

with all these ceremonies which are nailed with Jesus Christ to the Cross, it is my belief it will not stand examination."

From these statements of his own, Dr. McLeod's position is easily recognized. The Scriptural and time-honoured belief of the Church is that the obligation of keeping a Holy Sabbath is founded upon the command of God "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and sanctioned and enforced by Christ and the Apostles both by example and precept, and also sanctioned, in fact necessitated by the nature and duties of human beings. The belief of Dr. McLeod is that the Lord's day is of divine institution, of divine authority, but he means the authority of Christ and His Apostles; that it is of perpetual obligation, to be loved and revered, but that it is rightly kept, not in obedience to the law in the Decalogue, but as a Gospel institution.

Having thus endeavoured to correct his representation and to remove misapprehension by a candid exhibition of the facts of the case, a course we are assured the Synod will approve, the Committee may declare with freedom how strong their feeling is that the words of Dr. McLeod, considering what they assert and what they deny, where they were spoken, and what he is who uttered them, deserve animadversion and reproof, and that they should be answered by the counter declaration of the Divine truth, given to us to observe for our good always.

The effect of such words from such a man could be hardly anything else than painful to many of their hearers and readers. They could only cause surprise and sorrow to christian people in Scotland and elsewhere. They would suggest doubt of the obligation of holy Sabbath-keeping to many who would not understand, and to many who would not heed the wise distinctions between *qua* Decalogue and *qua* Gospel. They would be seized upon as a make-weight to arguments and influences brought at this time to bear against the national reverence for the Sabbath by Railway Directors and authorities favouring the running of trains on the Lord's Day. And they would be used by the more vulgar Sabbath breaker, "giving opportunity to many who desire nothing better than to practise this irreverence under the ægis of his great name."

Further, Dr. McLeod's words, when not intended to invalidate the divine authority of the Lord's day, were unnecessary. No christian man in a condition of sanity, even on the supposition that the moral law *qua* Decalogue was abrogated, would think it imperative on him to tell men, in the present state of the world, that they were not required to know and love and serve their God on the authority of the first three commandments, and that it was quite permissible to murder, bite and devour one another for anything the Sixth Commandment said to the contrary. Just as little was it requisite to tell men whose unhappiness and loss it is that they do not love and sanctify the Sabbath too well, that no obligation was laid upon them by God's solemn words, who was thinking on them and providing for their good when He made the Sabbath for man, and said, Remember to keep it holy.

But the words of Dr. McLeod have also a clear distinct meaning: they both affirm and deny in express terms: and so far as they touch upon the old doctrine respecting the Sabbath and the Decalogue they are fallacious and untrue.

There is fallacy which almost wears the appearance of disingenuousness, when in the argument the *Fourth Commandment* is coupled with "*all these ceremonies which are nailed with Jesus Christ to the Cross.*"—The ceremonies of the Mosaic Dispensation ceased with the order of things to which they belonged: but the Sabbath—made for men—instituted in