

was the interval of time, so far as these valleys are concerned, which separated them from the Middle Ages. I was told that M. Geymonat, who presided at the Balsille ceremony, had been dragged in handcuffs through the street of Latour. The historian Muston, who is only just dead, was condemned to exile for the publication of part of his work.

We stopped before a small structure, elaborately illuminated. It bore the inscription: "Il Re Carlo Alberto al popolo che l'accoglieva con tanto affetto. MDCCCXLV." It was a fountain erected by the gallant but unfortunate Charles Albert, after a visit he paid to the valleys in 1845. His memory is most affectionately cherished by the Vaudois. Hard by was a large building in total darkness. "Tenebræ in luce," remarked one of our party. This was the Roman Catholic Church, so that there was considerable justification for its obscurity. Not that there is now, any more than in old times, any difficulty with the Roman Catholic inhabitants; there were very few of their dwelling-houses which were not illuminated like the rest.

There was a subsequent meeting at Pra del Tor; but I was unfortunately unable to stay for it. I hear that it was as successful as its predecessors; and, further, that the king has conferred decorations on M. William Meille and on the Syndic of Latour. Every Vaudois will congratulate them, and will almost take their decorations as a personal favour to himself. Certainly the king has no more loyal and attached subjects than the inhabitants of the Waldensian Valleys.

A LAYMAN.



ART. III.—THE LAW OF THE SABBATH.

ONE of the accidents of time, to which eternity will not be liable, is the necessity of its division into portions to which various conditions of being are proper. Night, alternating with day, supplies opportunities of diurnal rest. Sunday, recurring after each interval of six days' labour, supplies its weekly rest. Such divisions are a concession to the imperfections of our present existence. We cannot work without waste of energy, nor rest completely without ceasing from work. In sleep we repair the strength spent in previous toil. Disregard of Nature's demands in this particular brings upon us sooner or later Nature's inevitable revenge. A general breakdown is the certain sequel to the overtaking of our powers, mental or physical. Our stock-in-trade is quickly disposed of, and we have little or no capital from which to recoup ourselves for an overdraft upon our current resources. Setting aside thoughts of a future and a higher life for man, these imperfections might well cause us surprise.

Many of the lower creatures are capable of far greater exertions than he, intermitted with far scantier seasons of repose. A Samson might envy the physique of a swallow; Hercules could not have moved a load proportionable to that a garden-beetle can lift.

Not only are divisions between activity and rest a concession to our present imperfect conditions of physical being; they are a concession also to our imperfect moral condition. Distinctions between the sacred and the secular will be unknown above. We shall never have any secular occupations; and this not so much because no occupations corresponding to those we now call secular will then have place, as because every department of saintly activity will be capable of consecration. All acts there will be supremely sacred. "There remaineth a Sabbath-keeping¹ to the people of God." There remain no week-days. Every deed done will be a religious service. Praise will hang on every breath, be vocal in every uttered word. "I saw no temple therein." There will be no "going up to the house of the Lord." This implies distinctions, degrees of sanctity, the possibility of profanation, a place for the secular. In whatever occupation engaged, the Sabbath-keeping of each soul will be unbroken. The songs of the adoring heart will never cease; the music of the consecrated life will never intermit its melody. Every vessel will be wanted in heaven for the Master's use. Every detail of life will be yielded to the Temple service; "Yea, every pot shall be holiness to the Lord of Hosts, and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them and seethe therein."²

Now, it were, of course, an idle task to seek for a full explanation of the fact that these divisions of time, offering as they do facilities for these earthly distinctions, are to be referred for their origin to the Creator's original appointment, and cannot, therefore, be considered as consequent upon the Fall. There need be no more difficulty in the conception of the solar system, or the universe, if we will, adapting itself to the altered circumstances of a fallen humanity, than in the conception of the human frame adapting itself to the altered climatic conditions of the earth. We need discredit Omnipotence with no such meagre resources as compelled recourse to the clumsy Miltonian disadjustment:

Some say He bid His angels turn askance
The poles of earth; twice ten degrees and more
From the sun's axle they with labour pushed
Oblique the centric globe.³

Adaptation, even in man's mean handiwork, does not always involve alteration. Her infinite fertility of resource is one of the

¹ Heb. iv. 9, marg. 'σαββατισμός.'

² Zech. xiv. 21.

³ "Paradise Lost," x. 668-671.

first lessons Nature's students learn from her primer. It is open to us to imagine a world passing from its Maker's hand in a condition of absolute perfection, and yet so unelastic in its constituent parts as to be incapable of adapting itself to the altered physical condition of its inhabitants. Or we may imagine the like lack of elasticity in those inhabitants, rendering them incapable of adapting themselves to an altered material environment. In either case the result would be destruction of physical life. Instead, however, of the world being incapable of adaptation to the needs of a fallen humanity, we find the Creator's forethoughtful love has stored it with compensations. There, under the heated tropics, where exertion is a pain, the earth brings forth abundantly with husbandry's lightest touches. Here, where the fitful temperate zones call for more anxious and laborious tillage, labour itself is oftener than not a physical delight.

Apply this line of thought to the Sabbath, and we shall have little difficulty in conceiving of the propriety of its existence in a sinless Eden, though we are compelled to allow that as a *compensation* it would be entirely out of place.

We pass to the consideration of the institution of the Sabbath. Its origin is thus recorded: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work, which God created and made."¹

Before entering upon the main subject of this passage a parenthesis is called for, to meet a somewhat frivolous objection which has been put forward by opponents of the Sabbath: that in the words, "on the seventh day God *ended* His work," we have the statement that God worked on that day. To say nothing of the immediately succeeding *pluperfect*, a justifiable rendering of the original,² "which He *had* made," it is simply the most ridiculous stretch of literary purism to insist that the day on which a work is said to "end," or "be ended," must itself share some portion of that work. The nearer we bring the English into touch with the original, the less colour is left for the cavil. "On the seventh day God *let go* His work" would be a strictly faithful rendering; and with this rendering the objection founded on the clause would never have been heard of.³

The passage demands a somewhat careful examination. First,

¹ Gen. ii. 1-3.

Kal. עָשָׂה.

³ The verb is in the future apocopated Piel, יָבֵל, "let go" therefore c. tches the slight *jussive* force of the form.

for the word "rested." This is "shabath," the word from which the naturalized "Sabbath" is derived.¹ This verb is found in the sense of *rest* only ten times in the Old Testament. In nine passages it is intransitive, and in all these it is used in direct association with the Sabbath. Exod. v. 5, where the form is the causal (Hiphil),² is the only exception. This narrow usage of the verb is significant. It is impossible to regard it as accidental. It marks the word off as sacred. The ordinary word is "nuach,"³ which is found about fifty times, as often in a causal as in an intransitive sense. There is, then, this fact before us, that with the stupendous work of original creation a single ordinance has been connected in the most solemn way by the Creator, ratified by His own example. As to the nature of this Divine repose, we are able to deny more than we can affirm. Weariness it could not have implied. "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary."⁴ Waste of energy He cannot be liable to. Whatever, therefore, we understand by the word "rested," when predicated of the Creator, we must exclude all necessities attaching to finiteness and impotency of being. It is mere trifling with a clear historic statement to argue that we have here an instance of anthropomorphic language. It is more than this. It is an ignorant misapplication of an exegetical phrase. Anthropomorphism is the application of the human to the description of otherwise indescribable acts or attributes of Deity. It is not the transference of acts or attributes or conditions from man to God which are not in any sense proper to God.⁵ Thus in speaking of the "hand," the "eye," the "ear," the "mouth" of God, we are taking legitimate refuge in anthropomorphic language. These terms are made to describe senses which in their exercise are all-pervading and simultaneous, and are therefore but imperfect, even as symbols of those senses in God. But in thus using terms applicable to man, we do not attribute to God attributes and actions which do not belong to Him; by them we inadequately describe that which is resident in Him. To argue, then, that because a human agent needs repose after labour, it is written that God after labour rested, is trifling. If God did not in some sense actually rest, no anthropomorphic expression is needed to relate that which never took place.

The patristic fancy, noticed by Lactantius, that "sabbath" is derived from שֶׁבַע, "seven," is quite worthless, as is that of Apion (Josephus, against Ap. ii. 2) who maliciously traces it to "Sabbo," the malady of buboes in the groin, with which the Hebrews were attacked after marching six days.

² הִשְׁבַּחַם. ³ נוּחַ. ⁴ Isa. xl. 28.

It is not, of course, forgotten that the old heretical anthropomorphism was this. The term is used above in its modern *expository* sense.

In what sense did God rest? Three ideas lie within the allowable range of the word: (1) A cessation of some particular activity; (2) satisfaction in the completion of the work; (3) sanctity. Binding these three ideas in one, we have a Sabbath which could be kept by a Being who can know no fatigue. For the first element, we have to observe that the Creator's rest did not include a cessation from all work; He still upheld by His omnipotent arm that which He had before made. It implied, then, a ceasing only from that special work which had occupied Him during the six previous days. The third element—sanctity—will be dealt with at a later stage in our inquiry. The second calls for a brief pause. At the close of each day's activity, it is recorded that the Creator surveyed His handiwork and pronounced it worthy of Himself. This verdict of approval appears intensified at the close of the whole work: "Behold it was very good" (ver. 31). The fresh young world was a true cosmos, in which no flaw was detected. Ineffable pleasure filled the bosom of the Eternal when He looked forth upon creation and saw nothing amiss; not the faintest unhallowed wish or thought in an archangel's heart, not an ill-formed insect's wing. Divine love and Divine power were attested in all. Perfect work done supplied its own proper bliss to that hallowed seventh day. In the beautiful expression of Exod. xxxi. 17, "He rested, and *was refreshed*."¹

We now pass to the second historic statement of Gen. ii. 3: "God blessed the seventh day." This is the third act of blessing we encounter in the course of creation. Jehovah is the source of all blessing, and every act of human blessing involves a direct reference to Him, and is meaningless without this reference.² The verb in the passage before us is in the intensive conjugation (Piel) and both the occurrences of the verb in the first chapter show the same form. With these passages in view, it is strange indeed that Kennicott and others following him should force an entrance for a causative sense into a conjugation which may very exceptionally bear such a sense. If we read thus, "God caused man to bless and worship *on* the seventh day," we shall scarcely be disposed to give the same significance to the Piel in ver. 22 of the first chapter, "God caused them"

¹ שבת וינפש. The verb נפש (unused in Kal) is only found in the niph'al three times, and *twice* it is connected with the Sabbath. Exod. xxiii. 12; xxxi. 17; 2 Sam. xvi. 14.

² The Divine Name "Shaddai" (שדי) is etymologically "the bountiful One." In it is indicated the fulness of God's grace. Under Jerome's doubtful guidance the Versions have adopted "Almighty" as its equivalent (Jerome, "Omnipotens"). The title is found five times in Genesis, *always* in association with a blessing—xvii. 1; xxviii. 3; xxxv. 11; xliii. 14; xlix. 25.

(the fishes and fowls) "to bless," etc. Besides this, the particle "aith" is in this singular rendering mistaken for the preposition, which is *never* used in a temporal sense.¹

The statement, then, implies that the Almighty bestowed in a special manner His own benediction upon the day. Now, the Divine blessing must always be a *fruitful* one. A barren blessing is a mockery. To bless a day—that is, a portion of fleeting time—is, after all, a metaphorical expression. The truth that underlies the metaphor is the potential bestowal of blessing, in connection with the day, upon some being or beings capable of receiving a blessing. Superstition alone finds solace in the contemplation of inanimate recipients of a blessing. So the only conclusion we can draw from this record is that the day henceforth was intended to be a means and occasion of peculiar blessing to man.

The sanctification of the seventh day is the third statement. Few more important words are to be met in the Scriptures than this word "sanctify." The Hebrew word "kadash"² corresponds generally to the Greek *ἀγιάζω*. In the Piel conjugation, which occurs in the text, the verb is found in *three* connections: *First*, "to hold sacred or hallowed"—*e.g.*, Deut. xxxii. 51, "Ye sanctified me not in the midst of the children of Israel" (so Lev. xxi. 8). *Secondly*, "to consecrate"—*e.g.*, priests, as in Exod. xxviii. 41, xxix. 1; or an altar, as Exod. xxix. 36; or the Temple, as 1 Kings viii. 64; or the people of Israel, as Josh. vii. 13; or a mountain, as Exod. xix. 23. *Thirdly*, "to declare holy." It is this third meaning that we must attach to the verb in Gen. ii. To this passage may be added Deut. v. 12; 2 Kings x. 20. The root idea is not, as some hold, *separation*, though this is a secondary element, but *purity, clearness*.³ The word is applied to *times* in several places of the Old Testament (see Joel i. 14; Lev. xxv. 10). And what is much to our present purpose, we find from Lev. xxiii. 27, 28, and xxv. 11, 12, a close association between the sanctification of seasons and the intermission of human toil. This in itself is a sufficient answer to those⁴ who contend that this primeval institution of the Sabbath contains no *command* to rest on it. If this command is not distinctly implied in the verb "kadash," what is the practical force of the verb? And it is surely a singular accident that at each place where the sanctifying of *times* by the Almighty is mentioned, abeyance of secular work is one of the direct results of that sanctification.

¹ אֵיתִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי, "on the seventh day," is not Hebrew at all.

² קָדַשׁ.

³ "Sunt qui *separandi*, vim primariam putent, quia sancta separata sint a profanis; sed mihi hoc secundarium videtur."—Gesenius, *Thes.*, p. 1195.

⁴ *E.g.*, Paley.

We have next to observe how the Divine Son is associated with the Father in the work of creation. Space will not permit more than a reference to the following passages from the New Testament: St. John i. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16;¹ Heb. i. 2. Concerning the nature of this association of the First and Second Persons in the Holy Trinity we can only with reverence, and possibly with some hesitation, accept Olshausen's striking suggestion, quoted by Canon Liddon,² that "the *χαρις αὐτοῦ* of St. John (i. 3), while expressing the dependence of created life upon Christ as its cause, hints at the reason of this dependence—namely, that our Lord is the *causa exemplaris* of creation, the *κόσμος νοητός*, the archetype of all created things."

Bearing in mind, then, the association of the Second Person with the First in the creation, we learn to attach a deep meaning to the solemn appropriation of the seventh day by our Blessed Lord: "The Son of man is Lord (even) of the Sabbath day."³ This Divine lordship over the Sabbath, we have further to observe, includes government, direction, the power to bind and loose in connection with it. In abolishing it this power would not surely be worthily exercised; for it has been appointed "for man." In the admirable words of another, He is Lord of the Sabbath, "to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, to ennoble it, by merging it in 'the Lord's Day,' breathing into it an air of liberty and love, necessarily unknown before, and thus making it the nearest resemblance of the eternal sabbatism."⁴

Our way is now fairly opened to the consideration of the fourth commandment. This brings us into contact with the most voluble opponents of Sabbath observance. We are met

¹ Of Eph. iii. 9 the New Testament Revisers have deprived us, omitting the words "by Jesus Christ," recognising the overwhelming MS. authority against them.

² Bampton Lectures. Edit. vii., p. 319, note.

³ It is impossible to accept Alford's exposition of this verse as it appears in St. Mark ii. 28 (comp. St. Matt. xii. 8). He lays stress upon the circumstance that our Lord styles Himself "Son of man" in this place, and refers to the words immediately preceding, "The Sabbath was made for man." He argues that because it was made for man's benefit, the Lord was its Lord in virtue of His manhood. In the first place it may be remarked that the phrase "Son of man" is so frequently upon the lips of Christ that nothing reliable can be drawn from its occurrence in this connection; and in the next place we fail to see in what sense the Lord is Lord of the Sabbath which is not equally applicable to all who share His humanity, His lordship accruing to Himself *in virtue of His manhood*. Bengel's guidance is sounder: "Finis sabbati facti est salus hominis secundum animam et corpus; hanc salutem præstare debet Filius hominis; et ad hunc finem obtinendum habet idem potestatem omnium rerum, et nominatim sabbati, quippe propter hominem facti; et pro hoc fine obtinendo recte moderatur omnem sabbati usum."

⁴ Dr. Brown, Commentary, in loc.

with the assertion that this command is distinctively Jewish; that it is part of the Jewish ceremonial law, which was done away in Christ, and is therefore in no way binding upon Christians.¹ If it be distinctly Jewish, it is somewhat singular that it should have been incorporated into the Decalogue, which is *not* distinctly Jewish. Granting that it belongs to the class of enactments called ceremonial, we may ask, How is it that it alone of all the ceremonial laws is removed from its own proper class and placed among those laws which are known as moral? The moral law, it is allowed on all hands, was not transitory; instead of being cancelled by Christ, it owes to His very first ministerial utterances its expansion and the furthest possible reach of practical application. The fourth commandment is found among these perpetually binding moral laws. All moral law is irrevocable, inasmuch as it is based upon the unchangeable verities of the Divine character. To all eternity this will abide the same; and so will the law, which is but a rescript of its changeless lineaments. Moral laws, therefore, are of eternal obligation. And among these moral laws we find this command, to keep holy one day in seven.

Now, apart from the promulgation, this law would have no ground on which to claim our allegiance. It is one of those laws which are known as *positive*, owing its binding force to the mere fact that Divine authority has imposed it. Further, as Hooker points out: "Although no laws but positive be mutable, yet all are not mutable which be positive. Positive laws are either permanent or else changeable, according as the matter itself is concerning which they were first made, whether God or man be the maker of them, alteration they so far forth

¹ Robertson, preaching on Col. ii. 16, 17, thus writes: "The history of the Sabbath is this—it was given by Moses to the Israelites, partly as a sign between God and them, marking them off from all other nations [How comes it, then, that this is the only one of the ten which links the Gentile "stranger" with the Jew?], partly as commemorative of their deliverance from Egypt; and the reason why the seventh day was fixed on rather than the sixth or eighth was that on that day God rested. The soul of man was to form itself upon the model of the Spirit of God. It is not said that God at the creation gave the Sabbath to man, but that God rested at the close of the six days of creation; whereupon He had blessed and sanctified the seventh day to the Israelites. This is stated in the fourth commandment, and also in Gen. ii., which was written for the Israelites; and the history of creation naturally and appropriately introduces the sanction of *their* day of rest." This outspoken avowal that the second chapter of Genesis was written for the people of Israel is made without an attempt at proof. It involves the absurd proleptical theory that God sanctified a day in view of the needs of a nation which should come into existence more than twenty centuries later; that the primeval enactment was no sooner promulgated than it was by Divine appointment suspended for 2,000 years.

admit, as the matter doth exact."¹ We may not, therefore, conclude that because this fourth commandment is a positive law it was not intended to be permanent. For not all which are positive are mutable. Is it not, let it be asked, perfectly legitimate to infer from the incorporation of this particular law in the Decalogue that, notwithstanding its peculiar character, it was intended, in its essential requirements, to be immutable? Unless this inference be accepted, what reasonable account can be given of its presence here at all? Supposing, then, that this command is to be regarded as *solely* ceremonial—as not in any way partaking of a moral enactment, we join issue with our opponents, nevertheless, when they demand its elimination from the existing moral code. Its very presence in that code is a plea for its perpetuity, which we leave with them the onus of silencing.

But we have betrayed our reluctance to concede the moral element in the command. That it is not to be classed amongst those which are anticipated by the consciences of men, and based upon the essential attributes of God, has been shown. Yet is it simply ceremonial? Can it be justly reckoned among such laws as were abrogated by Christ "for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof"? And if it be urged that the spirit of the law is binding, but not the letter, are we prepared to say as much of the other parts of the Decalogue? For example, when the Lord teaches that the sixth commandment forbids the harbouring of causeless resentment, does He make actual murder permissible? Spiritualizing these laws, He does not weaken, but rather ratifies, their literal cogency.

Is, then, the law nothing more than a ceremonial one? We think it is much more. It possesses a character distinctly moral *in its applications to human conduct*. The conditions of the body and the mind react upon that of the soul. Physical exhaustion and mental fatigue are more or less provocative of moral laxity; perpetual contact with one range of ideas or pursuits tends to stamp its own impress upon the character; liberty, if enjoyed without restraint, and without due regard to restrictive law, has a direct tendency to degenerate into license. What we believe ourselves free to do at any time (the act not being naturally agreeable to us) is commonly in danger of being left undone altogether. Upon these four points we cannot enlarge. But taken together they appear to us amply sufficient to warrant our attaching a moral character to the fourth commandment, so far as that character is estimated in reference to the applications of the command to human actions.

¹ Eccl. Pol., Book I., chap. xv. 1.

We proceed to examine the Sabbath law. The first word—*i. Remember*—is striking. It refers us back to some prior enactment. It bears witness to the fact that this is not the first publication of the law. We need scarcely stay to maintain that the word does not mean, “Do not forget this command now that it is published.” To say nothing of the feebleness of the sense, the word might with equal propriety have headed any one of the other nine.

In Exod. xvi. we find that the seventh day was respected by the people at large; and it is to be noticed that there the gift of the Sabbath is connected with the gift of manna. “See for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.¹ So the people rested on the seventh day.” The day was accordingly given to the Israelites *before* the publication of the fourth commandment. And it is interesting to find its first notice occurring in connection with the gift of the manna. Like the manna, the Sabbath was a *gift*. Like the manna, it had respect to the needs of human nature; but, unlike the manna, its utility reached beyond the demands of the body, to those of the soul. “The Lord hath given you the Sabbath.” Its opponents are pleased to regard it as an exaction. The first time it is mentioned in the Word of God it is called a gift. It is not something wrested from man by a harsh and exacting lawgiver, imposing heavy burdens grievous to be borne. It is a gracious boon, bestowed out of the riches of God’s fatherly love—a boon linked with that of daily nourishment, as filling up along with this the weekly round of human need.

ii. The next point to claim attention is the including of dumb animals in the command. The discriminating regard of the Creator for the lowest of His creatures is nowhere more strikingly revealed than in the Pentateuch.² Have we not here again an additional proof that this commandment was not intended for the Jews only? Are we to suppose that none but animals in the possession of Jews are included? With this pointed allusion to the cattle we may compare that remarkable account of the Babylonian Captivity, that it was not only the penalty for national sins, but that it was the occasion of the very *soil* of the land keeping the Sabbaths of which it had

¹ A foolish sect, variously called Masbothei, Marbonei, Morbonei, which arose about the time of our Lord, interpreted this injunction with ridiculous precision. No man was to *change his position* during the Sabbath. *Vide* Routh’s “*Reliquiæ Sacræ*,” vol. i., p. 225, edit. 2, on a fragment of Hegesippus. Origen censures this puerile trifling in his “*De Principiis*,” Book iv., chap. i.

² *E.g.*, Exod. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21; xxii. 6, 7, 10.

been defrauded by the secularising unbelief and worldliness of its inhabitants. This Sabbath-keeping of the soil is three times referred to in the prophetic warnings of Lev. xxvi. (ver. 34, 35, 43). The sequel is related in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, where we have the historian's inspired comment upon this overwhelming calamity in the following words: "To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate, *she* kept Sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years."

We encounter here a most singular instance of providential adjustment. First for the coincidence between the repetition of the violation of the law of the Sabbatic year¹ and the duration of the Captivity. The seventy years began in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, or B.C. 605, and would therefore have closed in B.C. 536. Probably the taking of Babylon by Cyrus (usually regarded as the *terminus ad quem* of the Captivity) was two years earlier than this.² Now, assuming that the Jews had neglected to observe the law of the Sabbatic year during the whole period of the monarchy, we have just time enough in the period, 508 years, to enclose seventy-two Sabbatic years. But it is hardly likely that the violation would be continuous. It is more probable that it would be distributed also over the lawless period of the Judges.

The conclusion to be drawn from this explanation of the national exile is that the Sabbatic rest had a far wider reference than to the Jewish nation. Through their fault the land had missed her periodic seasons of repose. These seasons the soil *needed*. It is a matter of common notoriety that land which does not lie fallow for one year in a recurring period becomes impoverished.³ God was but making provision for an impe-

¹ Lev. xxv. 1-7 contains this law.

² This account of the Captivity does not, of course, exclude others and weighty ones.

³ It is well understood amongst agriculturists that when the productive powers of a soil become exhausted by cultivation and the carrying away of its produce it is laid down to pasture, in which state it recoups itself, the decomposition of its vegetation renovating its producing virtue. In this state the land is said *to rest*. Variation of crops goes far also to save the soil from exhaustion. In olden times the same crops were produced year after year on the same soil. This would render the Sabbatic rest more necessary than with the modern farmer.

A friend who has spent many years in the study of agriculture has communicated the following: "When we find that land cannot be sufficiently cleaned and restored to its former fertility by alternate cropping, we make use of the summer fallow, which on strong clay land is usually done every fourth year. Further, land is said *to tire* of the crops, and clover cannot be successfully grown more than once in seven years. So also with the cereal grasses or corn crops. By the continuous wheat-growing in America, the virgin soil is rendered unproductive for that crop *in from seven to ten years*. Fresh virgin soil is then utilized,

rious natural need. Farmers of to-day bear unwitting testimony to the wisdom of the Divine regulation of the Mosaic law in their common practices of husbandry: "This also cometh forth from the Lord of Hosts, which is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working."

iii. Notice has now to be taken of the reference to the "stranger." It is needless to point out that the term means the Gentile. Many singularly tender and thoughtful allusions are to be met with in the Pentateuch. We may instance Exod. xii. 49; xxii. 21; Lev. xix. 10; xxiii. 22; xxv. 6; Numb. xv. 14, 15; xxxv. 15; Deut. x. 18, 19; xxix. 11; xxxi. 12. The lawgiver had a constant reminder of the Gentile in the name of his own son, Gershom, "the stranger." There was, it will carefully be observed, a strict prohibition against a Gentile partaking of the Passover uninitiated into Judaism by the rite of circumcision. No such initiation was needed in order that a Gentile might keep the Sabbath.¹ He was not only permitted, but enjoined, to observe it, if sojourning in the land. The reason, we take it, of this distinction, as Kennicott has well pointed out, was that circumcision was a national, and the Sabbath a universal, institution.²

iv. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth," etc. A different reason is given in Deut. v. 15, for the sanctification of the day; "and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Much has been made of this discrepancy. An attack upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has sought here for a weapon. It is contended that the Exodus, the great national crisis, which has ever since survived in their consciousness, and moulded all the religious thought of this people, was far better calculated to appeal to their susceptibility than the allusion of Exod. xx. to the creation; that this latter passage is an interpolation of a later hand. In answer, it may suffice to state that no evidence is furnished either by Hebrew manuscripts or by versions for the theory of an interpolation. The mooted of the theory is the common refuge of despairing exegesis. As to the discrepancy itself, is it of any magnitude? Are the two motives mutually destructive? We Christians commemorate two events on our Sabbath. Are these two commemorations mutually subversive? Could not a devout

This, I think, would perhaps be the strongest evidence of land requiring rest in seven years, as the land is in this case laid aside as useless for corn-growing at the end of this term."

¹ Exod. xii. 48.

² We do not forget that the LXX. has *προσῆλυτος*.

Hebrew think of the power of Jehovah as put forth in creation and in Providence at one and the same time ?

v. The prohibitory element. This is made much of in the cause of Sabbath secularization. It is urged that, under the Gospel, liberty is granted ; that practically it is impossible to abstain from *all* labour. A traditional saying of our Blessed Lord¹ is eagerly cited and set over against the offence mentioned in Numb. xv. 32-36.

It is not quite easy to approach this part of the subject with calmness. There is something bordering on insincerity in the warmth of the opposition to the burden of the letter here. Is the literalism deemed necessary to the interpretation of the command really believed in ? When the Almighty enjoins the intermission of work, is He stooping to give the slightest colour to the monstrous and repulsive gnat-straining and puerile restrictive rules of later times ?² Is not the sense of the prohibition clear enough to frank common-sense ? The ordinary avocations, and as far as possible all domestic toil, were to pause.

Two details of this prohibition at first sight appear strangely severe. The first is the case of the man gathering sticks (Numb. xv.). Here, however, we have an unnecessary work. The fuel might easily have been gathered on any other day. It was a presumptuous act, and, had it been overlooked, might, and probably would, have opened the door to general laxity touching the observance of the seventh day.³

The second detail is found in Exod. xxxv. 3 : "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation upon the Sabbath day." On this prohibition let an able living commentator speak. "The Sabbath was not a fast-day. The Israelites cooked their victuals, for which, of course, a fire would be necessary. But in early times, the Israelites, while subsisting in the wilderness on the manna, received a double supply on the sixth day, which

¹ The tradition is this : The Lord saw a man working in the field on the Sabbath. He said to him, "If thou knowest what thou art doing thou art blessed ; if thou knowest not thou art cursed." It is found in "Codex Bezaë," inserted after St. Luke vi. 5 ; cf. Augustine, serm. ix. : "Melius enim faceret Judæus in agro suo aliquid utile, quam in theatro seditiosus existeret ; et melius feminæ eorum die sabbati lanam facerent, quam in menianis suis impudice saltarent."

² Here are a few puerilities. Stilts might not be used to cross a stream. Ribbons, unless sewed to the dress, might not be worn. A false tooth must be removed. A person with toothache might not rinse the mouth with vinegar ; it must be swallowed. A cock might not wear a piece of ribbon round its leg—sufficiat !

³ Dr. Frankl, "Jews in the East" (E. Tr., ii. 6), mentions that many modern Jews regard it as a sin to use a stick on the Sabbath. Does the comment honour the text ?

they cooked also on that day (Exod. xvi. 23), so that a fire for culinary purposes was unnecessary on the seventh day. As the kindling of a fire, therefore, could only be for secular (*i.e.*, business) purposes, the insertion of the prohibition *in connection with the work of the tabernacle* makes it highly probable that it was intended chiefly for the mechanics who were to be employed in that erection."

Nor are we to suppose that mere abstention from toil fulfils the command to "keep holy" the day. Idlers are not keeping, but breaking, the Sabbath. They are much further even from the letter of the law than full-handed people who are engaged in necessary domestic occupations, which they do not allow to push out attendance on the public services of the Church. The day was to be "a sign between the Lord and His people." It was a memorial of His covenant with them. Their ordinary work was to yield place to worship and instruction in the things of God.¹ How utterly the guides of later Jewish religious thought missed the spirit of the command is well known. Burdening their flock with their foolish ἀπεραντολογίαι, they deplorably failed to guard the true sanctity of the Sabbath.

vi. One other remark is offered on the subject of the Decalogue. We venture to think that the fourth commandment endows the code with a definitely religious character. "Where through this Code," asks Dr. Hamilton ("Horæ et Vindicis Sabbaticæ"), "is the statute of religion if it be not here? Where else is it written, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart'? Not in those which precede it: they are only interdicts upon polytheism, idol-worship, and profanity. Not in those which follow; for they only regard the ethics of man, and of man in the present state. Here it is to be found if found at all." Without this command the Ten Words would have appeared to lack the enforcement both of the active service of religion, and of the active exercise of benevolence.² Its injunction to spend the day in holy employments elevates the merely negative warnings of the first three precepts into an active pursuit of holiness as the path to fellowship with the one true God. Its calls to provide for the repose and leisure of all dependent upon us, down to the beasts of the stall, inculcate a spirit of active love, and thus crown the interdictory ethics of the last six. All relationships find recognition in its wide allu-

¹ The custom of repairing for religious instruction to the prophetic schools on the Sabbath is referred to in 2 Kings iv. 23: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath."

² It is coupled with the principle of reverence in Lev. xix. 30, with that of submission in the third verse of the same chapter.

sions: man's relationship to his God; the relation of parent, of master, of owner. To eliminate it from the Code is to leave that code without its chief element of cohesion. The Tables drop to fragments; and the divorce of morality from religion may furnish the deist with a song.¹

ALFRED PEARSON.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. IV.—SIR WALTER SCOTT (CONCLUDED).

WHEN George IV. came to Edinburgh, in 1822, it was mainly owing to Scott's personal influence, authority, and zeal that the visit was so successful, and the King's reception so enthusiastic. "The local magistrates, bewildered and perplexed with the rush of novelty, threw themselves on him for advice and direction about the merest trifles; and he had to arrange everything, from the ordering of a procession to the cut of a button and the embroidering of a cross." The day on which the King arrived, Tuesday, the 14th of August, was also the day on which William Erskine, then Lord Kinnedder, Scott's most intimate friend, died; but this did not prevent Scott from rowing off in the midst of the rain to the royal yacht, where he was received by his Majesty on the quarter-deck. When his arrival was announced: "What," exclaimed his Majesty, "Sir Walter Scott!—the man in Scotland I most wish to see. Let him come up!" After being presented to the King, and after an appropriate speech in the name of the ladies of Edinburgh, he placed in his Majesty's hands a St. Andrew's cross, in silver, which his fair subjects had provided for him; and the King, with evident marks of satisfaction, made a gracious reply, receiving the gift in the most kind and condescending manner, and promising to wear it in public, in token of acknowledgment to the fair donors. The King then called for a bottle of Highland whisky, and having drunk his health, bestowed on Scott, at his request, the glass which he had just used, and the precious vessel was immediately wrapped up and carefully deposited in what he conceived to be the safest part of his dress. When Scott returned to his house in Castle Street, he found there the poet Crabbe, and in the delight of seeing the venerable man, the

¹ Josephus (against Apion, book ii., ch. 17) well remarks that whereas other legislators had made religion to be a part of virtue, Moses had made virtue to be a part of religion.