, when the sun went backward ten degrees. On which he remarks:—“In each of these cases there was a signal alteration in the course of nature and the succession of time, so notable, that it were very difficult to find out the seventh day precisely from the world’s creation, as to proceed in that account since the late giving of the law; so that, in this respect, the Jews must needs be at a loss in the calculation; and, although they might hereafter set apart one day in seven for rest and meditation, yet that this day, so set apart, could be precisely the seventh from the first creation, is not so easy to be proved.”

Or, to take the observance of the Lord’s-day, Bramhall says that it is “impossible to keep it at the same time in different longitudes; for that some people will be keeping it in the day, and others in the night. Let us follow this argument a little further. Let us take New Zealand, as being nearly

“ our antipodes. The inhabitants keep the Sabbath
 “ from midnight to midnight of their own time ; but
 “ of our time from mid-day on Saturday to mid-day
 “ on Sunday. But, supposing that the persons who
 “ carried the Sabbath thither, instead of going by the
 “ East, had gone by the West, they would, as to our
 “ time, be keeping it from mid-day on Sunday to
 “ mid-day on Monday—entirely a different day ; and,
 “ in either case, would have conformed to the spirit of
 “ the law. But let us take a still stronger instance.
 “ I fix on the Island of St. Helena, as being nearly in
 “ the same longitude as us, but with greater facility
 “ of travelling round the world—its being in a dif-
 “ ferent hemisphere and a different latitude not affect-
 “ ing the question. Suppose one ship to sail from
 “ thence round the world to the East, by the Cape of
 “ Good Hope, and to return ; and another, in like
 “ manner, to the West, by Cape Horn, and return.
 “ The eastern navigators would anticipate, and the
 “ western lose a day. The former would be keeping
 “ Saturday as to St. Helena’s time, and the latter
 “ Monday, and the inhabitants Sunday. Does not
 “ this show the absurdity of supposing the strict
 “ adherence to a particular day as necessary ; or of
 “ supposing any particular day to be endued with a
 “ peculiar sanctity.” (Archdeacon Stopford on the
 Sabbath; pp. 207, 208.)

The reason, however, for observing a particular
 day of the week, and not any day, is well put, with
 simplicity and force, by Anselm, thus (cited in Young’s

“ Dies Dominica,” p. 46) :— “ The vacation of the
 “ Lord’s-day is the moral part of the Decalogue in
 “ the time of grace, as the seventh day was in the
 “ time of the law.” And again, “ The observance of
 “ a day indeterminately, that at some time we should
 “ attend on God, is moral in nature and immutable ;
 “ but the observance of a determinate time is moral
 “ by discipline—by the adding of Divine Institution.
 “ When that time ought to be, is not for man to
 “ determine, but God.”

But again, Dr. Macleod objects that we cannot keep the Commandment unless we are bound by every jot and tittle of it. But what does he mean by every jot and tittle of it? The Commandment itself simply says, “ Thou shalt do no manner of work.” We are not saying that the expositions of this Commandment, given in the Jewish ceremonial and municipal laws, are likewise in force. We do not take up that line of argument with respect to the other Commandments. We do not, because we insist upon the Seventh Commandment, add to it the Jewish ceremonial and municipal laws, in respect of divorce and the water of jealousy, and so forth. Why, then, should we here? We do not insist upon Jewish penalties for breach of the Commandments of the Decalogue. We are insisting upon the present authority of the Decalogue. It has often been advanced, though not by Dr. Macleod, that if we insist upon the Fourth Commandment, we must stone to death the Sabbath-breaker. Then, we might equally argue, if you insist upon the First, and

Second, and Third, and Fifth, as well as the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Commandments, you must stone to death those who violate them, because the laws given by Moses to the Jewish magistrate made death the penalty of their violation. The answer, of course, would be, We are insisting only upon the present authority of the Ten Commandments, which say nothing about such penalties.

And if, as Dr. Macleod says, we are under "Divine obligation" to observe the Lord's-day, the question, in what that observance consists, still remains; so that we have not got rid of this question by getting rid of the Fourth Commandment.

I have thought it well here to meet these objections, to free the mind from much of that thought of austerity which darkens the Decalogue when this distinction is not seen.

The Fourth Commandment simply insists upon rest. But "the Sabbath was made for man;" and, from the beginning, works of necessity and mercy were not forbidden on the Sabbath. Indeed, those who argue against the authority of the Fourth Commandment will often unwittingly argue, when contending for a lax observance, that the Jews feasted, and enjoyed themselves, on the Sabbath Day. But we see, for instance, that the wife of the Shunamite would not hesitate on the Sabbath Day to ride on the ass to the prophet. The Sabbath Day's journey showed that a walk on the Sabbath Day was not unknown. The pulling the ass out of the pit, and

the leading the animals to the watering, showed the same conviction, that works of necessity and mercy were allowed on the Sabbath.

True, the Pharisees had straitened the letter of the Sabbath law; but so had they the letter of every other.

True, our Saviour took pains to vindicate, as many other Commandments of the Decalogue, so also the Fourth, against those traditions of men, by which they had made it of none effect. But would He have taken all these pains to expound, and to set forth, the right teaching of a law, which was waxing old, and ready to vanish away? Would He have declared Himself the Lord of the Sabbath, if it had been part of those "beggarly elements" which He came to bury? And would the accounts of these expositions by precept and by example have been written, as they are most fully in the Gospels originally penned for the Gentile world, if the same had pertained, merely as antiquarian and abolished law, to the Jews and their old Sabbath? Would He have left us in any doubt, if He had intended His followers to set aside the observance of the Sabbath? Would he not, for example, instead of saying, "Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath Day," have said, now, at the least, that "the destruction of Jerusalem has arrived, be not trammelled by the old Sabbath Commandment, which will be buried with me in my grave?"

The following is a collection of the teaching of our

Lord, both by precept as by deed, in the Gospels, in relation to the Sabbath.

“ 1. The disciples plucking the ears of corn. Matt. xii. 1 ; Mark ii. 23 ; Luke vi. 1.

“ 2. The cure of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue. Matt. xii. 10 ; Mark iii. 1 ; Luke vi. 6.

“ 3. Cure of a demoniac in the synagogue. Mark i. 23 ; Luke iv. 33.

“ 4. Simon's wife's mother raised from a fever. Mark i. 30 ; Luke iv. 38.

“ 5. On the same evening, the cure of all who were diseased, or possessed with devils, and also of his approval thereby of their being brought or carried to him. Mark i. 32 ; Luke iv. 40.

“ 6. On another Sabbath he laid his hand on a few sick folk, and healed them. Mark vi. 2—6.

“ 7. The woman with the spirit of infirmity for eighteen years, cured in the synagogue. Luke xiii. 11.

“ 8. Cure of the dropsy in the house of the chief pharisee. Luke xiv. 1.

“ 9. Impotent man cured at the Pool of Bethesda. John v. 2—16.

“ 10. Feast of Tabernacles, and renewed controversy relating to the performance of the preceding miracle on the Sabbath. John vii. 14—29.

“ 11. Cure of the blind man. John ix., the whole chapter.

“ Now, it is very remarkable, that of the eleven

“ above enumerated occasions and transactions, two
 “ only are recorded by St. Matthew, who wrote for
 “ the Jews, six of them are recorded by St. Mark, and
 “ seven by St. Luke, who wrote for the Gentiles. St.
 “ John wrote his as a supplemental Gospel, to supply
 “ what had been omitted by the others. He records
 “ three of the above occasions, which are not noticed
 “ by the others. Thus, then, of the eleven occasions,
 “ two only are recorded for the use of the Jewish
 “ converts ; whereas all the eleven are recorded by the
 “ other three evangelists for the use of the Gentiles
 “ or Christian converts from heathenism.

“ In St. Matthew we have only to the extent of
 “ fourteen verses on the whole subject. In St. Mark,
 “ thirty ; and in St. Luke, thirty-four. St. John oc-
 “ cupies forty-one verses with the single miracle of
 “ the cure of the blind man, and the controversy
 “ arising from his performing it on the Sabbath-day
 “ (ch. ix.), and eighty-seven with the circumstances of
 “ the miracle of the Pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath-
 “ day, and the controversy thereupon, v. 1—47, and
 “ vii. 14—53 ; or a hundred and twenty-eight verses
 “ altogether ; and yet St. John wrote after the destruc-
 “ tion of Jerusalem. Do not these facts strongly
 “ prove that these corrections of our Lord’s were in-
 “ tended for the general body of Christians, and there-
 “ fore that the Sabbath was to continue to be ob-
 “ served under the new dispensation ? ” (Archdeacon
 Stopford on the Sabbath, pp. 133—135.)

Again, who, it may be asked, forbids the doing of

parallel deeds to those our Lord did on the Sabbath Day? And yet these same deeds of our Lord are quoted as a license for deeds on the Sabbath Day of a totally different nature.

Dr. Macleod quotes before the Presbytery, as if in triumph, what St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans :—“ One man esteemeth one day above another ; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.” (Romans xiv. 5.) And he also alludes to the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, “ Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.” (Gal. iv. 10.) And he also refers to the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Colossians : “ 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.” (Colossians ii. 16.)

But why does Dr. Macleod quote these passages? What have these passages to do with the point in dispute between him and the formularies of his Church? Dr. Macleod himself says he believes that “ *this* day ” (the first) “ is sanctioned by the Apostles, inspired by the Spirit of God, and under the authority of Jesus Christ.” And again he says : “ And thus I thank-fully acknowledge the day to be divine, and of perpetual obligation.” Dr. Macleod’s Church believes that the first day of the week should be kept holy, because Christ and His apostles transferred the authority of the Fourth Commandment from the seventh day to the first. And Dr. Macleod himself believes that the

first day of the week should be kept holy, because Christ and His apostles founded the Lord's-day as a distinct institution. But if the Apostle Paul, in the above passages, includes the first day, which the Christians were now keeping holy, these passages equally deny the obligation to keep holy the first day. The passages equally overthrow the observance of the Lord's-day which Dr. Macleod would found upon the authority of Christ and His apostles, as the Lord's-day made to rest upon the authority of the Fourth Commandment. In either case, the words would equally overthrow all right to insist upon any difference between days. He that regardeth the Lord's-day, whether in respect to Christ and His apostles, or in respect of them and the authority of the Fourth Commandment, regards it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. "One man esteemeth one day above another;" as Dr. Macleod the Lord's-day. "Another esteemeth every day alike;" as the members of the National Sunday League. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And the same reasoning will apply to the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, "Ye observe days;" and to that in the Epistle to the Colossians, since it mentions "an holy day" as well as Sabbaths. These passages equally overthrow the Lord's-day, which Dr. Macleod would set up, and the Sabbath, which he would cast down.

Now, Dr. Macleod must hold that these passages include the first day of the week, or that they do

not. If they do include the Lord's Day, they make null and void all his efforts to prove that our Lord and His apostles, while they overthrew the Old Testament Sabbath, founded a new institution, the Lord's Day, in its place. If these passages do refer to the Lord's Day which the Christians now set apart, then it is impossible to maintain that the Apostle, who declared that a man might esteem every day alike, could at the same time have held and taught that the observance of the first day of the week was, to use Dr. Macleod's words, of divine obligation. Dr. Macleod must therefore agree with his Church that these passages do not refer to the Lord's Day; or else his own argument, that Christ and His Apostles put the Church under "Divine obligation" to set apart the first part of the week, is worthless.

But, it may be asked, why, if Dr. Macleod's view of the sanctity of the Lord's Day and ours agree in the fact that it rests on Divine obligation, why this alarm at his denial of the connexion between it and the Fourth Commandment?

His own favourite authority, Mr. Cox, in his *Literature of the Sabbath*, might show Dr. Macleod the danger we fear. Mr. Cox's great authority is the work of the late Sir William Domville, which, it may be seen, is dedicated to Robert Cox, Esq., we suppose the author of the above work. Now, Sir W. Domville has occupied nearly the whole of his first volume in examining the only six texts in the New Testament which, he affirms, say anything about

the observance of the Lord's-day.* And, agreeing with Dr. Macleod that the Fourth Commandment is not binding upon Christians, he comes to the conclusion that there is not a tittle of evidence in the New Testament Scriptures to show that the setting apart the first day of the week was enjoined by the Apostles. This will show the magnitude of the evil Dr. Macleod's speech and pamphlet may create. For Sir W. Domville is so far right, that, if there is an utter severance between the Fourth Commandment and the Lord's Day, between the Sabbath of the Old and the Sabbath of the New Testament, then there is not a sentence in God's Word that commands me not to work, not to buy, not to sell, on any and every day of the week alike. Then, no man-servant nor maid-servant can put their finger upon command or precept which forbids their master calling them to labour on the first day of the week as well as on other days. Then it remains that, though the passages which mention the Church assembling

* "I consider, therefore, that I have, by the examination of the Six Texts, fully established the following propositions:—

"First—That the Christian Scriptures record no instance of the observance of the Sunday in the time of the Apostles, either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day.

"Secondly—That they afford no evidence of a custom in the time of the Apostles so to observe it.

"And that, consequently, they contain no evidence that, by some precept from Christ or his Apostles (not now extant), Christians were enjoined to observe the Sunday as a Sabbath day, or, if not as a Sabbath day, as a prayer day."—(Domville on the Sabbath, Vol. I., p. 145.)

on the first day of the week may be sufficient to show the transference of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, there is nothing to show that if the early Christians, like Dr. Macleod, held the Fourth Commandment was not binding, they did not go on the first day from their worship to their labour. As to the necessity of their meeting to celebrate the Lord's Supper, that for Dr. Macleod's countrymen would prove too little; because they, for the most part, I believe, communicate but once or twice a year; while for the early Christians it would prove too much, as they were wont to partake of the Lord's Supper every day. As to leaving the rights of our fellow-men to the rest of the Sabbath to the "Christian conscience" of their employers, that, in this fallen world, would avail little, when the Scripture tells us of an "evil conscience," of a "defiled" conscience, and of a conscience "seared as with a hot iron." What would be thought of leaving any civil right of man to the arbitration and the protection of the Christian conscience? As to the Ten Commandments not being mentioned in the Pastoral of the Council of Jerusalem, and the breach of the Fourth Commandment not being spoken of by the Apostles in their writings, why the mystery becomes tenfold greater, if you simply insert "Lord's Day" in the place of these. Why, it may be with as much reason asked, if the Apostles were teaching that the Sabbath of the Old Testament had passed away,

and that they were founding a new institution to take its place, are they wholly silent on the subject? Why, if they taught that the observance of the Lord's Day was of Divine obligation, do they never enforce this fact either upon Jews or Gentiles?

“Nor is the neglect of the Sabbath more to be justified by the silence of the Apostolical Council concerning the observation, than idolatry or blasphemy is to be justified by their silence about the Second or Third Commandment.”—(Bishop Horsley's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 443.)

As to appealing to the custom and authority of the Church, where is the country that has preserved the Sabbath from trade and labour, unless it has rested the observance of the Sabbath on the Fourth Commandment?

As to the leaving the rights of men to the enjoyment of their Sabbaths to the fairness and right feeling of their neighbours, look at the Lutheran countries, yea to Geneva itself, where even now watchmakers and carpenters are trying, by associations, to recover from labour their Sabbaths. Should the day arrive when the working men of Scotland sigh and mourn, as from a life of unbroken labour they look back upon their forefathers enjoying without loss of income a rest of one day in seven, equivalent to one year in seven, or seven years in forty-nine, they will, I fear, see that they owed this harm and loss in no small degree to the Minister and Royal Chaplain who first sought to deprive them of their Magna Charta, that Fourth

Commandment, in which God steps in between the master and the servant, and claims, in His own name and authority, "that thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou." But that God's rights and man's need throughout time have been met by a legislation as wide, and that God has ever claimed one day in seven for His worship and our rest, let the one note that speaks in these parallel texts show :—

"And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." (Genesis ii. 3.)

"But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." (Exodus xx. 10.)

"This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." (Psalm cxviii. 25.)

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, *from* doing thy pleasure on my holy day." (Isaiah lviii. 13.)

"Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." (Mark ii. 28.)

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." (Revelations i. 10.)

Throughout, the idea is one, and the same, and continuous.

Like the granite, this legislation for the Sabbath runs throughout time, as from Genesis to Revelation. Other Scriptures, like strata, may often, and through long intervals, hide the Sabbath from our view; but, like the granite in the peaks of the mountains, it rises again in such texts as these in all its majesty and all

its power, and tells us that the Sabbath is like the mountains, firm and immovable, save by Him before whom the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed. And then, when that consummation has arrived, but not till then, shall the Sabbaths of earth be swallowed up in the Sabbath of heaven.







