

Lord's day? I answer—because I believe this need of rest is not an arbitrary thing which has been created by command, but is something founded on the everlasting necessities of human nature, and, therefore, was commanded. I believe the enactment of this law of rest is based, not on the nature of things, but on the nature of man, and therefore is eternal, and therefore also was promulgated from Mount Sinai.

Holding these views, then, I can easily speak of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's day as being a perpetual institute. It is perpetual whether you look at it from the Decalogue or from the New Testament; in the one direction getting the idea of rest as a perpetual necessity for the body—in the other getting the idea of worship and communion with Christ as a perpetual necessity for the spirit.

After shewing the change that has taken place in modern times, necessitating a certain amount of work on the Sabbath, he warns against coolly ignoring all these things, and turning round fiercely to denounce some other violation practiced by the poor or by the working classes. He advocates the keeping in mind the grand universal principle which covers and absorbs the whole Decalogue, and is the fulfilment of the law, "Do unto others as you would be done by," and continues,

There is a law of Christian expediency which you must put into force—which you must carry with you to interpret the law of the Decalogue. And there is a rare gift of common sense which you must also take with you and employ it in such a way as to reduce all labour as much as possible in your own household and let your servants and others get as much of that Sabbath rest to themselves as is compatible with the necessities of human life. These are some of the things you must do, and in the doing of them you will find there is enough of responsibility to occupy your thoughts, and plenty of scope for tact and judgment, and considerateness, and Christian love, to engage your attention without travelling out of doors to inspect your neighbours. Solemn is your responsibility in this matter, my brethren. You and I shall answer to God if we deprive any human being unnecessarily of that rest and that worship without which the soul withers and loses all vision of its Maker, and becomes stunted and dwarfed, and godless. This is the law that doth hedge you in with a command as loud and as obligatory as that which pealed in Sinai—the voice of Christ—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do you even so to them."

It is well that Mr. McQuisten has published this sermon. Throughout the length and breadth of the world where the English language is spoken, infidels and Sabbath breakers are triumphing over what they believe to be the adhesion of a strong party in the Church of Scotland to the side

of Sabbath desecration. Whatever we may think of the sincerity of Dr. Macleod, it will hardly be disputed that he chose a most unfortunate time to draw fine, wire-drawn distinctions, and raise subtle questions as to the authority on which the observance of the Lord's Day was founded.

No man, we will venture to say, more deeply regrets the consequences of the course he followed than does Dr. Macleod himself; but if men will, for the sake of effect, use striking expressions, bold imagery, and antithetical turns of speech, they must make up their minds to lose in clearness what they may perhaps gain in eloquence. The much reviled Scotch Sabbath, with its deathlike gloom, and puritanical stillness has been blessed of God to the souls of His people. It is not for flying tourists, newspaper correspondents who are forced to write smart things, and find it easier to caricature than to describe, to hold up to ridicule and abhorrence that blessed institution to which we owe so much. It may be very witty in Dr. Macleod, and may excite the laughter of the thoughtless as they hear him tell, as he so well can do, of exaggerations of the feeling of reverence for God's Holy Day; but the feeling of disrespect on the part of those who would fain throw off its restraints, needs no encouragement from one who can so well dispense with the incense of ignorant followers, throwing up their caps and cheering to see their best safeguard swept away, and its foundations undermined by one who should have defended it to the last.



At a meeting of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, held on the 27th of December, the innovations introduced by Dr. Robert Lee, of Greyfriars Church, formed the subject of a long debate.

We shall content ourselves at this time with giving an abstract of the discussion, without making further remarks on the subject, to which we shall probably return. It is one of the utmost importance to the well-being of the Church, and we prefer to put our readers in the first place in possession of the general scope of the remarks of the various speakers. The motion was lost by twenty votes to fifteen, a decision not come to on the merits of the question itself, but from another consideration—the opinion held by several of the members of