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To all that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity.

Dear Christian, bought with a price, most happy in this that thou art not thine own, for thy sake I have undertaken to answer this Treatise to thee, doe I Dedicate it, to the mayest of right challenge all that I am or can.

Thus, whether noble, wise, mighty, learned, unlearned, weak or mean, near or far off, are interested in all that maketh for the Truth, and in all that is done against it. Paul, Apollo, Cephas are thine, all thine; for thou art Christ's, and Christ is God. In the breaking of thine, thou art wounded, in the making of schisms thou art racked, in every lie thou art laid at; nothing commeth against a painfull Minister, but reacheth to thy heart through his sides; nothing from a Laborious Minister, but aymeth at thy setting, stabilising, comforting, perfecting. Wert thou the meanest that ever lived, who can think this too much for thee, seeing God withholdeth himselfe as a Father, his Sonne as a Redeemer and Brother, his Spirit as sanctifier, Comforter, and the Spirit of Sonne-slip in thy heart, and thy ow-
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ry body also, be enmoyes at his Temple? For as a coom-
ence he enlarged: give they selves to God, receive no-
thing against, but all that is for the Truth: Let the
reproaches wherewith Christ and his Ministers,
are reproached fall on thee, some the Ministers
gifts and labours, as thine, reign, but not without
them, be honourable, but not when they are disgraced.

When I first received this book intituled, A Learn-
ed Treatise of the Sabbath, a little before No-
ember last, though I was utterly ignorant of any such
controversie to have passed between my Brother, and
Master Edward Breewood, and had not yet call
mine eye on the base language of the reply in the end
of that Treatise; yet the very noveltie and dangerous
vulsence of the Doctrine, without any reference to
things small, struck me. My spirit was stirred
in me, when I saw the whole right of the Law for the
time of God’s worship allotted, the confederation
whereof was needes in this, the whole kingdomes body
given to Atheisme and Prophanennesse. The zeal of
Gods glory and thy good began to ate upon
me: I throw my selfe into the open field, that thou
mightest be nourished, I rejoiced what I saw, or
may be, should be (Christ strengthening me). Gods
and thine, that God the Lord of Heavens might
have his Righteous unto us, his dutie laid out;
Superiores directed to hand, for God and Me, in
the things of God, and Superiors to Gods, while mens
and mens, in and for God.

Now knowing that there are none but are selves, so well
as spirits, and that the unregenerate part will catch at
the most excellent truths, to sucke thereon advantage
to

The Epistle Dedicatory.

to it selfe, by tearing a sounder things inseparably united;
and taking in things hand upon hand in a wrong appli-
cation, fearing thy mischance, I could not but adver-
sifie thee a little, to that part that concerns thy

The superior or master may conceit his power in-
trenched upon, the inferior or servant may suppose
some unwarrant liberty granted him, all may think of
an over-rigid constriction of the unchangeable pre-
cepts. This Dispute yields none of those wilful preju-
dice to the master, nor occasion of liberty to the servant,
or other than received and allowed sense, to the ne-
er-failing law, as will appear to him that thoroughly
peruseth it. But for prevention of over-hasty conceits
in all, behold thy way-markes, before thou readest or
receive any thought to fore-thall thee, take what I set
here before thee, which hath beene seen, and heard, and
allowed and received, blessed be God’s holy Name,
and I doubt not but shall be, much the more of con-
tradifting spirits. For I admonish thee of no other
things than what are already received, in the printed
Book of Mr. Nich. Byfield. Consider, I say, what
that Master of Allcombs hath left, in his writings
as testes to bound on the way of both master and ser-
vant, superior and inferior, in running the race of
this fourth commandement, and as goades to quicken
thy heart in the embracing of that divine Law.

For the Doctrine of the Sabbath be thus explained:
himselfe in twofold;

First, God hath provided by his unchangeable law
that one day in seven, servants shall rest from their la-
bour. M. Byl. on 1 Pet. 2. 18. pag. 725.

Secondly, Servants must from their fear of God in
their
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First, the master must give account of all he doth to God, though he be not bound to do so to inferiors, in 1 Pet. 2:17.

Secondly, good masters not only license, but teach their servants to keep God’s Sabbath, and worship him. Commandment 4. Gen. 18. 19. in 1 Pet. 2. P. 736.

Thirdly, masters do not only wickedly in restraining their servants from the means of their salvation or comfort, but do foolishly also, in hindering them of those means that should make them good servants, in 1 Pet. 2:18. P. 735.

Fourthly, they may not make their servants break God’s Sabbath, to satisfy their wills, in Col. 3:25. P. 730.

In these Aporisms, that faithful servant of Jesus Christ being dead, yet speaketh unto which let me add, a wonder too, that thou mightest in all hands be left ready to duty in this behalf. Remember if thou be a servant, that in works of kindness, mercy and necessity, the master’s power is to be obeyed in subjection in his commands, for the thief he under God, for God, and over thee. Then it is thy praije to follow him in the lawful use of his power, at his leasure.

Lastly, the well-ordained bond of that worthy praiued Cenunion, should be the plague, for families that intend their wellbeing. When he had his servant gone, he went and came, he came, and doe this, and he did it, if thou be a master, and hast such servants, thou shouldst know, couldst thou serve thyself of them. I am persuaded there is not the most curious and praiued Atheist, but hee hath so much

their callings, by easiness to doe God’s service, as well as their masters, not only by spending the Sabbath in the duties of religion, but in redeeming the time in the week days (as may bee without hinderance of their work or offence to their masters) to employ themselves in prayer, reading, conference, &c. And the reason is, because servants must doe their masters work, as they are servants; so they stand bound in the common obligation, to do God’s service, as they are men, and no more but is subject to the law of God who hath given all his commandments to servants as well as to masters. Byl. in 1 Pet. 2:18. p. 734.

For the servant he joyeth downe these godly and savory limitations, as follows:

First, the subjection of servants is of Divine institution, to which God hath bound them by the first Commandment, and so is a moral and perpetual ordinance, in 1 Pet. 2:18. P. 731.

Secondly, no faults in superiors, can free inferiors from their subjection, in matter or manner, in 1 Pet. 2:18. P. 742.

Thirdly, if the master bee only inexcusable and unmannerly, thou must obey, in Col. 3:23. p. 130.

Fourthly, thou must bee sure that it be done that thou receivest, if thou must needs doubt, it is better to doubt and obey, than doubt and disobey. Id. ibid.

Fifthly, thou must not unreasonably yield to obey by sufferings. Id. ibid.

Sixthly, the servant must avoid inquisitiveness, the servant knoweth not what his master doth, Joh. 15. 15. in 1 Pet. 2:17. P. 735.

For the master he giveth these heavenly admonitions. First,
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much sense of a deity, and so much conscience yielding and heart giving, and relenting, that he would sometimes in a mood, prostrate to his household the Lords libertie. Is it so indeed? my prayer shal be for thee, that of this decide thou mayst never repent, and pollute Gods Name, with those wretched Israelites, lest it should happen defoliation upon thy house and name. thy repentance may be faire better believed, upon the remainder of other names, against other the Holy Laws of God. To which works I leave thee and all others that know, that Repentance towards God, and Faith towards the Lord Iesus is that which fumeth up Christiantie among those that follow the Truth in Love, the Lord answer us all with strength in our foules, that always we may labor fervently one for another in prayers, that we may stand perfect and compleat in all the will of God.

So prayeth

Yours in the Lord,

RICHARD BYFIELD.
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15. Godresting from creation was his Sabbath, and his resting in him self, the sanctification thereof, after declarations of sanctification of the Sabbath in Paradise, will hence be preserved out of the place in Gen. 2:2.
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FINIS.

THE PREFACE.

Before I touch upon this Antijahbem-Dominical Pamphlet to grapple with it, it is requisite briefly to skim the title and sentences of Scripture prefixed; and to propose the subject safe or questionable controverted.

Both the booke is intituled, A learned Treatise of the Sabbath. What the Treatise affords shall be seen anon, God willing: the title favours of little learning, wherein for Sabbath is written Sabundance, which signifies bôtles, as in 2 Esdr. Perplex the Lord of Sabundance had left us avaitsment. Ely 19:21.

What bottles bringeth in this Treatise? What the bottles of flies, of which Saint Augustine speaketh: who comparing the ten Plagues of Egypt together, as the dict of Confessing the medicines, doth parallel the plague of flies to the Condemnation of the Sabbath, and thus applyeth it; 2 Cor. 11:3 (as I believe) whose deep flies, (or as I would say, true flies, of which Augustine speaks) reacheth it, Exod 8:16. Thus are unquiet men, which are not so well disposed to the commandment of God, as the Jews.

But the booke is intituled, A learned Treatise of the Sabbath; that is, which will be found full, not faulty; not wicked, nor unfit in reading and prayer. The body of it, ye see it yourself; the true treats, treatises of the Plague. These are bottles under the command of God, with the bottle of the command of God.

The Preface to the Treatise, Antiboom-Dominical Pamphlet. I would have men, impudent! lest to the Printer's oversight, if either the Errata or any other part had been omitted, or the whole Treatise in any place had been amended, or the orthography thereupon. Well, but be it, the Treatise written by the hand of the Printer.
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To this Discourse, and therefore how profanely abused, as well as sincerely committed of God, it will appear, by letting other places to them, and applying them to the matter in hand. Take them thus:

The First Place.

"From all things, hold fast that which is good." 1 Thes. 5:21.

I'll apply to try that reasoning, that brings out one precept of the Decalogue: Oppose that text:

"Whoever shall add to it, shall it be called great in the Kingdom of heaven, Matthew 5:19; 13:19.

The second place.

For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth, proving what is acceptable to the Lord. Ephes. 5:9, 10.

I'll apply to the works of the Spirit in Christ's name and cause of the Lord. See the context:

"If I put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will that my people, Jeremiah 31:33.

The Lord is well-pleased for his righteousness sake, he will magnify the Law, and exalt it exceedingly, Isaiah 49:10.

The third place.

Holy Father, sanctify them through thy truth: Thy word is truth. John 17:17.

I'll apply to the great things of the Law written by God's own finger. Look at that Text, these written are the great things of my Law; but they were counted as a strange thing, Hebrews 8:12.

Thirdly, now for the matter controverted: this learned Treatise hath in it the occasion, and the substance. We take the last first; that all may the better judge of every passage fully out of the first part, viz. the occasion thereof. The Case of Conscience questioned must be propounded to clear the words of the whole Discourse, that the force of the arguments against it in this Treatise may be seen, and the blunting of their edge if they have any, or the unmasking of them, that all may see they are not wooden Daggars, may be apparent to every understanding. The Author of this Treatise takes it thus, and so opposes it as an untruth.

Breerwood. Pag. 3.

That for a servant to do light labours on any other works on the Sabbath day, although it were light work, might lawfully be done on another day, and although he did it in his own disposition, but only in obedience to his master's command, yet was it against the overthrow of God's Commandment teaching the Sabbath, and that he was not bound to yield, whether he feared God in yielding obedience to every such commandment of his master that day, which was the quality of Almsgiving, God was wholly perfectly confounded to refute the office of God.

This the point opposed to our Adversary, whose reason shall be delivered in his own words and confessed: It will neither add to nor diminish, but only cut it into parts, that every part may receive its answer apart. This precluded, I proceed.

Breerwood. Pag. 4. 29.

You are stewards of God's word, within the compass of that word I will stay with you; and by it we are, by divine command, with your patience, whether this frame of your Doctrine be grounded on the rock, or on the sand, I will fix you in the sense of your own faults and understandings, the Law; and so whether it tend to the understanding of the Word of God, or the sense of the Church. For teaching the commandment of the Sabbath, I mean, to whom the charge of servants coming from work on the Sabbath day given? Is it to the servants themselves or to their masters? Is it given of servants to confide, their works is the mastery of the Commandments? But I demand, whether it be given and imposed on the servants themselves, or to the masters whom servants they are? For if the Commandments be not given to them, then do they not transgress the Commandments, if by their masters they bear no weight,
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The Law was given, that the servant should not work and consequently the sins in their masters and not theirs, so the Law be not imposed to them, nor is it required to be observed of them, it obliges them not; therefore is neither the sin, nor the servant, guilty of it, nor is any crime to them, but only to those whom it was given as a Law.

Answer.

First, the Commandment is given to servants also, the Words are, Thou shalt do no manner of work. Can have no other fitter than this; then shall do no manner of work, shall art in the matter, do thy servaunt shall do no manner of work; the Commandment of eating from works be glu of him, but to him also. For, how know you, that the commandment is given to the matter but because the Lord faith, thou (meaning, that art a servant) shalt do no manner of work? And can you bee so purblind as not to see, the Commandment is given as well to the servant, when it is thus delivered in the same forme, Thou servant shall do no manner of work? Nay, consider, you the Publisher for, as for the Author, hee knoweth already by the issue, whether his collection hence were found or no, and if he might have the favour the Saints had that wrote in our Savours revelation, hee putted hee would judge that Treatise to the fire, and therefore (you the Publisher) say, and yee that fear God, and know that a bored care is the best Sacrifice, consider, The Commandment is given to the servant, as a day, and as thy servant. I will not worke, neither thou say, but my servant shall, his works be mine by Covenant. The Lord with whom there is neither bond nor free, interpreted and faith not, should not command any to work. But thus thy servant shall not work. What is this but to say, as thy servant and as true, he shall not work. As if hee said, as a servant, and as true, his works are thine, but now his works is mine; thy covenant shall not infringe his covenant with his God. As thy servant, hee is thine in thy works or servile worke: that day, but the Lords freemen, yet thy servant.

touching the Servants Duty.

vants that day by thee to be enjoyned to the Lords worke, God servait to be free from thy worke, the Commandment in this owne person, and performe it in the person under thy charge, thy servant must doe no manner of servile worke that day, but must bee thy servaunt to be ordered for the Lords worke. Consider it well for the matter forbidden is the servile cares and labors of the household, both of masters about servants, and of servants towards their Masters.

Secondly, and seeinge we are affected by your good leave to confesse the Commandement, let us with your patience (for I cannot but thinke the hearts of any deceiving or deceived is not only Hindesb but convinced by the former words) weigh the Words of the precept, from which I think reasons.

First, The servant, so named as a servant, is commanded to remember the day therefore a servant the Commandment is given to him to cease from his servile worke, or the worke of a servant. For is hee to remember a part and not all the precept? Or may hee earth himselfe in forge, and put all on his masters memory.

Again, the servant as a servant is commanded to keepe the day holy. If any deny this, then God and Cesar cannot have their due, God &c. and all the servile cares and labors of the household, both of masters about servants, and of servants towards their Masters.

For the day is enjoyned, that holiness may be followed, and cessation from worke forbidden, to whom holiness is commanded, as the words run, Remember the Sabbath or resting day to keep it holy.

Besides, That persuassive immediate not onely given, but to the servant, shall doeth thou &c. do labor and do all that thou haft to do, therefore the command for the seventh day is not only given, but to the servant: for the command of both, respect the same person.

Likewise,
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Likewise this Command, Thou shalt not do any work, is given to him that is restrained in the word, Thou: but the servant, as thy servant, is contained in the word, thou; and it is not given to him then. For the words following expound the first Thou, Thou shalt not, Who meanest you by this Thou, who but thou master, thy servant, thou father, thy sonne, thou mother, thy daughter, &c.

Furtur, the Commandments are given to them to whom the reasons of the Command reach; but they reach alike to thy servant as to thee: therefore the Command reaches alike to thy servant as to thee. And if you say, ye have reasons to reach all alike to persuade to sanctify, but not to all alike to do lawful work, it is false: for besides that there can be no sanctification without cessation from lawful work, the reasons do equally and strongly tend to persuade cessation from work, and the reason of the right of the lawgiver appropriating it to himselfe and his worship, the equity of the law, which giveth free for workes, and restraineth but for one day, the example of God, and the special blessing given to the day.

To come to handy-gripes with you; you yield, the servantes works is forbidden, I demand, is it forbidden, because it hindereth the matter solely from sanctifying the day, or the servant also? Surely, because it hindereth the servant chiefly, and not the matter, or not chiefly: his works croseth the end of the Sabbath in him, if therefore the command of sanctifying the day be to him as a servant, the command of ceasing from works is to him as a servant.

Let one againe reason with you from the command, if the negative be of the servant, and not to the servant, then also is the affirmative, which is this, Thou shalt doe the works of holinesse that day: and from hence follows this antithetical that if the servant goe not to the affemblies, not apply himselfe to works of holinesse, and the master also doth not bid him, his matter, every finneth, and not the servant; because according to your new learning, the matter is charged with the servant, for the works of holiness.

touching the Servants Duty.

neffe, and the servantes holiness that day is the matter only of the command: the matter and not the servant is the subject person commanded. This Command, Thou shalt doe the works of holiness, is of the servantes holy workes, but no precept to the servant: it may be you will free off herefrom, but you are caught in your owne net, as sure as the negative precept hath his affirmative every way proportionable.

This day, and seeing there is no more, where each apart will make a party good 4, I advice: He that gives the law knoweth best the meaning of his owne Law; let us see from his Word in other Texts the precepts that stand expressly charged to whom is it given? In Jer. 17. 10, to the Kings of Judah, to all Judah, to all the Inhabitants of Jerusalem that entered in by those gates was this Command given of ceasing from works of bearing no burden on the Sabbath day: where the servantes none of Judah, none of Jerusalem inhabitants, none of those that entered in and went out by Jerusalem gates? To whom is the Command of the Sabbath reff given in Exod. 34. 21. to him that serveth, these are the words of the Text: Nine dayes thou shalt serve, but one of the seventh day thou shalt rest: in ceasing time and in keeping thy holy day, now who serveth properly as a servant, and is not the original word the same that notes in that serven, and a servant, give that one is the Verb, and the other the Noun? And what servent doth it signify? No other than that servent, of household servants, of such until the ground. There can be no way to exclude the servant at all from the charge of this precept.

Fourthly, besides all this, how is your doctrine built on the words of this Commandment: the law, thou and thy servant shalt doe no works; you say, it only faith, Thou shalt not command the servant to works. Againe, take your saying, the Law bindeth the Master from commanding, and will this follow, therefore it bindeth the servant to obey his master, if he should be so wicked as to command what God prohibiteth him. This is a plain non sequitur, and
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can not hold together, by all the Geomantry in the Word, nor can any Carpenter make this joyne, but such loose reasoning hold fast for them that would goe in a broad way. Now weaken these following arguments if you can.

Fifthly, hee that is circumcised is bound to keep the whole Law, and none is bound by your own confutation, but he to whom the Law is given: the Jewish servant then, being circumcised, was bound to keep this Law as given to him. The circumcised, faith the Apostle, is a debtor to doe the whole Law.

Sixthly, he that wrought on the Sabbath being a stranger, was not fit for communion and ordinary converstion with the Jews, as appeareth by the words of the Commandement, that charged the stranger within the gate to rest that day, and by the practice of Nebuchadnezara, that were such from within and without the City Jerusalem, and by a like instance of Rehoboam at the Feast of the Passover, and of unleavened bread. For if the stranger that sojourned only, and was not borne in the Land, did this while thee that was leaveth, he was to be cut off from the Congregation of Israel, Now shall the servant be left to the subjection to that command, that makes him unfit for communion with the people of God, God forbid. Yet thus would you provide for servants, and be such a sinner against their soules.

Seventhly, how much better might you have saied to Lyra's Harpe, than to rumine a new straine; he saith thus, he speaketh not of those of ripe age, which did now know the Law of the Sabbath, because they are forbidden together with their parents; but this is added for childrens sake, that know not the Law, which ought not to bee permitted to doe any works on the Sabbath day. This inter-pretation hee had from Rabbe Solomon, I doe not say it is the truth of the place, but this may, you have neither truth nor patron for your absolute opinion.

Let all Christians be warned how they receive every one that pretends Scripture: all Heretikes were such, according to that freeman, they were evil Expositors of things well.

touching the Servants Duty.

well spoken Sat. laid his most dangerous assaults upon Christ, and would persuade them by Scripture too.

Behold here one professing to stay within the compass of the Word, and by a furious distinction of its, and in, errores in proemium from the A.B.C. Such words seem like a Canker or Gangrene.

It shall be your wisdom, not to serve God by difficulties and to learn Divinitie of your Teachers, and not Divisions of Sophisters.

CHAP. II.

Brewed. Pag. 5, 6.

For the better clearing of which point, let me say you a question of two other Commandements, that for their sense are parallel to this, and whereas you have no prejudice, God commanded the Israelites, that no stranger should eat of the Passover Lamb; again, that no Ammonite nor Moabit be entered into the Congregation of the Lord in the tenth generation. God tells me, did the strangers, if he eat of the Passover being falsely invited? or did the Ammonites and Moabites, if they came into the Congregation being admitted? Did the strangers, if he, and the Ammonites and Moabites, be admitted to the Congregation of the Lord, the Commandments were given, as it is the case, to whom the Commandments were given; the Israelitae to whom the Commandments were given, no, but it is clearly the meaning, that the Israelites should not admit of any Gentile to the participation of the Passover, nor receive the Ammonites and Moabites into the Congregation of the Lord.

Answer.

First, I reply, these Commandements are not parallel, and to your ground, faith, these Commandments I lay this, they fast, and doe no manner of work; and this, No stranger may eat of the Passover. In the first, you acknowledge the matters worse is forbidden to the matter, whether done by himselfe or by his servant. In the latter, the Passover forbidden to the stranger, is enjoined to the Jew. The few Ca...
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be underhand: for the Law in its own nature carrieth a
certain respect and disposition to them, on whom it is im-
posed. Now for the Law of the Passage, the stranger
was not to be admitted to it, as being not under the Law: but
the servant being a bond, was alike capable of the Law of
the fourth Commandment as his master, because equally
under the Law. What the Law spakeeth, it spakeeth to
them who are under the Law, saith the Apostle.

Secondly, I affirm, that the strangers, Moabites and
Ammonites, did enter into their unison and admission by
prophecy, they prophesied holy things, as in Daniel did the
Prophecy of the Temple. Now the justes fulfill a
proclamation cannot take away their prophesying. It standeth as a
Pagan living among us, that relied our Religion, and were not
baptized, should yet come and eat of the Bread of the
Lord, though some Master for some be supposed to invite him. There were among the Jews
strangers that kept house, and had servants, that ye were no
Prophets, but other strangers within the gates; these
fenced against the precept, if they would kill the Passage
and eat; although the Jews should through emissaries
further. Further, that a stranger may fence against a
precept given of him, is clear by that precept in vers. 14 of
ch. 13. of Exodus. Let all men be circumcised, and
then let him keep the Passage. The Commandment is
given expressly to the likeness of the stranger, and yet it
that stranger should come out of Zipporah's husband's
house, and eaten of the Feast of unleavened bread, he
waive to be cut off from the Congregation of Israel. (for pun-
nishment is to be inflicted upon transgressors) and
yet the Commandement of keeping the Feast of unleave-
ned bread was given to the Jews only in any form of
words that we find. 15, 17.

Thirdly, for your information, I have yet further to ex-
cept...
Lord of time himselfe. It is clearly the Lords intent, that the master should not suffer, nor change his servaynt to worke this day; and as clearly the Lords meaning, that the servaynt should not doe his matters worke that day which is the Lords, and not his masters day.

CHAP. III.

Breezwood. Pag. 6.

L erste asketh you one quesion more, p.e. a case that hath fallen in my acquaintance: A servaynt comes out from the Prince; That he dines in London, and on suthen a day keepes his seruants within doore, and not suffer them to goe abroad. If notwithstanding that servaynt some matter tends forth his servaynt about his business, doth the servaynt tranfugif the Princes commandement by obeying his masters? Or ought he by pretence of that pretence to disobey his master and neglect his charge? Is it a place he doth the former, and thereby bringeth not to doe the latter. For the commandement that cometh was given to his master not to him, and the purpose of it was to restrain his master from obeying his master; if he were commanded there he is not the former; it appeareth the obligations of commandements, whereby to that end, he doth them to whom they are preferred as rules, and not to them of whom not tranfugif the Princes commandements of the force of this instance is infall: convert it there, so the

Answere.

First this agreeth not with that in the commandement; for the Lord saith not thus, Thou shalt not suffer thy servaynt to work; but thus, Thy servaynt shall not work. If the Prince commanded this, Thy servaynt shall do no workes of rata have not

shines, that he may attend on me in my behoof, and in my works without anoynton and disturbance, did not the servaynt tranfugif the Princes charge, if he forsooke the Prince, and obeyed his master? or would his masters command excuse him in doing that which was against the Princes command, or in neglecting the Princes service? Sure this doctrine of yours would leave Princes persons, kinfoltes, and institut.
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days thou shalt labour, is likewise of indulgence: for the Jews in keeping the days of Pentecost ihated not. Yet, sometimes that command under the form of a command in words, which is only spoken by the conscience, when ye have the thing in view, not allowed or approved for good, as when the Apostles, be angry, but sin not. Be angry, is in words of precept, yet spoken only by conscience, and yet no way alloweth the anger he speaketh of: for that he speaketh not of a laudable anger is evident, when it followedeth, let not the Sonne see dayes unsanctified with thy wrath. How needfull is it that we understand this thing definitively, lest we be deceived with the law of a command? To remove that, the learned Scotchman, Cameron, gives us this excellent rule, whereby to know a precept that is of indulgence, or of the Empire and Lawlike charge, as I may say truly: whatsoever, faith be it, God doth prescribe which hath not the reason and nature of a benefit, simply, but of a duty and office, that is from the Empire of God. And afterwards explaining himselfe, he addeth: I say simply a benefit; for God requires no duty of his creature which is not in the thing itself a benefit, but there is simply a benefit in which no nature of a duty or our God doth show it selfe. Now follow this Rule, and who sees not that this precept, Thy servant shall not work on the Sabbath, hath in it the nature of office and duty the servant owed to God as well as the matter, even the observance of the Sabbath to God, though in a second place here is a matter of fatherly indulgence, God graciously rending the servant (as he doth also the very bruite beast, for whole ease he not otherwise provides that they, now Master Bubbling, if you have any mind to put questions, you shall have leave, if you please, to ask as many more.

Answer.

First, this proof is sufficiently overthrown by all the former arguments, yet I add: This precept is directed to the parents restraining the use of their power to interrupt, and enjoining the use of their power to preclude the justification of the day, and to the spouse and daughter also not to work as the household worke: for, faith God, the sabbath, seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, and holy convocation; yet shall she work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings. Who are these changed in the word, yet? Who, but ye that stand bound to come to the holy convocations; see that continue families; therefore ye chil- dren as well as ye parents.

Secondly, and to free all that subscribe to this truth from fear of so much as any private interpretation, and to call it wholly
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Deut. 5:15.

First, your first way of confirming your exposition was by infallible texts; then you went on to prove them from other texts, whereof the first taken out of the commandment was taken off in the former Chapter; there is your second proof built on the text in Deut. And here, because you blame it out in many words, and in many places and in times as if they were made to your purpose, besides the main of your argument, I thus reply: first, on your reason drawn from the text; secondly, to some chief passages in the venting of it.

The substance of the reasoning is this: first, Moses applied the precept of servaunt's rest, to the masters that were slaves in Egypt, but now released and set in the estate of freemen, that they should allow their servants' rest, and make the Sabbath a resting day, therefore the commandment (that shews not do any works) is given only to the masters. It is applied to the masters, therefore given to them, were a right consequence; but therefore to them only, it is fallacious, for more is it in the conformance than was in the Antecedent: and if you put the word (only) into the Antecedent, then both the propositions are false: for in Lev. 19:3, as above was specified, *Moses* applies it to children. And the argument is yet unsound, for it tends thus: Moses applyeth it in his expositions only to masters, therefore it was given only to masters: for applications are according to several occasions, but not always extended to the utmost breadth of the precept, and yet all this Moses, sedilete no way impeached, insinuating he is the faithfully applyeth, where it most needeth as occasion serveth (keeping the bounds of truth). These consequences from this place as you expose it, may be gathered: therefore the reason and not servants, or this, therefore the master Jones must not ungraciously will disturb his servant's rest, or this, therefore it is given chiefly to the masters, instead that must not only keep, but make a Sabbath, all which we yield; but the mind that once is big of a new fancy, maketh all that it daeth upon, nourish that fancy.

Secondly, the truth is, the Lord by *Moses* pleads in those words, the reason of the right that he hath to command his servants rest, who is his freeman by virtue of that redemption; the servant as well as the master called into the liberty of his holy people, as appears in the Parables of the Decalogue, *Exod.* 20, and in *Exod.* 15:3, and *Exod.* 16:2, bound and free indifferently entertained into the privilege and honour of the Covenant, and into the band of it; and the reason the master both to obey, and yield up his servant for that day to God's commanding and appearing, and also to use his authority for God, in setting the servant free, the Sabbath; but in other respects both master and servant to rejoice alike in the great works of their redemption.

Thirdly, but let us examine more narrowly some of the special passages. *Moses* addeth in vers. 14, that thy man servant and maid servant
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Servant may rest as well as thou is to this (Thee) therefore to whom this charge is directed, &c.] Which (thee?) that in these words, then and the former. That makes nothing to the exception of the servant, as thy servant from the obligation of the full, that is, that thou shalt do no manner of work for thy servant is one contained under this then, as well as thou art that art the master. Or if it be meant of this full, thou, that were abounded from the very context. It being meant of the latter then, we must ask what you mean when you say, it is to this then to whom this charge is directed. Mean you by charge, the charge to make the servant rest? That you say afterwards were needless, they need not be once, and no command nor intend. Or mean you the charge to give them leave to rest? Nay, that is against your own reading, the master is to make a day of rest, and your own interpretation to make it into so important not only to observe is benefic, but to cause others able to observe it. Or by charge, mean you the command, Thy servant shall do no manner of work; and this is directed to this then; namely, the matter of the servant? Well, bee it so: And what will follow thence? Why surely this. This master must know that God commands thy servant to rest, and that to make him keep the Sabbath day; but not this: Thou art commanded to rest, but thy servant is not commanded to rest, but may work if thou biddest him, the same and peril is none only. What new Divinitie and Logick is this? We see then, here is some motion in, but no promotion of your cause. Nay, because the command is given that the servant may rest as well as the master, and that all might be free to attend on God's service that day alike; therefore it cannot be that the servant should remain bound to the commands of the matter for servile works on that day.

For as a matter, Calvin well observes, 'We must understand, that the alone worship of God was properly looked unto; but we know (faith he) the whole offpring of Abraham was fo

touching the Servants' Duty.

Sacrificed to God, that this that they were servants was accor- tation accision, whence also circumcision was common to them all.

The commandment of rest had been directly and immediately given to servants. Dost your own concience know and force out this acknowledgement, that it is given to them, though not directly and immediately? Would no servants offire & wear their dates visible, be of themselves glad to rest on the sabbath? These interrogations are brought in, to set the proofs, that the com- mandments of rest was not given at all to servants but how ill they conclude, may bee seen by these certain truths.

That the servant (if not religious, which God looks not to find, but by his word to make us such), had rather oftentimes works for his master, than bee employed in the duties of satisfaction for a part, much more for all the day; for they are more infirm to flesh and blood, than handy works. True, that question might take more place, if it were rest alone that were aymed at; and not rest for an higher end. That the master (if covetous and profligate) will not stand upon pleasing or displeasing God, in requiring such unlawful works, but respect his gains more than all, and to the utmost call for the servants works that day, when the servant in the Court of God and man can have no relief; yes out of an religious penitancy be will molt exact works then. Agift, that the toiled servant will be oft ready to works for himself, as in mending his clothes, or the like; now the master is charged to remember the condition of his slavery, that he may not dare to overrule his ser- vant with works in the first days, but every way make a Sabbath day.

Hash is any other but to declare, &c.] Yet, it declares God's suit to over their servants to commend them that day and their unequall and wicked carriage, if they should offer to plead their covenant to over God's covenant.

Which reason could not bee intended, nor directed to them that still remained in ferrein. No: not all intened

E
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This redemption procured them God's servants, and not them, nor any man to use them as slaves to use them as servants on the Sabbath. As we read in Lev. 25:38, 39, 41, 42. Thou shalt not compel them to serve as bond servants, for they shall return in the year of Jubilee; for they are my servants which I brought out of the land of Egypt. And in ver. 53, 55. The stranger, meaning to whom the poor man was sold, shall return with what he took, he shall not continue in the land of his inheritance, he shall return to his own, the children of Israel are servants. They are my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God. Here the servile law that God put no difference between bond and free, and that the Sabbath made master and servant equal in respect of freedom for attendance on God. Tho' Sabbath of years had all respect to engrave on them the respect of this Sabbath. Here no slavery (but liberty for God's service, which is perfect freedom) may pass upon the redeemed; and therefore their servitude did not make the Redemption void to them. But such an Expositor as you are would love them slaves, because servants, and slaves without instruction, even on the Lord's Sabbath; to deaden and not the Lord's servants; when yet they were the Redeemed of the Lord equally as their masters were. Thus you derogate from the breadth of the covenanted, and the rest, and clip the wings of Scripture, while you take that precept to belong only to master, and the master enjoy no further than to make a slave for his servant, when the text faith, and make a Sabbath day. And the whole reason applied to the Sabbath left for servants found no less than this. Remember when you was in Egypt the Egyptians made them a slave, and marked the Sabbath days, now I have set thee free, thou shalt freely serve thy servant that day, and make the Sabbath day. After reasons are evidently directed to the masters, not to the servants; therefore the servant working at the masters command hath not. What reasoning is this? the master is by arguments pretended to make a day of rest, and there-
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CHAP. VI.

Bretwood. Pag. 11.

Or not notwithstanding all these evidences, you will still contend that the prohibition touching bodily labour on the Sabbath is directly imposed on the servants themselves, so whether you bring not the Oxe and the Afe and other cattle sly under the obligation of this commandment, whose work is immediately after that of servants abolished, and specially the hawk of goods, whose labour ye yet on the Sabbath I hope you will not lay to be in them fins and transgressions of God's law.

Answer.

First, No: we do not; it is imposed on servants, yet not on any one or else for he servant is forbidden labour, because he cannot labour without thee, and so he is capable properly of commandment or reft; but the Oxe is not forbidden labour, but to be laboured and wrought: for he cannot work without thee, and is not capable of the commandment. The servant is therefore forbidden labour even in his masters works, that he might be vacate to holy duties, not to the Oxe. The servant is forbidden to be brought by his master, because now he must acknowledge another master, whose service he is this day commanded to work; with whom there is no respect of persons; and this end, the servant's obedience to his masters unlawful commandments.

*Ole non osta.
fo. Zonde in a proeq.

*Nonnum quid mandamentum of work day that would cross; no man can force two masters. Moreover, doth God the care for Oxen?

No doubt it was written for the servants sake, that he might not attend to guide the Oxen labour, and that money due to the Oxe might call for more to man, Zonde is expresly, that the commandment was given to the servant; he faith; *God would have no man excluded from the satisfaction of a rightful demand, and have a right to live, Deut. 24:16. But when you shall say, What am I to do that is unlawful commands.

touching the Servants Duty.

The Sabbath, because of our servants masters, fathers, as parents, strangers as home-born, are bound to God, and born to his worship, teaching breed there is another reason, etc.

Secondly, the Oxe is forbidden to be wrought, that they might have no time to draw them to work: and may a servant work at his masters command? how great a favour would this be to the master, who naturally (and such a master as will require his servants to work on that day, is not far from his pure naturals) love more profit than his goods; and fears a penny lost, where he thinks it might be gained, more than the breach of a precept that God threatens with the curse and hell? He will be ready not only to lay with Rebecca, N. One will be a curse, my avenue, ps. *Gen. 13. 13. may not make you know about your works, ye shall not answer for my faults; how cannot you this new religion now? I therefore conclude against you thus: that forbade the strangers work, and the cattle, that all examples and occasions might be removed that might excuse to evil: it cannot bee that bee would leave none, daughter, man and maid in the families free to the matter, that they should, and must obey him in his unlawful commands.

Thirdly, and to require you out of the Text. In the same sense of words that the Oxe and Afe is prohibited, the stranger within the gate of another, is to forbid work, and is not given to the stranger's will as well as: yet I hope it is partly you will lay in to the given to the oxen. If you lay in it not given to the stranger; I vowe you this: The stranger is there meant, in the time of the stranger, which being a few, go with thee for the common good, and causeth that he be a guest, take him from the bond of this Law; if the few within whose gate he is, without cause should require him to work, as he exegeted, because he is not within his gate, as you lay the servant? Is Agains, *the Co. should have no man excluded from the satisfaction of a rightful demand, and have a right to live. Deut. 24:16. But when you shall say, What am I to do that is unlawful commands.

E. 3: vernout.
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is commanded to compel those within his gate to keep the rest, and to punish those that do not offend. Will God authorize any to punish those that do not offend? and those do not offend, you say, to whom the Law is not given: those do not offend that can no more transgress a command, than the Osceor Afe. Moreover, Zæcchly faith expressly, that though upon the Sabbath, the heathen which did not agree with the Jews in the true religion, did not come to their assemblies to be partakers of the sacrifices, and to the performance of other parts of God's service, which pertained to the sanctification of the Sabbath; yet they were commanded to rest upon that day, as well as the homebome leves:

and he gave one reason of this command, which concerneth the strangers themselves, namely, that they might after some sort be trained up in the knowledge of the Law of God. 

Fourthly, therefore you must know, that the same sense of words shall not the like bond and obligation in a precept; nor the precept the same; nor before all that I have said before in chap. 3. The end not only differeth much from the precept and protheto a precept, or a privilege, as here the end of the Oxens reft, as respecting the Ox, is merely rest; but of the servants, chiefly holiness, which labour servile wholly therein; but also the end giveth the precept itsmodification for the end of the prohibition of the servantes labor, being the sanctification of the day, the servant whereby bound to rest and apply himself to holiness and the matter not only not to work him, or to admonish him to sanctify the day, but to compel him to the outward worship.

touching the Servants Duty.

CHAP. VII.

Breetenwood. Pag. 111.

By the labour of the heathen is the sense and translation of the chafier of which the commandement of the Sabbath resting from labour was given, so is the labour of the servant also, which by the master commandment is executed on that day (as being, touching bodily service, incident to mankind in like degree of holiness, the master's finnes, and the servant's.

Answer.

First, here you deliver your Doctrine and your reason. Your Doctrine is this:

The labour of the servant on the Sabbath done as his master command, is no more the servant's sinne, than the labour of the Oxe is the Oxen sinne. This heathen pamphlet opinion delivers rather truer things than arguments; yet is a word or two:

The labour of the Oxe doth not violate the commandement of the Sabbath, but you acknowledge, the wreke of the servant doth, when in the words of the next page (pag. 12.) you say thus of the servants toke this day: (for all indeed, wherewith the commandement of the Sabbath is viola-
ted is the servants.)

The Law of nature it is foreseengeth in general of all men, the sanctification of times no lesse than of places, persons, and things unto God's honor; for which cause God exacts some parts of men by way of perpetuall homage, never to bee dispensed withal, not remitted. Of this kind among the Jews was the Sabbath day, the chafier & general festival.

Now Nature hath taught the Heathen, and God the Jews, and Christ in (with worthy Hooker) first, that festivall fe-

CHAP.

Holiness are a part of the publick exercise of Religion. 2nd,

condly, that peace, liberality and rest are as natural ele-

ments, whereof solemnities consist. The labor of the servant, though

Holiness are a part of the publick exercise of Religion. 2nd,

condly, that peace, liberality and rest are as natural ele-

ments, whereof solemnities consist. The labor of the servant, though
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though injoyed by his master, on this day violates the rest and so the sanctification of that time, indefensible, insensible to any man who owes it by way of perpetual Homage unto God, by the obligation of the Law of Nature. For ordinary labour with small services to God can neither easily deserve, because painless and joy are opposite, nor decently be made in the house of gladness, the need of ordinary tole and careless become the one no. Thus learneth Heber on page. Now can the master's command dissolve the eternal Law, and the servant itching holy time be found less full than one prophan and faciously? But what kin betweene Ozen, Asph, and the everlasting Covenant and Holy times? Let them to their fables, and servants as Christis brethren to the attendants in the beauty of holiness, as they will answer it to the God of Nature, the eternal Lawgiver.

When the servant hath no more soul than the one, nor holiness and attendance on God's worship required more of him, than of the one; nor the Sabbath made for man, but for the one, then shall the servany and oxes labour that day be alike faultless instead of them. This of your Doctrine, which brings to my mind, that of Halley's, which I with might bee the contention of every one that hath been infected with this doctrine: Surely I am more brutish than any man, and have not the understanding of a man; I neither learned wisdom, nor have the knowledge of the Holy.

Secondly, your reason is this:
That the servant as touching bodily service incident to mankind, is in the degree of subjection to his master, as is the one and the other.
This is abhorring to Christian, to natural ears: no slave is so the matter.

It fights with that Rule: Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye to them, Mat. 7.12. A perfect voluntary servitude between Christian and Christian can scarce be lawfull to be exercised on the master.

touching the Servants Duty.

It fights with the fifth Amendment: Yet this placeeth not man in the condition of a beast for subjection.

It fights with that humane and lenite which masters owe to their servants, with whom they may not deal imperiously as with their cattle. Epist. 6.9.

It fights with that restraint given to servants to obey their masters in the Lord, which cannot bee applied to beasts.

It fights with that liberty the servant hath, in things unmeet and inexpedient, though lawfull, humbly to use all means to prevent and avoid the commandment of that nature.

It fights with that liberty the servant hath humbly to contend with his master.

It fights with that common honour both master and servant are equally establisht in by creation; Did not he that made the man in the womb, make him? And did not one fashion them in the womb?

It fights with the eternal Law in the fifth Commandement in which the master of the servant is required that he be to his servant in his manner a brother, in his office a father, things incompatible to brute beasts and man. Com. 3d King 5.3.

Thirdly, and whatsoever the condition of a slave was harder than that of an ordinary servant, or one hired, yet our question hath been all this while of Jewish servany, and of Christian servany; now the Jew in servany might not bee accounted a slave or bondservant, but as an hired servany, as in Levit 25.39.

The Jew that was servant, was fill a brother in Religion, and to be used in his service and labour; not so the one.

Fourthly, for the duty of subjects to their superiors, to cleare the whole matter, these grounds I lay downe:

First, subjects are bound to obey their superiors only in those things in which themselves are subjected to their superiors, or in which the superiors themselves, are not contrary.
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The guilt of sin has somewhat of good in it, and is of God; and in regard God can separate guilt from sin.

But partly it follows from sin as that which floweth from out of sin, and the defeated merits of punishment, and so it partakes of the nature of sin, and is void of any such thing as a thing victorious: and in respect it cannot be separated from sin.

This double consideration of guiltiness is intimated in Rom. 1:32. We know the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death. This is the nature of guiltiness, but the form of sin can be clearly separated from sin, and yet the sin be sin; that was a contradiction. The form of sin is no respect good, that were likewise a contradiction.

Thirdly, besides this, you say first, there are two things in every sin, the All and guilt, as the matter and form; yet in the same breath you tell of three things in every sin, the All, the accident or unlawfulness, and the Guilt.

This for the application of your Scholastic terms.

Fourthly, hence, you say, it appears manifestly, that he is the guiltiness, whose the transgression is, and this the transgression to whom the law was prescripted as a Rule, and that is the master, &c., and what coherence is here? because guiltiness is, in your title, the form of sin, therefore he is the guiltiness, whose is the transgression. Is guiltiness and transgression all one, and is not transgression the form of sin?

This is then in your own sense, as much as to say, he is the sin, whose is the sin. A fair conclusion, but no matter you were thus puzzled here, for your reasoning should thus have runne from your own ground: The All where-with the commandement of the Sabbath is violated is the servante, therefore the guilt is the servante, for who so violate the Law, he is guilty, and thus not only the matter that commandeth, but the servante that doth the work, violating the command of God, is guilty. What followeth in this fiction of yours, hath been pastily answered already, and followeth to be answered below in its more proper place.

CHAP. IX.

Brettwood. Pag. 12, 13.

But you will reply perhaps that the commandement touching sa-

France, as given to their Masters, indeed, but

not only to them, but to their servants also. No such matter; for it be, let that appear and be done the clause wherein it is mani-

festo expressed, or necessarily implied, that servants are forbidden all la-

bour on the Sabbath day, as servants I say, touching matter of service or labour imposed on them by their Masters, for else in such works where it leaveth them on the Sabbath day of themselves and not proceeding from the Masters' inspection, but from their own edicts; it is no question but they transgress the commandement, but those works they do not as servants, that is, at another's command; but as in the execution of their service or favour of their Masters they receive some degree of liberty, and have some direction of themselves permitted unto them, &c., in that respect fall into the clause of freemen, as the clause of the commandement, Thou shalt do no work; but to servants as servants (as in case they be commanded to work) which is our question, there is no clause of the commandement imposed.

Answer.

First: this indeed is our just exception against your doctrine, that the commandement, though given chiefly to matters in those words of specification, authorizing and appointing them not only to cease their labour by them-

selves, or any under them, but to cause them to cease, and to cause them to fast the day for outward conformity; yet is given also to, and imposed on, son and daughter, man and maid, and when you take for the express or implied peril, reaching them as servants, you have the same expressiveness in that clause of every servant shall not work, and in that other, Thou shalt do no work; as hath been shown ab-

urdantly and manifestly proved, and of plain light to mani

fested it selfe. Therefore when you call the first clause of the commandement, Thou shalt do no work, the clause of

freemen; thereby implying, that the latter is of bondmen, you
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ding the loss of things, according to that in Deut. 25. Thou shalt bring home thy brothers seeing one; and therefore a corporall work, and therefore a
paracred work, pertaining to preserve the health of one's own body, doth not violate the Sabbath; so to care, and
such like, whereby the health of the body is preferred. So the Jews sought, Maschab. 2. Elias travelled, fasting from
Jenabbel; and the Disciples plucked the ears of Corn on the Sabbath, &c.

This Scholeman faith, that the bodily works whereby
man serveth man, or all bodily labours are forbidden
this day, and to the other the servant as well as the freeman
is bound freely to apply himself. And that these works of
servants doe contrary the obserbance of the Sabbath, and
hinder the application of the man that serveth, to divine things.

CHAP. X.

Brewerwood. Pag. 13, 14.

Whereby may easily and clearly bee discovered the difference be-
 tween the equity and wisdom of Almighty God in the constituti-
on of the Law of the Sabbath obliging Parents, and Misters and ow-
ers, for the children, and servants and cattle that are merely under
their power; and the righteous and integrity of wretched men inter-
preting the law as immediately and directly obliging the children
and servants themselves; for (good sir) consider it well, and tell me,
whether it be more equitable before the law of creating from workes to
the servants themselves, or to their masters in whose power they are?
Servants are not homines gratiis, but oportuntur feminis. As Law-
yers speak; they are but their masters' beings, and younger men.
As if to say, then, they have no right or power to dispose of
themselves, they cannot play and work as their own pleasure (for
this is the condition of freemen, out of servitude) but are merely and
entirely for bodily labour and service under the power and command-
ment of their masters, and under their power for service only; in
such a case as they can neither freely perform any labour, which their
masters forbid, nor omit any which their Masters command, but are
under their imprisonment and punishment also if they disobey. This
is the property and obligation of a servant, and this by the law of
master,
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others, but are under the authority of another; but this hindrances not the imposing hereof on the servant also, who shall answer for his own offence to God, and cannot be excused by the command of his master.

Secondly, but in your discourse divers things suffer exception as most unbound, as: First, that they are merely under their masters power; this confuted before in Chap. 5.

Secondly, that they are under their power for service only; which is mostly false; for in this fourth Commandment they are put under their power directive and coactive for duties of Religion. And this your position overthrowes the power of Princes over their subjects in matters of Religion. A wicked doctrine.

Thirdly, that they cannot justly perform any labour their masters forbid. They may in case the matters life or livelihood be in manifest hazard, by obeying the masters prohibition, as in Abigail’s case. They may hit their neighbor out of a pit, or save him from some imminent danger or loss, though the matter should forbid it.

Fourthly, that they may not omit any labour which their masters command. They may omit the labour which will manifestly creep them, and ought to doe it by virtue of the sixth Commandment, Thou shalt not kill. And so that phrase of yours in pag. 9.7. (overfit with five days toyle) if spoken as a thing lawful on the matters part to overfit his servant, is finitall. Again, they may omit the labour that is against the commandment of an higher power, as Thomas A. Kempe, the whee in his summer 25, 1514. art. 5.

Fifthly, that servants are totally void of power and liberty to obey the commandment of God, in relating on the Sabbath when their master bids them work.

This is manifestly false: for,

First, if they are not void of liberty to refuse works that will crepe them on any day, then much lesse are they not void of liberty to refuse such works on that day. They are not void of liberty to refuse such unce cient imployments as will not give them leave to take breath, in so much as that will

touching the Servants Duty.

will kill them. Now to worke the seventh day too, is to have no time to take breath, as the phrase is in Esai. 3. 5. The same word bond-maid and the stranger may take breath. And so in the other cases forementioned.

Secondly, they have power to refuse a thing unlawful; but the servants worke that day is a thing unlawful; for it is forbidden, as your text acknowledges.

Thirdly, they are here for this day reford to freedom, by that the Lord commands the master not to work them.

Fourthly, they have no power to fell themselves from God’s solemn worship and service, and such a bargain is void, if it were made, since no nor did the Law of nations so bind the servant to his master, and make him fob to be his masters.

Fifthly, if the master bid the servant do any thing which is either contrary to pietie, or repugnant to a servants duty, he is not bound to obey, because the master ought not to command such things. Rightly therefore S. Hierom annexed this exception to the Apostles (In this thing) to whither we in which the matter according to the flesh, both command things contrary to the matter of our spirits. Now these command of the master are of this nature, and where the matter ought not to command, the servant is not bound to obey; the matter here, you confesse, ought not to command; then the servant is not bound to obey, and thus, be 4. g. 3. t. 4. t. 1. 15.4. serv. the servant that is in force upon him, and is wont to work, if he were not, as his masters command this day.

Thirdly, and as their grounds are wicked, which you interlace your argument withall, and therefore do not strengthen, but weaken your reason, so where your ground is good, your conclusion is nought. This is indeed true which you say, that the master hath over his servant a coactive and corrective power. But what a miserable consequence is this.

Masters have a coactive power; therefore there is no will, well, justice or equity in the Almighty to give a commandment to a servant in obeying wherein he is liable to the slates of 

wicked
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wicked matter. Nay, God requires servants to undergo  
wrongfull buffettings patiently, 1 Pet. 2, 18, 19, and yet he  
is wise, and just, and equal in so doing.

CHAP. XI.

Brethren, pg 15.

It is therefore much more agreeable to the will and justice of God to impose the commandment, that on the Sabbath they cease from all servile labors, than the matter of the commandment. The servants, for they are necessitated to serve their masters, and the punishment that might attend on that, and the breach of the law of nations, (all which the other had occasioned,) and yet the matter was not in any way wronged for their labor was remitted in their power, no less than the Sabbath, than the other (for common days), only the Lord did qualify, and determine the seventh or exception of that power, on the Sabbath day, namely to command their servants' children from bodily labor, and instead of that to receive refreshments in spiritual works of learning, it was a way to establish the commandment in such form more agreeable to the will and justice of God.

Answ.

First, in this continuance of your former reason, partly you charge our doctrine, and partly you charge your own.

First, you charge ours as occasioning servant disobedience to their masters, and servants punishment by their masters, and the breach of the law of nations: but yours, as you say, prevents all this. We affirm, that the giving of the commandment of the Sabbath to servants as well as to masters, though to masters as those that should preserve this Law, if those under them would violate it, occasioneth none of these three evils: First, it occasioneth not any disobedience to masters; for at the most it giveth but power to the servant submissively to refuse the unlawful command of his master, and not to obstinate subjection to his authority; to the first he is not bound, and therefore is not disobedient, when he obeyeth not, but on the contrary, if he should yield
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yeeld to the thing that is unlawful, he is a man-pleaser.

And to the second he yields himself in his submission, as well as acknowledge the power to the full, when he gives up himself that day to bee commanded by him in things pertaining to the worship of God, in which thing alone God hath allowed the matter the acting or execution of his power over his servant for that day. The reason hereof is, because God's foolish, when you say, the servant remains in his master's power no less this day, than any other, but to other and better ends, unto which ends, viz. respecting the worship of God, you confesse the masters power, for the time, is determined in respect of the execution thereof. And who feeth not then, that if the execution of the power be bounded, the servant is not to fulfill the bounds, but unlawful occasions forth of that power, here it is enough to be a patient merely, and by no means an agent. So then the servant remaineth no less in the masters power, but to higher ends, but more free to Gods service, while the matter may not call him off by unjust exceptions. And so farre is this from occasioning any disobedience, that it occasioneth, and properly effecteth, in the servants heart a controllable, and produceth in his life an entire and uniformer obedience to the matter as it is here by brought to the house of God where they labour all day to God and man, though their matter should be wicked, and disproportionate to their masters mens, faithfull and conscionable serving them, not with eye-service, but with all rightness, to which the fear of God will bind them. But the unfaithfull to God will be unfaithfull to man. Oh the wisdom of God that provides for particular mean and societies by this his Law, better than they could or would for themselves. Secondly, this occasioneth not any punishment unwisely incurred, if then it come, it may patiently, yea, joyfully be borne; for this is thank-worthily with God, 1 Pet. 2, 18}

we see by experience, that as religious observing the duties of the Sabbath maketh one faithful in his calling about all the weekes; and as fidell it is in it to be a stable and to the ma

G. 3
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The Law of the Sabbath is observed as a day of rest and devotion. It has been established to honor the memory of the seventh day of creation and to remind humanity of its dependence on God. The Sabbath is a day set apart for worship, reflection, and family gatherings. It is a day to remember the blessings received from God and to engage in activities that promote spiritual growth and community. The Sabbath is a reminder of God's covenant with His people and the importance of maintaining a close relationship with Him.

The Law of the Sabbath is observed by many religions, including Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. It is a fundamental aspect of religious practice and is integral to the cultural and spiritual identity of many communities.
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condition, wherein he should never have power to frequent
the solemn worship of God, as will of necessity follow, if
he be always, absolutely as you teach his masters. Shew
me whether over the nations generally, or only over any
nation willed to be given such a Law? If no such Law or
determination, it is no way of the Law of Nations: if not ordained,
it is much more abased from Natures influnt. I say,
such a thing could never possibly be found among the Na-
tions of men, it is so abhorring to Nature: but men could
so farde and so universally degenerate, yet this without all
controversie determines this fact: *the Law of Nations
being a positive Law and humane, though brought in by
the cunomi of Nations, cannot, nor must derogate from a
Law of Nature. Now the Law of Nature binds all men,
even servants as servants to serve God solemnly on the last
day, doing times he shall call for their homage from them indistin-

cessibly, as on this day he doth, and to this end to be vacant at
freedom from bodily labours that are servile for that time. The
Deborah is the Law of Nature, it chargeth servants in the
fourth and fifth Commandments; the duties these required
servants (and bound unto, and to them first as the rules of
the Law of Nature, to other duties after, and is delivered to
the next states of mankind, and as the law of God is not
without a Law, for that is not a Law which is not just and right;

*nulla juris quod

is perpetuus, no Law: it is not Law, but less, but filial,

but a destroyer, but error, but tyranny, anything rather than
Law, as all the learned conclude. If you, or any can show
nothing such a Law, or rather less of Nations, blessed be God in his
his service, wisdom, justice and equity for ever, who by his eternal
Law seeth poor servants from such tyrannous exact on.

Secondly, as our doctrine is that which cometh of the pure
grape, so yours is the posyon of Dragons prelised from the
wine of Sodom: for if thine, that is produced in all the for-
mer evil: for this, That the servant is left, even the Sabbath
day also merely in his masters power to be obedient to

his
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his commands for his works; first, it would occasion rebellion in the servant through bitterness of soul arising from an unsupportable burden; secondly, and so from thence just punishment on the servant; if the matter of strength can reach them to inflict it, or from superiour Magistrates, and thirdly, over the Law of Nations, by striking at the life of Religion and Societies in the first and fundamental society, viz. a family; and in one of the most necessary props of that society, viz. matter and servant. From this likewise it will follow, that God shall be neglected by the servant, through neglect of holiness and that the servant of his unrighteous master shall no way be provided for; in respect of his slovenliness, and not so well as the other rather for God, will be the avenger of that injustice, his poor creature being mercilessly used, but for this God, you lay, provides, that the servant shall of his conscience obey, and to God's justice, wisdom, goodness, and the ends of giving the commandment in regard of the servant shall be inspected, and wholly frustrate.

Thirdly, lastly, you overthrow your own text, if the execution of that power be bounded for that day, as you rightly teach, how is the servant to obey the unjust usage of his power? For it he have no power to command, the servant may refuse to obey, and may, both because in this respect the servant is made a freeman, and so under the obligation of God's command by your own confession; and because every one of charity to himself is bound not to lose his liberty, without some weighty cause, but to enjoy and use it rather where he may be free, and because the power the matter in this case takes, he usurps, not of God, but is turned directly against him, I say, therefore, if the matter of power be determined, the servant is fixed; but if he have power, how is it notwithstanding therein determined? Again, if the matter must not only discharge the servant of works, but he shall thereof charge him to the exercises of holiness, the servant must needs in obeying his master fillfull command of working, fire off
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FROM his charge and power, to charge him at that time of his to labouring, in the duties of holiness, seeing no man can doe two things (chiefly of this nature) at once.

Brewer. Pag. 15, 16, 17.

A ND last not all to his goodness and compassion! For say that the commandment touching the servants vacation was given to themselves, notice their Masters, should not thereby power servants (for none everywhere else the law of God appeareth mild and pitifully) be intrettled with inextricableness perplexity! For suppose his matter injures him some work on the Sabbath day (cereous masters may soon doe it), especially if they think that prevent touching their servants relations, not to touch them; or else they may be ignorant of the law of God, (as Oristus and few other happily have Pagans) John 15, 16, some master commands his servant to work on the Sabbath, what should the servant do? Should be work? what, God hath forbidden it? should he not work? His master hath commanded him for the benefit of God is at enmity with the law of usages, and that poor servant like the sailor between Sylia and Chrysis, Hamedes perplexed and afflicted in the midst of the spices and timber he must of necessity either disobey God's commandment, which is sin; or he Masters, which is attended with spices. Besides it is absurd that the law of God, should restrain the servants from obeying his Master, and yet not restrain the Master from commanding his servant unlawful things! Avis a still another absurdity that that day which by the law given was manifestly intended to bring servants release, and renunciation of their weekly toil, should by the decree of the law be kept above all other days brede those greatest perplexities! Nevertheless as above all other days, (if their Masters be not intent that fate God) enforced they are (there is no avoidance) to render either on sabbate, on sabbate, for either God must be disdained, and some clearest to their Masters, or their Masters: and scribes, right upon their bodies, either they must obey God, and be plagued by masters, or obey masters, and be condemned by God: you will say it is better to obey God than men; and work to disobey him that can eat both body and soul into hell, than him that can only for a time afflict the body, the soul.

1 Cor. 7, 21.
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mandement; the commandement doth not cease, time.
had you had 
  Charity spirit, you would have justified the
law, and laid upon the hands and corrupt nature
of men, and of all, and have advised all youth to cleanse
their ways by taking heed thereto according to God's
word, and not go about to fill Greene heads with crock-
cherish. Yes, but if they be not, but obey, 
tisence; and this is against the mercy of God. Indeed? Is this
your humbling block? It is then against his goodness
that 
should return to her Misfortun, and to his children.

Heb. 11.19. It is against goodness to be happy;
for blessed are yee (faith Christ) when ye suffer death
usage for righteounesse sake. It is against goodness that
any man should be, or done good, inasmuch as some wicked
men will perpetrate a man for that good. Why should the
pitable God require that which will cast uson the wheel,
greed, rage, fire, and faggot, and what not that is so
torment and torture? Oh direful, earthly and sensual resi-
lng. This is far from our Saviours Doctrine and Spirit,
The king of Sion, meek and having Givation, who blesse
us take up our crosse daily, and hate father and mother, and
our own selves, as ever we mean to be worthy of him, and
find life to life eternall. Such sufferings are to Gods glory
and to our glory. Our Saviour premissing of his suffer-
ings, said, Father, glorify thy Name, that thine Holy
Spirit, be done; Lade me now to the Cross to the Cross he calleth,

Rom. 7.11,12. heart, old under flame. Since taketh occa

Heb. 13.19.
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brought. Therefore that Starre in the firmament of your reasoning (whose condition is ye benefit and lawfull) shooteth and falleth.

Yes, but you say, the point you stand on, is not, how much better it is to obey God than man, but how the command, requiring obedience in a thing that will call us into the hands of wicked men, can stand with the goodness of God. This is the point that all this while I have handled; read and see how.

Forthwith and for a recompence, when you talk so freely of mischief and inconveniences, free your Doctrine of them if you can. For if the servant must obey his master's unlawful commands or works on that day, (for he cannot do it, but he falleth into mischief; for he is hold from God's service and the Covenant of God, (I Envry one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, taketh hold of God's Covenant;) a matter be wicked; and into inconstance, for he hath no break of time; he cannot leave it undone, but he falleth into stripes and pain at once, without any support from God or man.

Therefore your Conclusion, that all is avoided by this your doctrine is not untrue, neither Scripture nor reason favoureth your opinion, and in that you suffer the full reproofs of a Peter and Jude, you are one of the filthy dreamers. Leulitnian faith of Plato, that because he talked much of one God that made the world, but nothing of Religion and his worship, that he dreamed, and knew not God; How much more do you dream and know not God that talk of him to evet his worship?

The touching the Servants Duty.

CHAP. XIII.

And doth not the practice of holy governours registred in the Scriptures declare, that they had the same understanding of the commandments Nebuchadnezzar, when he was among the Jews in Jerusalem, the Sabbath prophaned with teasing of wine, griss, eating of butter, беysing and killings, whom reproved he for it: I The servants being employed and labouring those things were done, and the Sabbath defiled? No, but their whole power the Servants, the rulers of Idols, and what rulers? the Magistrates only? No such matter, but the freerome of Idols, that is to say, such Ministers of their Servants: for such (namely freemen) the word would there use both properly so, not only the Magistrates as Rulers of the Commonwealth, for the Scriptures which being themselves leaves I hold, I hold it in the property of their own language, translated into, by the Greek word translated, that word is properly and directly applied to freemen: and every where almost in the old Testament where the Hebrew word is found (which is known, to signify a freeman) and translated in the Greek in & μν is the Latin Chaldee, which is understood to be the same with the Hebrew word, is put before more usual in the Chaldee tongue. They were the freerome of Idols then, that by Nebuchadnezzar were called to account, and reproved for the profanation of the Sabbath by their servile labours which (no petition) had been executed by their servants, but if the servants by those labours, had themselves transferred the commandment: had he not done both falsely, to have made them partakers of the sinne, (feeling the commandment of God, Jay equal on both) wisely too, that if he could not reprove the masters from commanding, yet he might reproach the servants from obeying: and to have done two things, to hinder? This Nebuchadnezzar did not (who understood well the commandment) but rebuked the freemen, Masters only, and omitted the servants; and yet, deal with you will not deny I am foreboth puffed and wisely: for had he done more wisely, thank you to rebuke freemen for not esteeming on the Sabbath, that would have rest with all their hearts; if they had not been constrained to work? Or had he done more puffed to exact that of the servants, which (for ought that appears) the commandment of God exacted not from them.

Answer.
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10.14. Therefore shall the sabbath be accounted for us, that the second commandment may be fulfilled: for sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.

Chap. XIV.

Bretonwood. Pag. 18, 19.

For what work is it that men are forbidden of the Sabbath? Is it not the same that is permitted on the sabbath day? Yea, it is the Sabbath work whereabout, as a servant is employed, that neither begins or endeth, nor is undertaken of himselvgs, but is done by his hands, but the Sabbath work is, that he begins and ends it, and is performed in his master's service. It is manifest that in the command of God, it is not for God beheldeth the heart, and that is the man's own work with him, that proceeded from his own will and therefore in Sabbath it is the will that is forbidden, about the performing of the Sabbath, which is in the law was written. This work is there in thy will and that most justly for the will to be done is the proper seat and estate of sin, which therefore is nothing else but the inordinate or unprofitable or unlawful actions of ours, but the express or manifestation of fruits or effects of sin, for properly they are not which hath her residence and intention in the sabbath it itself, and Paffith from othoe only the inordinate and unlawful actions they carry with them, because they flow from a full determination of the will, and are no what further injurious then they are voluntary. Seeing therefore

touching the Servants Duty.

therefore shall the seventh especially in the observance of the will, that they that are only masters of another's whatsoever will, and only masters of another's service, which is not only the observance of their own, but as their own will commandeth them. Therefore, the servant therefore doing that work as the seventh is a commandment, but is not the seventh, yet the sabbath is none of itself but the sabbath, that excised the work, that although the work as naturally considered be the sabbath, yet is it in the Master's, but the sabbath as in the seventh, but the sabbath as in the Master's, for the sabbath is not the sabbath obedience to the Master's commandment, but in the sabbath disobedience to the Master's commandment, which hath indeed prohibited the work of servants in the Sabbath, but yet the prohibition is imposed, and directed to the Master's, but not to them, who are only masters, nor authors of their own labour, but in the imputation of same, difference is to be made between the authors and the masters.

Answer.

Let the reader remember that you here yeald that if the commandment be imposed on servants, then they sabbath be working this day as their master's command. Now this hath been proved, and all plainly answered that may seem to make against it: and I proceed.

First, the work forbidden is; first, service, which is permitted on the sabbath; for in Sabbath it is the will that is forbidden, about the performing of the Sabbath, which in the law was written. This work is there in thy will and that most justly for the will to be done is the proper seat and estate of sin, which therefore is nothing else but the inordinate, or unprofitable, or unlawful actions of ours, but the express or manifestation or effects of sin, for properly they are not which hath her residence and intention in the sabbath itself, and suffereth from only the inordinate and unlawful actions they carry with them, because they flow from a full determination of the will, and are no what further injurious then they are voluntary. Seeing therefore
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in feste with the middle word, with which is the same fame in found. If the first, then it is opposed to all that duty of the Sabbath which consists in the immediate honour of God, done with the full complacency of heart therein, and the honorable mention of it in our words and discourse, as is clear in the Text to him that duly weighteth it. Now, say, Is not the servants fenced in this word (stir plenary) as that which is no duty of God's worship, publick or private? If the second, then it is not as it is forbidden (and so your argument fails) but rather concerns as many learned and considerate Divines deliver our works of recreation, or sports which we finde out, though after other times lawfull, which take off the heart from holy duties; for God hath found us another recreation; chiefly on that day of any will be merry, let him sing Psalms (as in Ps. 92). The Titre compared with the Psalm, & would have the Sabbath to our delight.

Fourthly, Now whereas you lay this for a ground, that the election of men will be the proper form of actual sin, I wonder how you should mistake, but that Divinity was not your covenanted Wife, but only your Concupiscence, which for a time you use, and in the use you wash. Assay or irregularity is the proper form of actual sin, be the Anaxy in thoughts, in desires, in deeds, or in words. Moreover, election of the will is an act, and good, and therefore by no means the form of sin; and if you say, you speak not of election, but this election, namely, the unruly and improper election; tell me, is the election or the unlicensed the form of sin? Unlicensed doublet, which informeth both the election that is senseful, and the action that is senseful. And whereas you say, that outward unlawful actions are but expressions of sin, and not sinne properly; if they be unlawful actions, they bee sensefull actions properly so called, for you yielded before, according to the truth of Scripture, and reason (p. 12.) that sense formally is nothing else but unlawful senses; if you will, that sense formally is not sense properly. A proper position.

For your reason whereby you would maintain this (that

touching the Servants Duty.

(faste sense hath her residence and inherence in the sense it selfe, and passeth forth of the actions outward carry only the tincture of sense, therefore they are not sense), I reply: If they carry the tincture of sense, then are they sensefull. Against are they dealt with sense, and yet hath sense no inherence nor residence in them. This is strange, and for the residence of sense, it is not in the soul alone: Saint Paul says, Phil. 2:5, and we know sense cometh by propagation, but the soul is not propagated; only the body cometh, and is traduced from the parents, I would know where, in this propagation, sense hath its inherence, and whether an unutterable, and perpetual fighting with the righteous and apostles God approved, be not traduced, and do not naturally tickle in the very bodily faculties?

And when you say sense only consisteth in the exorbitancy of the will, it is most false; foundrell philosophy refeth this, for Aristotle hath exorcell not from a fault, the things that are strict, are offended in, or done amiss against ones will through ignorance; and Divinity teacheth, that errors in judgement and ignorances (when it is of things which of dute we should know) are sense, that the want of original righteousness, and the defects of graces are sense. And Thomas a faith, that to be every habit, and Art deprived of due order. The habit also of sense is strict in the understanding, because all sense cometh from error which is in the understanding; consider it also in its absolute and without working with the will, so sense is strict. Vpon such rotten props, what building can bee reared? Yet let us take notice of your reasoning for further satisfaction to all, and the utter subjection of this new learning; it stands thus.

The minster of another mans sense, being but the minster of another-exercist will, no further certain, than his own will concur, therewith. The servantes doing his masters work on the Sabbath, and of election, but is obedient to his master, is but the minster of another's exercist will, and his own will no way concur, therewith; but doing his masters not.
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Instruments in the works of the Master and confederate all will: I an
swer: he confederate will indeed if he be a good servant, by reason
of the obligation of obedience wherein he standeth to his master, but
yet not absolutely but conditionally; not the life, election, but only
the obedience as yielding of his will; and this only as it is his mas
ter's work: nor is it his master's line for the work on the sabbath,
having none annexed to it, and so being a lawful work, the serv
ant and the master will divide it between them: the work is the
servant, and the line is the master, for the servant is bare to his
Duty in obeying his masters commandments, but the master's command
ments in disobeying God's commandments, touching his servants
acting from that labour.

Answer.

First, why should we fear to say, the eye beholding va
nity finneth, and so of the tongue loueth to blaspheme, flan
der, and lyeth? For, first, they move irregularly; secondly,
they are the weapons of our thirdly in them sin is finnished,
the bringing forth of death both on body and soul: fourthly, there are the fineness of both body and soul, and not of either part: fifthly, the fineness is made greater by the outward action, in respect of the extent thereof, it having now invaded the body, and not only possessed the soul: so that there is fineness of flesh, as well as of the spirit; a Cor. 7.1, and in respect of the damage it bringseth to others, either by way of civil and offence, or by some rea
d discommodity, as slaughter, desolation, with the like: fixithly and hence is it, that certain punishments are rightly
inflicted for the outward action of some time, which never
never could have place for the inward time alone; as divorce
is rightly inflicted for the act of adultery, that cannot be so
for the intent of it. And thus all the Scriptures charge all the
members of the body, eyes full of adultery, the tongue a
world of iniquity; 2 Pet. 2:22. Rivers of water run down mine eyes
because they (that is, mine eyes) keep not thy Law. Your
hands are full of blood; I doubt not but the Scripture are peck
more exactly than you. You would be thought to speak properly when you say, These works are the fineness of the disaffected minds, but neither Philosophy nor Divinity will

will admit it; for we may not say, The will finneth, the body
finneth: but thus, The man finneth. For actions are spoken,
and are not the actions of the subject person; it is not a proper 
Action finneth, or that speech to say, The body finneth, but The man finneth; The finneth, but The man finneth. For that saying, The soul that finneth shall die, Ecc. 18.19, is meant thus, the person that finneth; as
in that phrase, so many souls went down into Egypt, Gen. 46.26. Now from this it followeth that not only in lying
the tongue is abut, as the senile creature is abut by a
fitter, but (inasmuch as the body and soul are but one
and make one person whole, as the animad works
good or bad) the body and members thereof have their
place in the very time, in the irregularity, filth, and guilt of
it, and so shall find it by the punishment hereafter, and do
find itself by the punishment that finneth on the body here;
and though the members be instruments of the soul, yet
dost not such as can be separated from the man, for the body
and soul are essential parts of man.

Secondly, and for objecting, first, I would recount upon
you your own argument; if the natural instrument, that
in your opinion finneth not, (as the tongue lying, byth not,
a presumptuous) yet it is charged with impiy in the Scrip
ature, it is punished for sin there, and hereafter, and is pollu
ted with fineness; then how much more is the voluntary in
strument charged, polluted, and shall be punished, that can
not works in will, but must needs bring will to the works,
and election too inseme fit.

Thirdly, for your objection and solution; the objection
is this, The servant is a voluntary instrument, not so the eye,
or hand in the body; therefore from the hand to the servant
will not hold. You solve and solve it thus; The servant con
fesseth will, but this and that a conditional will; will ob
the servant, not being an election, will to the work, not to the fin;
therefore a natural instrument and such a voluntary are all
one. This can never make good; for by your own

confession,
The Doctrine of the Sabbath vindicated.

confession, such an instrument is in part voluntary, and so is not the natural instrument.

Besides the mischiefs of your answer forth in this, that to obey the master in his works, and not in his sins, is lawful; you yield then that if it be a sin, no condition or half-election will serve to free him, that to chastise it, from being a sinner. I urge not only the matters commanding of works that day is fine, but the works of the matter that day is forbidden to be done, and so is fine. There the conditions, hall, or under will, the obeying will of the servant (if he work) will not excuse him from fine. For nothing takes away voluntariness from a deed, but absolute violence of compulsion, and a mere causality that could not be foreseen or forehealed. As if one be compelled to bend the knee (by force his knee bowed by others) before an idol or, if one kill another by mere chance, Deut. 19:5, 6, 10.

Fourthly, for that speech where you say, The works on the Sabbath hath fine annexed thereto, it is not right; for the works on the Sabbath is fine, that circumstance of time, not the Sabbath, is the form of it. And this indeed must bee divided between the matter and the servant, as both their fines; the masters in commanding, the servants in working. But to divide fine from servile works on the Sabbath that they should not meet in the same person, neither matter, nor servant, nor all the one in the Gate be able with Cox-treesto dot. I pray you name the works (say you) are the servants, the fines are the masters. Why, the works is the fine, and is not the servants then?

CHAP. XVI.

Breevwood, Pag. 21, 10 23.

By being I have begun to object, I will proceed a little further, in that course, both the more evidently to declare my meaning, to touching the Servants Duty.

Left it be obvious to examination, and allow to those objections that may be produced against servants obedience touching works on the Sabbath, if my imagination be good to find them, and my learning able to define them. For if it be such works of servants are touching this commandment in better condition than other men by their work on the Sabbath they transgress, it is not; and transgress it they do not, for do not not imposed on them, but only on their masters. Teaching them, assure that the works of servants, and of two persons proceeding from them, as they are servants, that is, upon their master commandment others proceeding from their own election, unto which namely not by any commandment of their masters, by the way of their own, duties they are carried. Of the first sort of works they are only ministers, of the second, they are Authors. And teaching this second sort; confiscatory (although of the former it is first or second) both than servants have a free, yeas well obligation of their own, and that their transgressions and fine is universal, and therefore there of necessity are bound to answer it to the judge of God, but whether the fine of their second works, be peculiarly the servants, or that the master is not concerned in the guilt thereof, it may be questioned, for if they be done merely by the servant election, before the knowledge and contrary to the commandment of his master yet these to be partially the servants fine. But if they be occasioned by the masters negligence, then doth he certainly participate in guilt thereof, and his servant although in a divers sort, for it is a fine of composition in the servant, being an unseemly and a false composition in the master neglecting his due care, because by the precept of Almighty God the master is bound not only to command his servant to work, but to command him not to work on the Sabbath day; well then the works, which servants due on the Sabbath day on their own election, are condoned; the works they do by obedience, are excused by their masters commandments; but what works are so excused, are all due, but briefly all those which while they are permitted by the servants, then they that do them are not as punished for being the servants of God. That is to say, the works of a servant, but not the works of a master; for to the last they are obliged by the law of nature, but the former are forbidden thereby the law of God, not made by the servant as their labour on the Sabbath, but directly and immediately forbidden them, but the same, I believe, that all other commandments, being indifferently imposed without other specification or exception of any person whatsoever, respect not any more one than another and therefore hold all men under an equal obligation, and so it altogether conveys the revealed Laws of God, and no less written with the finger of God in the heavenly tables of the heart, than in the tables of stone, all of them.
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them forbidding those things that by their property and nature, or (as the Schoolmen say) 

are in general evil, but the commandment that forbids them works on the Sabbath is of a different sort: 

for because the sabbath is sanctifying the matter which is forbidden (labour) wholly subject to another more commandment: secondly, because the commandment forbids not the sabbath to work, but only forbids the sabbath's labour to work: thirdly, because the thing itself is itself, namely, sabbath labour, is not evil in itself, neither is it 

forbidden, as the matters of the other negative commandments are: but only circumstantially, because its done upon such a day: the idolatry, blasphemy, dishonouring of Parents, murder, adultery, theft, false 

testimony, correcting that is in other sorts; which are the matters of the other commandments; are evil in their own nature, and therefore forbidden, because they are evil in their own nature: But to labour on the Sabbath is not by nature evil, but therefore evil, because it is 

forbidden. So that the matter itself in the other commandments the prohibition, but the prohibition in this is the evil: for labouring on the seventh day if God had not forbidden it he had not been evil at all; it is more than to labour on the first, as nothing interfered by any law of nature, as the matter of all the other commandments are: for although the seventh day, so in the other sort of nature teacheth all men, that the sabbath is to be withdrawn from their bodily labour, and to be dedicated to the ho

nour of God (which even the prophet) Gentiles, and all the blind 

ecclesiastical, and dutyful, where with they were covered, in some sort doth appoynt (as I seem to be in fact) and devotion to God, which they were for their Gods, yet to observe one day in the number of seven, as a certain day of that number, and namely, the seventh in the number, or a whole day by the revelation of the same, and with that were exacted by restraining all works (as was enjoined to the leaven) is but merely ceremonial, brought in by positive Law; and is not of the law of nature. For had that form of keeping sabbath, but a law of nature then, had it not obliged the Gentiles as well as the Jews, enacting they partake both equally in the same matter: yet I did not but was given to the Jews to be a

special mark of their separation from the Gentiles, and of their particular participation in God: neither shall we find either in the writings of Heathen men, where of there were in their kind very religion, that any of them had ever any thing of it, or in the record of history, that it was ever observed by any of the holy Patriarches before it was pronounced in that same. But it had been a law of nature her folk, and he had obliged all the Patriarchs; and as long as nature 

had not been corrupted, and was immutable night by night, he had obliged all the Gentiles: and had it not been as 
durable, as nature too, and so obliged us Christians also? Certainly it had; for if that pacific occasion, and sanctification of the Sabbath was, after the state of nature, it had been by the decree

touching the Servants' Duty.

of all Divines, immovable, and consequently right glorious should the name of Christians be, which now profane that day with ordinary labours, and chiefly theirs, which first translated the celebration of that day, being the seventh, to the first day of the weeks; who yet are necessarily obliged to be next other than the Apostles of our Saviour.

To come to the point and clearly to determine it; the matter only is accountable to God, for the servants work done on the Saba

both; but for what work? Namely, for all the evils of labour, but 

not for the work itself, and how for the work of labour? Namely, 

is it done for the evil, absolutely, of his own devotion, but reflectively 

as of obedience to his masters command: for touching labours, serv

ants are directly obliged to their masters, but touching the work, themselves are obliged immediately to God. Therefore these they may do 

because their master command them: these they may not do (al

though commanded) because God forbids them.

The servants then may not in any case, done at the commandment of any master on earth; because he hath received immediately a direct commandment to the contrary, from his master in heaven. For it is better to obey God than man. And there is no purpos 

ion between the duties which they owe as servants to their masters according to the faith & which they owe as children to the father of families, the obligation wherein they stand to men, who have power but over their bodies in limited cases, and that for a se

ason. And that infinite obligation wherein they stand to him that is both creator and preserver, andredeemer, and Judge of body and soul; from therefore they may not, because their masters command them, because God hath forbidden this (not only forbidden) by, but forbidden it is them labour they may in their masters command them, because God hath no way forbidden them that, God hath indeed forbidden the masters executing such work on the Sabbath, but he hath not forbidden the servants execution of that work if be demanded of them, but he hath restrained the matter from commanding it, but he hath not restrained the servants from obeying if it be com

manded for although he acknowledge the servants work on the Saba

both to supply done; yet I say it is not the servants faults. And albeit I took (if the commandment of God be transgressed, and God dis

avowed by such works on the Sabbath, yet it is not the servant that transgressed the commandment, let not be that different God. For the question is not the same sense, whether God be displeased with their work, but of the affair who displeased him. The thing is confessed; but the person is questionable. Confessing that in that there is some connexion in that work, but questioned which sense it is. For work have relation both to the Master and to the Servant to the Masters commanding and to the servants executing; I affirm that the
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were given more to servants than to others: and direct the
your former words, where you say, their labour is forbid-
done: For if they labour, is it not their labour, and so on
the contrary? Or to the words (directly and immediately) you
yield then, that servants labour is forbidden indirectly and
immediately. The truth is, that which is directly forbidden,
is directly forbidden: and that which is immediately for-
bidden, is indirectly to be done, though meditately; meditately
or immediately takes not away the edge of the precept, or
power of the commandment.

Thirdly, you say, The other commandments were imposed
without specification or exception of any person whatsoever,
and therefore hold all men under an equal obligation; but
this not so. Anso. What arguing is this? This Command-
ment is with specification, and the servant is specified, and
his service is specified to his master on the Sabbath specified
and prohibited, therefore it bindeth him not, it is not his
harm. Nay, the specification maketh it more his sin, and
God provided by this enumeration of the persons, (as
all have and will agree, unless any should use your false
gloss) that this sin might be no means be violated. Man-
ners. After all law in this enumeration not a freeing of the
servants and subjects from the obligation, because a charge
is laid on the Governors, so that others keep the day: but
a reason to persuade the inferior the more cheerfully to
keep it: thus he says, The charge is laid on Governors,
that inferior might yield cheerfully to God will, consider-
ing himself a charge God hath given to all Governors.
And that be meant by God will, the commandment here
imposed upon, and binding servants from doing their ma-
ters homage, though commanded, is apparent by his words
in the same place, which run thus: Many masters have
their children, many masters command their servants to go
about their common business, and send them from place to place
as that time, when they should attend to the holy Command-
ment of the Lord, whereas both of them might well and law-

fully.

fully reply to their fathers and masters, and say with Christ,
our Saviour, Luke 2.49. Will ye not that I must be about my
Father's business?

That word (exception) is venomous, as if some persons
were excepted by that specification of persons in the fourth
Commandment: these are certain words and will that
will quickly corrupt good manners. Therefore Christian
Reader, I give thee this note as an Antidote; and that it may
be the more strong to expel poison, know that the specifica-
tion of persons in a precept negative, cannot be an except-
tion of those parties from under that precept, if specified
in the prohibition, not excepted. And for the equal obliga-
tion that holds all men alike under the other Command-
ments, it is the same also in this: for if you say the command-
ement more obligeth Governors, I answer, It doth so in
respect of their publick observing of the command, as they
are Governors, and so ought to see this Law kept, and not
violated: and thus they are bound more, and otherwise
than other men to every of the other nine Command-
ments. For the Magistrate is the keeper, or preferrer of
both = Tables of the Law. But in respect of their personal observance herof, it is equally charged on them, as on the
servant and subject: and so it is also in the rest of the pre-
cepts.

Fourthly, you say, this commandment is of a different
sort from others, therefore is otherwise obligeth, and you
give three things to show this difference; first, the nature
of it; secondly, the matter prohibited; thirdly, the com-
mand is fles.

First, for the nature of this Law, you say, It is a Law
imposed in the Tables of sense, but not on the Tables of
sense. You make this distinction, that there are revealed Lawes in the Decalogue which are not the certain Lawes of Nature, the Lawes ingraven in
stone by the finger of God, were not all of them the Lawes
of Nature.

Against this I protest you with reasons, authorities, and

L 2 your
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of the other Commandments: in the nature and property of the things, as you say, and so you give three instances: two of them have been already answered, namely, that the labour of the servant is wholly subject to another man's command, and that the commandment only forbidden is the matter of the servant's work. The third instance (which now we will, God willing, frame) is this, That the thing forbidden, viz., the servile work, and the servant's work, is not evil materially, and ex suo genere, as the matter of other commandments is, nor evil of its own nature, but only because it is prohibited, and therefore you hold, it is no Law of nature.

Here still consider how far we stand thus to your scope, and the question in hand: for what if the matter prohibited be evil but only by prohibition? would not that prohibition make it sinful of itself, and that to the servant? I'll give you an instance in a precept ceremonial: God commanded that no leaven should be in their houses during the Feast of unleavened bread: suppose the matter should command his servant to make in those days leavened bread, if the servant did it, the servant sinned as well as his master.

Secondly, the proposition is false: for the matter of the second Commandment is not evil materially, any more than the matter of the fourth, to make an image or likeness of any thing in heaven, earth, or sea, is not evil, but only circumstantially, as to make it to bow to it. If you say, to make it to bow to it, is the matter of the Commandment; and as to make an image to bow to it, is evil materially, and of its own nature, so to spend (the Sabbath) I say not, but, in seventh day, but,) the Sabbath, the consecrated time of God's worship, in our labour, is evil materially. And therefore the matter command cannot excite the servants' work that day. And now hence I further reason against you thus: Though the second Commandment forbid to make images, which is not evil in itself, but only with this circumstance added, to make them to bow to them;

respecting the moralitie thereof.

them, yet he that makes them for another that he knoweth will worship them, breaketh the second Commandment: therefore in this Commandment, the servant that worketh in his master's commandment, whom he knoweth to abuse his labour in this kind, breaketh this Commandment. Now by your Rule, the servant commanded to make an image, which he knoweth his master would abuse to worship it, ought to make it, because to make a likeness or image is only evil.

Thirdly, when you hold, that the Law of Nature is of those things only that are evil by their property and nature, this passage received shuffles out the second Commandment from being a Law of Nature, according to your exposition of a thing that hath in it native illissome: for to make an image (letting aside the circumstance) to bow to it, is no more evil, than for a servant to work, letting aside this circumstance (on the Sabbath.) This you give arguing favours of Popery, which hath shuffles out the second Commandment as a positive and ceremonial Law upon the same grounds.

And when you say, that the prohibition of other things is caused by their native illissome; if you mean, their illissome was before the Law (not understanding by Law, the promulgation thereof, but the Law of Nature written in the heart of man, and such as this Law is the express righteousness of God) it is a blasphemous Tenet, for hereby transgression shall be where there is no Law, and a chief evil, a sinnum medum, as well as a chief good, or an absolute goodness of God, which this illissome swerve from. For my part, I cannot tell how any thing should be evil natively, but evil, because it is defective of good, which is perfect good.

Thirdly, the Commandment is false in those free things.
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you say in moneys Ceremonials brought in by positive Law; and is not of the Law of Nature; first, to observe one day in seven; secondly, to observe a certain day of that number; thirdly, to observe the seventh in the weeks; fourthly, to observe a whole day by the revelation of the Saviour; fifthly, to observe it with greater exactness of restraining all works. This ye suff to prove, first, by a place of Scripture; secondly, by the example of the Patriarchs; and thirdly, by the assurance that else will follow.

This matter shall be more largely disquieted, because it will much clea the Doctrine of the Sabbath; for now you strike at the root of it, and would lay Religion on the ground: but your own staff will break your back, which you give by the handle into our hands. This you yield, that the secret instinct of nature hath taught all men, even the profane Gentiles, that some time is to be set apart, and dedicated to the solemn worship of God, as times to be spent in sacrifice and devotion. Now go on; this instinct is the Law written in their hearts; therefore the Sabbath is a Law of Nature. But did this instinct of Nature guide them to your former five particulars about the time of worship? If it is dand, that the sabbaths hereof are found among the Gentiles, you cannot, nor any other for you conclude (unless you will play the mad-man with reason) that every of them hath left than moralitie and perpetuain it. It is true, the Gentiles a thousand ways de- praved the use of the Sabbath, by keeping holyday to their idols, faith Artemision; they also wrested the name to a won- ton and ridiculous significion, in which notwithstanding there hath remained some footsteps of the ancient original, to which securing Gentes revere dehurman, or length the Gentiles, though late, ought to return. To omit their de- pravations, see in them the footsteps of every particular.

First, the Gentiles set apart certain and constant days not moveable and wandering.

Macrobiüs faith, there are four kinds of publick holy- days (Festus, that is, days vacant from pleasing and labour)

... respecting the morality thereof.

Labour, Sabbath, Consecration, Imperative, and Multitudes: and the Saturae are common to all the people on certaine and fast dayes, and moneths, and noted with standing observa- tions in their Calendars.

Secondly, they observed a certaine day of seven, and partic- ularly the seventh.

Hallowed, the seventh day is a holyday, Lampeusus, to the tenth of Alexander Severus, that on the seventh day, when he was in the City, he went up to the Capitol, and frequen- ted the Temple. Hallowed faith, the seventh day is holy, and was the day in which all things were perfected, and on which we depart from the banke of Hell.

Callum sanctus he is, and that is the day of rest; chief and perfect.

Clement Alexandrinus swereth, that not onely the Hebrewes, but the Greeks also knew the seventh day ho- lily. And Eusebius saithmeth, that all the wise Phi- losophers as Poets knew that the seventh day was most sanctified. And Plato the new faith, Who does not honour that sacred day, which returneth every weke.

The seventh day holydays were wont to be granted to children in Schooles among them.

Certaine of the Ethnicike Doctors were wont only to dis- puse on the Sabbath.

Seneca in his 97. Epistle saith that exceptions are not enough, but we must obliging precepts, yes, the de- crees of worldeone; sene recketh the Sabbath as the fislidall day for Religion; but commendeth their manner of observing it, when he faith; Let us forbid any one to light a candle on the Sabathist for neither doe the gods want light; and men themselves are not deligited with smoke; he worshippeth God who knoweth him. Macrobius swereth, that Saturnus (of whom is the name of Saturday) was honoured with Candles lighted at his Altar, and wax- Tapers offered on his days.

Artemius hath these words; The Greeks and Latines call the Sabbath, The day of rest, which the Gentiles called 96/97/98.
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But before I pass over this point, I would take off the exceptions of one Franciscom. Gemmarum (a German, who pleads, that these allegations for the seventh days celebrity observed among the Gentiles are insufficient, and the consequence thence drawn to prove this to have ought of the Law of Nature is infinite. The insufficiency of allegations out of the Poets he would evince from this, that those Poets, as the proverbs of Garthke, but we speak of Osiander, though Clemens Altorinius & Euclidius allege them, yet for this cause they deserve little credit, because they speak of the seventh, but the Poets only of a seventh. I answer, that they must needs write, and be of force to any that hath reason: for if they (speak not of that seventh from the Creation, yet) that they speak of the seventh of a seventh, make them wholly and sufficiently to prove, that they were guided to a seventh, and if they knew not the seventh through iniquity and vanity, that can no more disprove the celebrity of the seventh to be from the beginning and reach to all, than the falsings in many scriptures of the first, and second, and third, and other commandments, can disprove their ingrasing on the heart of man, as Laws of Nature; and on the other side, it proveth as sufficiently that this commandment is a Law of Nature (so far as is expressed in the Decalogue, as the relics of the other precepts in the hearts of Gentiles, prove them to be Laws of Nature, and therefore his exception in especial against that authority out of Hebrew, if it should be underflow of every seventh day, taking the calculation from the first day of the month, doth no way supplant our intended purpose. Well hath a learned Bishop of our Church observed, that sufficient is found in the heart of the Gentiles, to their condemnation, for breaking the Law of the fourth commandment, they knew that Nonumtuplerum eff Deo praemium, and it was numerus quisque; and hence they might have gathered, that God would have his rest that day; and the seventh day after birth they kept necqua, and the seventh day after death, the Funerall. Note also that...
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Against the Galatians, who faith, Neither is there any city of the Grecians, nor Barbarians, nor any Nation, so wondrously confined to the Sabbath, in which we rest, hath not come. A pregnant proof. But Gamaliel's faith, there are words foregoing which do end the controversy, namely, If a man be a sinner, the people doe now much emulate our piety. Which words, (as faith he) do only shew, that the observance of the Sabbath among the Gentiles, was only its imitation of the Jews by Professors, and perchance many others. What? Were all the Gentiles East and West, become Professors? or would all of them admit a mere ceremony? Some Nations besides Professors, admitted Circumcision: but did all the cities of Greeks and Barbarians admit thereof? And if they imitated their piety, could it bee thought that they imitated it as theirs, and not rather as that which their natural light glimmeringly guided them unto; especially seeing the Jews were naturally hated of all people.

For his quotation out of Theodoret upon the 20. chap. of Ezek., to seth to his text, who faith, That in the observance of the Sabbath, the Jews seem to obtain a certaine proper commonwealth, for no other Nation did observe this rest, and neither did Circumcision so distinguish them from others, as did the Sabbath. I answer: This cannot bee understood of any kind of observance of the Sabbath, for then Theodoret must speake directly against all received testimonies of antiquity: which (as may be thought) but of the true observance thereof in the solemn ritual worship of God, which being all publique and commonly used on that day, as the sanctification thereof, did so much more lively distinguish the Jews, Gods people, from the Heathen Idolaters, than did circumcision, as the whole Law doth more than any one part thereof.

This wee have made good the sufficiency of the quotations excepted against, wee leave them therefore with the rest fore-alleged to be cavilled at by the next that dares to attempt it.

The

respecting the morality thereof.

The instrumenste of the consequence (as faith Gamaliel) is this, that if the observance of the Sabbath had prevailed among the Gentiles, yet from thence no such antiquity of the Sabbath may be evinced, but only thence appeareth the imitation of the Jews by the Gentiles, as by Professors and others perhaps. I answer, the consequence is fine, for the former Heathen Authors have no reference to the Jews, and the Gentiles deriveth the Jewish Sabbath, Lament.117.

But suppose it came up among the Gentiles by imitation of the Jews, yet this spreading oft farre and wide, proveth the goodness of the consequence, that it is of the moral Law. For hence it sufficiently apparres, that the institution of a sabbath day in the weekes is immutable, and not ceremonially and temporally; not proper to the Jews only, but common to all, seeing nature apprehends it meet and necessary, that we often exercise the worship of God, and cannot but acknowledge (as we see in the inclination of the whole universe of men) that this weekly determination of a day is most convenient, and altogether advisable.

Hither of the answer to your position, determining what is ceremonial in the fourth commandment. Your proofe of the ceremony of it in those respects, is first, taken from Texts of Scripture in Exodus 20. 11. and Ezek. 20. 12. 13. Hence you reason thus; That since Sabbath was given to the Jews, as a speciall mark of their separation from Gentiles, and consecration to God; therefore it was necessarily ceremonial, and obliged not the Gentiles; which is had done, if it had beene a Law of Nature.

First, here your consequence is weakke and fallacious; for every mark of the difference from others, and consecration to God, is not ceremonial. Baptisme is such a mark betweene Perish and Heathens, yet no ceremony; in the Sacrament of the Lords supper, such was the Sabbath then, and is at this day.

Neither doth every mark of separation and sanctification, oblige only those that have that mark; for the duty and
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was no less necessary to men before the Law given, than after, and examples are not wanting of the Majesty of God himself, of Noah, and of the sinners before the Law, by whom the days were gathered into weeks, which sheweth, that the observation of the Sabbath was not unknown.

Lastly, you urge us with an absurditie that will follow on this doctrine, that if it be of Nature to keep the Sabbath, it bindeth us Christians to keep the seventh day Sabbath, and is the first changes of the day to the first day of the week finned grievously. This argument is of no consequence: for the first day of the week is now the Lords Sabbath, as the seventh day from the Creation was then. And thus neither Law of Nature broken, nor finne incurred; and therefore all absurditie avoided: the first day of the week is also the seventh, though not that seventh day.

This accommodation also of the fourth precept to the Jews in the determination of the day maketh not the commandment ceremonial, nor yet the change of it to our Lords day, on more than the fifth Commandment is made ceremonial by this promise, respecting Israel in Canaan, That the day may be long in the Land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. And this change in the application of the precept by the Apostle, that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest live long on earth.

It standing finne then, that the Commandment in every part thereof, as it is contained in the Decalogue, is moral, and of the Law of Nature, and the breach thereof a sin, your conclusion taketh place against you, namely, that the servant may not in any case work on the Sabbath as prohibited workers (because it is) at the commandment of any matter on earth: For it is better to obey God than man. To the Answer whereof I leave you, or others that in pride of spirit, and a spirit of contradiction desire to attempt in your behalf. All that followeth in this part of your Discourse, seeing it is but by way of Recapitulation, by the former Answers is found to be of no force.

CHAP.

respecting the morality thereof.

CHAP. 17.


But there is another objection, for the servants work upon the Sabbath in the Masters mean, that impelled it, is it not done to give content and furtherance to another man's service? But this servant doth when they execute their Masters commandments, and consequently it is nothing to yield, lawfully therefore it is no servile and subject such commandments. I answer, it is touching the point of contenting, that in such a work is both justified the Judge and the guilt, that in the work is well and the fictitious in it, of servants may content to it, as it is their masters work, not as it is their Masters mean, for except thee thing be inflicted upon, God himself can no more avoid the humiliation of the being the author, than power servents of being the ministers of them; for that God concurreth with a mean to every action whatsoever, as touching the substance of the action, is out of all question, being both all power wherein actions lie, are derived from him, and that no power can proceed into act without his patient assistance and operation, but yet to the point, the fact toucheth the moral nature, the unlawful work of the action (wherein the nature of man doth for me include) have concurreth with, but it wholly proceedeth from the infallibility of the consequence, whereby with the fulness of the soul are originally directed, the actions themselves shifting from the powers, and the fitness of the actions from the fulness of the powers, because because flowing from thence springs, it is not therefore every concurrence of the servants with the Masters to a sinful action, which causeth the same, and action of upon the servants as when he conteneth and considereth only to the action, not to the soul, namely, that and approves it, as his masters workers, yea, yea, yea to the same: namely, it being so as it is his masters transgressions, that is the work of the obligation of obedience, wherein (touching the right hand) to forego his Masters, and yet contribute to the same, as the least obligation wherein every one handeth toward the hurt of God, but yet to the point, the point of fulfilling the servant ought not for any delay of distraction of the an- nexion, service to refuse, and subject his masters commandment touching the work; for in obeying he is at most but the minister of another mans mean, and that as they lay upon, namely, as it is necessary to such a work, lest in refudging he is directly the author of his own mean, by withdrawing his obedience about bodily service from
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I say, for the matter doth not in any case in commanding his servant to work, but in working him, and so bringing his command into execution; which thing the servant knowing to be unlawful, must (that he may not partake therein) not only, not touch it with one of his fingers, but also persuade the contrary and freely refuse it. Again, he ought to attend on holy works, which directly will hinder that unlawful work, and to there is he bound as God's servant that day. Thirdly, by approving and doing these, he serveth really, by his work, and by his example.

Your second solution is found by this that hath been set down, to be vain and frivolous, the servant must refuse to do in any kind. And his refusal in this kind is not against the Law of nations as we have hitherto shewed, nor against the own covenant, for his covenant (though without limitations expressed) doth not exempt him from the service of his Prince and Country, the Prince may prefix him to the wars, much more from the service of his God, when his Lord and Saviour prefects him to his warres; as he doth in the day of assembling his army in holy beauty.

It is therefore wicked and injurious to God, man, nations, laws, and covenants, that you say, that the servant should be bound to his master in all bodily service, without any exception of the Sabbath more than other days. Your phrase of the Servant refusing, is your own; we teach the servant must refuse and not, all such works which God hath forbidden to be done that day; but not refuse, nor, he must acknowledge his master's authority, though not obey his unlawful command, and be so far from refusing, that he must suffer patiently the hard usage of an evil master, and endure stripes rather than offend God, in all, committing his sufferings to his judgment righteously.

And for the servants more full direction in this thing, one case of Confessio I would here briefly decide, which is this, what works may servants do on the Sabbath, and in what are they under their master's command and bound to obey them? Answ. To conceive hereof plainly: There are four sorts of works lawful on the Sabbath: First, works of holiness. Secondly, works of mercy. Thirdly, works that are in their nature servile, yet do directly respect the present worship of God; as our travels to the places of God's worship; for these works become now holy works, and are not only but God's works. Fourthly, works of common honesty, that is, works that make to the comely, decent and orderly performance of God's worship, and our carriage and behaviour therein. Such are the toiling of a bell for the calling of the Assembly, the reading and making of the prayers, the setting up of the tables, whereby provided that it be not vain, curious, or ask much time, but be thrust into the narrowest rooms that may be. The spreading of our Table, so that food be not taken up, and all things bee prepared before as much as may be, with the like.

By works of mercy, I mean, not only the necessary labours in the house of the sick, and of women in travail, and of beasts out of a pit, with the like; but also all those that are called works of necessity, which I rather call works of mercy, because they are therefore necessary, as they tend to the preservation of things, not from a fear or suspicion, but eminent and imminent and present danger; and the work is done in mercy, not in covetousness or other respect. Now of this sort are these works, labour in provision of convenient food, the sending of cattle, fight for defence of our country being a failure. Ruling of poxts on the affairs of the state in causes of present and imminent danger.

In all these the master hath power to command, and so hath the master over him that is under his charge, and the servant is bound to obey. The master may command him the works of mercy, and the works servile, that directly looke to the worship of God, or to give with him to the Seminary, though many miles off (if it cannot bee had nearer hand); and as the master may take his horse and ride thither, his servant going on foot, so may he command his
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his servant for this purpose to saddle his horse, as in 2 Kings. 4. 22, 23. The question of the Shunamites husband thefeeth, who to his wife defiring one of the Attels to bee made ready, and a servant to be sent her, that she might go to the man of God, faith on this wife, therefore with helpe to him to day, it is neither new moone nor Sabbath. It was then their custome to doe on the Sabbath and new moone. In like manner, the master may injoyne the servant such worke as tend to necessary provision of food, and tending of children in the family, &c.

Yet here againe some things seeme to fight with the sanctification of the day. First, if the master shal firmly stand upon his place and distance, for if the family-necessary in respect of young children should necessarily require the presence of some constantly at home, the master may not keep his servant hereby constantly from the publicke worship, but rather sometimes change turns with him. Much lefe may he defire such unnecessary superfluities as may cause absence from the Assemblies: for this is to feede thy carcasse on the lef blood of the foules of thy servants. Deale in all plainenesse of heart, and know howe haft to deal with God. The servant must be sure the worke is lawfull before he offer to withdraw his obedience, but thou shalt finde in that worke in which thy servant finnest not, because thou art bound to search more into the nature of thy necesseties.

Secondly, if the master see not his business in so wise and discreet an order, that without all unnecessary hindrances hee and all his household may finde the day and keep it holy.

Thirdly, if the master remember not that he is a God, and that both by communication of name and power, to provide for and see to the servants and his households reft, and therein respect that mercy which God would have shewen to servants, yes, to cattell on that day.

Ch. 18.

reflecting light workes.

Very one people remember, because every person that did any work on the Sabbath day, was by the law to be cut off from posterity, and so to die the death, every person therefore, the servant as well as the master. I answereth, that the judiciale commandement is to be understood of the same persons to whom the moral commandement was given; the commandement touching punishment of them, to whom the commandement touching the offence was imposed: but I proved before, that the moral commandement was not imposed to servants as servants, but to them that were at liberty. All they therefore that did any work on the Sabbath were to die the death by the judiciale law; they, I say, that did it, not they that were made to doe it; which were as well allowable as therein doing of it: namely, they that did it of necessity, as free, that might abide in freedom and safety, and would not, not they that did it in repining and necessitie, as servants that would abide in worke and might not; which condition was such that they would not work by themselves discretion, might be made to work by their masters compulsion, for a hard rule it were, if poore servants to whom no commandement to cease from worke was given by God, and yet might be compelled to worke by men, should dye for it, if they did not worke. It is therefore to understand of them that work willingly of themselves, or (as another) cease others to worke (as masters doe their servants) not of them who only (as master) and against their wills are fect to worke. And rather because the worke of the servant (that, I say, which he doth by the commandement of his master, to whom for matter of labour he is not free (and therefore) execution and equity will insewer the masters worke, and certainly that God accomoteth it, so the declaration of that Precept in another place doth make manifest. See Judges 12. 6. Here fore and that off, and saw ye, the Midianite, &c. may be referfed for it is not manifest that the servantes worke is accounted the masters, but the servantes reft from the masters worke in the reflecting of the servantes; the master therefore who by the moral law was commanded that his servantes should not worke on the Sabbath, was by the judiciale to be punished with death, if the servant did worke that day by his commandement.

Answer.
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Answer.

First, that place is to be understood of the presumptuous offender as appeareth in Numb. 15:2-36, with that in v. 34-35. The same that durst not appear before the Lord, and shall be cut off. For if the sin was of ignorance, iniquity and error, he was bound to bring a burnt offering, v. 27, 34, thus the lewes understand that place in Exodus. Now the servants worketh at the masters command will not come under a willful and presumptuous sin: yet that law saith this truth, that men for breach of Sabbath shall be punished according to the nature of their offense, so shall he that forgetteth God to doe his matters workes. This is the true Aniwere, you must be there, and therefore the force of the objection leath still upon you, and your Aniwere falls like an unfruitful fruit or rotten nut. And your hard cases (for they seeme full of piety, and yet would have a servant to be in the condition of a beast) are near conceits. And for that phrase of yours, saying, The servants may be compelled to work by men, speaking there of such workers as the fourth commandment hath forbidden, doth contradict your former Tenet expressely, who lay, that the master may not command his servant to work: may he not command him? and may he yet compell him? Good stuff! I promis you.

Secondly, in this place also you offer you to our thoughts Gods judicial Law, and do his judicary proceeding, I urge you with the just hand of Gods vengeance that lighteth oftentimes on children and servants working at the command of their parents and masters on that day. God punished none but they that offend lefle or more. But this ungodliness he hath punished from heaven. And all wise Christians will esteem more of one Demonstration of Gods wrath, than of two hundred sophificated.

Respecting light workes.

1559. A certaine covetous woman, who was so greedy of gaine, that she would not frequent the Church her selfe, nor suffer any of her family to doe it, but continually troubled about driving and pulling off fluxe, and doing every household businesse: neither would she be reclaimed by her neighbours, who admonished and dissuaded her from such unmeetable workes. One Sabbath day as they were thus busily occupied, fire seemed to issue out of the flame, without doing any hurt. The next Sabbath it tooke fire indeed, but was quickly extinct. Yet this wretch continued obstinate in her prophaneness even the third Sabbath, when the flux again took fire, could not be quashed till it burnt her and two of her children to death, for though they were recovered out of the flame alive, yet the next day they all three died: and that which was much to be wondered at, a young infant in the cradle was taken out of the midst of the flame without any hurt. God we fee, tooke vengeance on the children that wrought at the masters commandement. Are there not strange punishments for the workers of iniquity? Above fifty persons were consumed in the fire which burnt the town of Fawertone in Devonshire, in the yeere 1558, where 400. dwelling houes were all at one time on fire and consumed for their horribile prophanation of the Lords day. Can any think that of those fifty, none were children and servants, whose workes that day had been usuall abused?

Here also, Christian Reader, I thought it my part to lay before thy more serious consideration these notable and late examples of Gods wrath from heaven against mens ungodlinesse on the Sabbath day.
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Blacksmith by trade, (he is yet alive, the Lord give him an heart to repent, and all the Towne to leave by that hand of God) this woman was with her yong childe in her arnes within her owne gate looking on them: and it was that while she looked on, one of the geese ropes failed and broke, and the Pole fell downe upon the pale that parted their gate and the threee, and the upper end of it with theall, lapped over, and strucke the childe on the head in the mothers arnes, and killed it. It was the edge of the weathere-coche that hit the childe on the head, (make it well) and clept the skull, and it dyed the next day.

It is time for thee Lord to workes, for men have made void thy Lawe. Phil. 1:9.126.

The Lord is known by the judgement which he executeth: The wicked is feared in the works of his owne hands. Hagg. on. Selah. Phil. 9:16.

That place in Exo. 2:12, which commeth in on the left side is absolutely readed by you when you read, that thy son and thy maid may be refreshed, whereas it is thus in the text, the sonne of thine handmaid: and when you say, it is manifest that the servants worke is accounted the masters: seeing the rest from the masters worke is the refreshing of the servant, is it not also manifest that it is the servants, when the rest is his refreshing? For by another rest I am not refreshed, if I worke: and what if in some refreshes it may be called the masters worke, is it therefore no time in the servant to doe it? This is a begging of the question, and a shame in a professed Dissenter.

Chap. XIX.

Brethren. Pag. 32, 33, 34.

And thou hast proved my affections, namely that the commandement of the Saboeth was not given, nor to be given to the servants themselves, but to their governors, both by arguments of reason which is the rule of men, and autoritie of scriptures, which is the rule of Christ, and cannot finde any thing material in either of both that may be prove it be ye if I should admit (which I doubt you will never prove) that the commandement was directly given to servants themselves, as servants, and that they might lawfully dispose their matters touching those works whereby the precept of the Sabbath might bee transfiguraded: yet have I another exception against your doctrine; namely, for commanding every light workes (such as vizing of glasses, or fetching of wine from neighbour's houfe, or giving a boke or provender) there is the very iniquity which be the occasion, for transfiguration of God's commandement, forbidden on the Sabbath: no, it is not the commandement unprofitable, such thing, for it is not (as you) that is, every workes, but (as you) that is there forbidden, that is, every servile worke, for such worke (as you) properly dought import, and servile worke, by the interpretation of the old Divines is accounted either that which is attended with the toyle of the body, or a work intended and directed to serve and gain of victuals, with some care of the mind, such as mean ordinary work is wont to bee on common dayes. And that the worke there forbidden hath a special relation to the gain of victuals is the better apparent, because the same word (as you) signifies (as you) as well victuals as well worke: and not only where the commandement was pronounced (in the book of Exodus) but whereover it is repeated in the books of the law, which is oftentimes (and differently for other circumstances) the same word (as you) is ever retained and never changed; not every worke therefore absolutely, but every worke of such a kind, namely, consisting in toyle, and sending to gain, is restrained by the commandement, and is there not evident reason to understand it? For seeing the intent of the Precept is clearly (in the point of that dayes vocation) that the body should be refreshed by abstinence from labour; and (in the point of sanctification of it) the mind should be refreshed by attendance to spiritual exercises; it follows manifestly, that if there bee any worke that resolve not the body, and is hindered not the refreshing off, nor disable nor alienate the mind from the service of God, and meditation of godliness, that those worke are not forbidden, because occasion the vocation which the commandement importeth, nor that sanctification which it intendeth, is impeached by them.

Answer.
written by his owne hand at the time when these things were in agitation: the copyry being his first draught, and so very imperfect in many things, cannot be published as could be wished for the satisfaction of the Christian Reader. Therefore wee must be contented there and there to give thee a little taste: and first in this particular you have it this in his owne words. The word \( \text{Melachah} \) doth signify properly servile works, and is a choyce word of purpose used in this Commandement.

That the word signified servile works, I finde some Divines so saying: but that by servile works they meane only toil and toil without labour for man. To deal plainely with you, I see no cause why \( \text{Melachah} \) should have any such special weight in signification for thoug thy conceit of it is that it signified \\( \text{opos} \) as well as \\( \text{opos} \), might call from color to prejudice that it might meane works of gain, yet that it hold specially note works of toyle, there is no color. Nay methinks, \( \text{Magnificat} \) is of a larger signification, and fits for toyle, as signifying to works, \( \text{cum mergiis} \). Thus the wicked are workers of iniquity, and Nathanareu called \( \text{Magnificat} \). And all that worketh, and all that worketh in \( \text{Keser} \), called the name of \( \text{Works} \), because man bueth himselfe in getting them; and yet \( \text{Reuwwahl} \) more fit than them both, it signifieth \\( \text{opos} \) and \\( \text{opos} \) to the mercies, works and the reward of works; worker of hands, Psal.2.10. The works of the hasting, Iob.7.2.

It is likely that he that published this Treatise of Master Brewerwood, hath a perfect copie of a full answer. (For Master Brewerwood provoked spirit, as he tremeth himselfe, would not have beene allied, without a satisfactory answer.) Faire dealing would have required, it should have beene produced, and then I had saved this pains in auwelling! But then the Publisher had missed his aim, which was to traduce the Dead; who then being Dead, had yet spoken.

Surely, that this interpretation is orthodoxy, and yours novel and adulterous; see how Divines and the Churches of Christ have understood it.

Our Church of England declareth her mindes in the first part of the Homily of the place and time of Prayer; where the example of the man that gathered stubbes on the Sabbath day is allowed; and those that pranke, and pick, and paint, and point themselves to be glorious and gay, those that joyfully talk, are reckned a sort of transgredient works; worse than those that keepe Markets and Fairs that day.

Tertullian saith, \( \text{God forbade humane works, not} \), divine. Thou shalt do no works, what works? namely thine own: but to carry about the \( \text{Ark} \) (that is, about the wars of Jericho) can neither serve a daily worke, nor an humane, but a good and holy worke; and therefore by the very Commandement of God, divine.

Master Gresham, \( \text{thus} \) excellently, that recreation, as shooting and the like, at other times lawfully; and bankettting, and the exercisings for flete for refreshments, if it be not in reading, finging, and holy conference (for if they be flete, it is a time of praying, not of playing; and if they be well to play, are they not to doe these Heavenly and comfortable duties?) All these are unlawfull to be used that day; neither, faith he, is the Sabbath onely broken by prophaneness, but also by idle worke.

Moyer upon the Fourth Commandement saith, \( \text{We must} \) ret from worldly speche and thoughts: small works which come not within the compass of religion, mercy or necesse must not be done on the Sabbath, faith Master Dods on the Commandements: Peter, Rower, Wallouw and Thythus, Iob. 4.7. This is unusual and ingrateful in manner, that the whole minds be taken off from other cares on the Sabbath, and the whole day believed in the duties.

Non facit o-
The Doctrine of the Sabbath vindicated.

morally? or to see how the Jews put a difference between the one and the other? for you will need the ceremonial precepts in the body of the fourth Commandment. And why bring you in, the Instance of our blessed Saviour who was a Jew, and bound to the law as given to the Jewer, and kept the ceremonial as well as the moral law?

Secondly, Come, come, you are plunged, let me help you. In that our Saviour did allow and do many light and laboured works, in your Abraham phrase (for we take your words till we come to examine the matter further) and yet by voluntary dispensation was bound to all the law, it is clear, that no ceremonial law or clause of any law in the old testament forbade the works that these did on the Sabbath: and so your answer, that that command in Exod. 35:3. was a ceremonial, in a mere pharnese, you must file to some other reason: and you might have known it hath been alluded by divers to bee this, that the Lord there answered a particular case about working at the Tabernacle, and prohibits every work though never so light about the erection thereof for that day because it tended not immediately to the worship of God and thus now at this day it was requisite to build Churches on the Sabbath, or to kindle a fire to prepare or fix any workethereabout. So the precept, about the boiling and baking of the Manna gathered on the first day; that it might be left till the Sabbath to be then drest, was a precept that concerned that pietous time, while the Man which he made it in the field, that they might see the miraculous power of God, in the keeping of it without corrupting, till the next day; and because on the Sabbath they should not find it in the field.

Consider it well, if to kindle a fire to prepare things for the building of a Church be unlawful, which you tell hold to be a light work, and cannot but confesse to be no work of private gain; then certainly much more are all other light works forbidden, that fall not under the works afore-mentioned.

Thirdly, be his English Catechism explained, pg. 62.

Fourthly, thus we need not dispensation for our Saviour, but a pardon for your abuse of his blessed words and deeds. That all which you allege touching his being under the Law, cuts the throat of your solution to the objection; and gives us just cause to consider and conclude, that all that you, or any other Divine hath ever said for the Christians freedome on the Lords day, will bee found but the Jews freedome, which both they might have had, and had also by the Law of the fourth Commandment, had not their superstitious or superstitions teachers, wrung the Law and them; for he what Christ did on the Sabbath and allowed, and that behold those burdens of Jewish Superstition abandoned, and that (as some call it) of Christian Liberty, which yet are no other, than matter of Christ's due to the eternal and moral Law, delivered in the fourth Commandment.

First, you would have allowed a comfortable use of the Creatures, not only an use for mere necessity, God ever gave it on this day, for the Sabbath was a festival day;
The Doctrine of the Sabbath revived.

Fithly, you would that things that tend to decency might be done, without which the ordinances cannot be performed to order and edification. They ever might...;

Sixthly, it is not against Christian liberty to have the precise day appointed of God, it was against the liberty and glory of our nature in general. And tell me (I pray you) whether it make more to Christian liberty to observe a day by the continuation of the Church, or by institution of God, whose Spirit is perfect liberty: Yea, since it is full of God to power upon the Church on the Lords day the holy Ghost (which is the Spirit of liberty) certainly he never returns, but it interesteth that liberty with greater eacclisions daily.

That which some Divines have said, that the Sabbath in itself is to be kept, and as a day of holy sabbaths and is of itself apart and instrument of piety; interprét of the rest: I cannot see how it can be grounded on the Commandement, or any other Scripture: the Commandement is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy:" it was lastly said, and the rest is not. If any such thing were found to belong to that day, it was necessary, and if ought of type were in it to the Jews, it was not injoyned in the precept, but given as an appendix to it, and so istaken away by Christ, and no way bindeth to the util thereof.

CHAP. XXI.

Bremerwood. Pag. 26, 37.

Be it observed, that the commandment was immediately given to servants: Secondly, that it was given touching the highest degree of works. Let servants bee the persons, and those works the matter to whom, and of which the commandment was given, is a doctrine yet un Published hereby, or objected in any other respect. The persons have afforded me exceptibleness in this, because the commandment was not given to servants: And the matter because it was not to perform nothing that was work of works; the same also will, because it cannot be understood of the Lords day, for what day was it, of which the charge of vacation was to be daily given? Was it not the seventh day of the week? The seventh (with the precept is the Sabbath of the Lord) God. Is it this day? To works. And why the seventh? Because in five days the Lord finished all the works of creation, and rested the seventh day, there he was glorified the seventh day, and what day is it whereof we question? The Lords day? That's the fifth day of the week. It is therefore the seventh day of the week (the Sabbath of the Jews) not the first day of the week (the Sabbath of Christians) that was fixed by God commandment delivered to us. Therefore the works done on the Sabbath day are no confusions of Gods commandments, but your obje. will say, the old sabbath is abolished, and the celebration of it transferred to the first day of the week. Translated, by whom? By any sect commandments of God? Where is it? The holy Scriptures we know to be sufficient, it contains all the commandments of God, whether of things to be done, or to be avoided, or to be believed. Let me brese either one precept, one Word of God out of the old Testament that is should be translated; or one precept, or wind of the sense of God out of the new Testament, committing into be translated; I say, one word of any of his Apostles, intimating that Chris commandment was translated, is a prerogative that there is none. I there fore it is evident that the solemnity of the Lords day was not established in any other places. Not by any commandment of God, and consequently that to work on that day, is certainly no breach of any Divine commandment.
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The day of the week is the Sabbath; the commandment stands in vigor to them also for that day. Therefore he saith, Remember thou the Sabbath day, and keep it Sabbath; because the Lord made the world in six days, and rested on the seventh day, therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and holiness unto it. The same is the Sabbath day.

You proceed, and would prove this wicked assertion, That it is a breach of any Divine commandment, for a servant at the commandment of his master, to work upon Sabbath, which is the Lord's day, the first day of the week.

First, the commandment, say you, cannot be understood of the Lord's day. Why? In the next breath, the Lord's day is the Christian Sabbath. You must then yield, that the commandment is understood of it. You would bee thus understood; and take it very basely, that it should be understood of the Sabbath, of the Lord, of the Lord's day. Then, say you, the Lord's day is not the Sabbath; for the Sabbath is the commandment.

Secondly, is to your reasoning; for it is not a reason of religion.

What day was it of which the charge was so strictly given? Was it of the seventh day of the week? Say you: Yes. Indeed, of the seventh, as the precept was first applied to man. But ask again, Who is the seventh more than the first? And the Lord saith, Who is the Sabbath? the Lord himself, who is the Lord's Sabbath. What is the Sabbath? The Sabbath is holy unto the Lord: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested the seventh day, therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it. The seventh is the Sabbath, the commandment stands in vigor to them that observe it to the Christian, the seventh, even the first day.

touching the Lord's Day.

The day of the week is the Sabbath; the commandment stands in vigor to them also for that day. Therefore he saith, Remember thou the Sabbath day, and keep it Sabbath; because the Lord made the world in six days, and rested on the seventh day, therefore he blessed it, and made it holy. The seventh is the Sabbath day.

Therefore the commandment stands in vigor to them also for that day: therefore it is called the Sabbath, which is the Lord's day, the first day of the week.
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ed, looke in his worke, and finde undoubtedly the making and institution of the day to the world newe; the seventh day lay in the grave, here was no worke of bleeding and sanctifying; but the first day of the week very early he arose, and appeared to his Disciples; and unfolded the Scriptures, and opened their understandings to understand them.

The fourth commandment (as spoken all clearly) stands in force to us, and the Lord's resurrection, resting from the worke of our redemption, and rejoicing in it, is signified with that worke, with divers apparitions that very day, and signifying it with spending it among his Disciples in his presence body, now glorified, in heavenly expositions and operations upon their hearts, and in the returne of the day many times, and in especiall, upon the returne of it at Whitsuntide with the mission of the Holy Ghost. This day, appeareth, and determineth it to this day we now observe.

And as the Jews are wont to keepe the precise day in the Lords resting from the works of Creation, so we are fain to the rest, from the worke of redemption. The institution of this day is clearly in the very worke of the Resurrection, as the institution of the seventh day was in the worke of, signifying the Creation.

This hath been anciently taught, and still is spair'd in the writings of the godly learned. S. Augustine faith, The Lords Resurrection hath promised us an eternall day, and hath consecrated us to the Dominical day of the Lord. The day which is called the Lords day, it seemeth properly to pertaine to the Lord, because that day the Lords day against.

The same Father tells us, that in this resurrection of Christ, the Apostles and Apostolical men saw as much: he faith, the Lords day the Apostles and Apostolical men have ordained with religious solemnity to be kept, because in the references, S. de S. Sermon. 12. Domini, etc. etc. etc. that the day of the Resurrection is consecrated to the Lord.

Respecting the Lords Day.

S. Augustine gives this for the only Reafon binding every one to keep this day, saying: Let every one that loveth Christ, celebrate the Lords day, the day pertaining to the Resurrection, the Queen and Prince of all days. Athanasius calleth the Lords day in which Christ renewed the old Man, the beginning of the new Creature; and therefore, here faith, when he had renewed the Creature, which was made within five days, he would have this day consecrated to this resurrection, which the Spirit foretells in the Psalme, This is the day which the Lord hath made. Inaudius speaking of the time necessary to publick worships, faith, It is the eight day for ever, which the Church from the resurrection of Christ, hath called the Lords day, which Christ by his resurrection and deed hath dedicated to holy attendants, which the Apostles have observed, and have taught, that it is dedicated thereto, and which the Christian Church obedience to their words, and imitating their deeds, doth joyfully celebrate.

In the Preface to the Assembly of the Church of Scotland at Perth, Anna 1618, the question being moved, now the particular and material day may be knowne, that the Christian Church should observe: the answer is, that the particular day was demonstrated by our Saviour's Resurrection and his apparitions made thereon; by the Apostles' call and practice, and the perpetuall observance of the Church ever since that time, of the day which in Scripture is called the Lords day, as that which the Jews observed, was called the Lords Sabbath, because as the one was appointed by the Lord for a memoriall of his rest after the Creation, so the other was instituted by the Lord for a memorial of his Resurrection after the Redemption. For this we must hold that as a sure ground, whatever the Calvinists Church hath observed in all Ages, and is bound in Scripture expresslie to have been practiced by Christ and the Apostles, such as the sanctification of the Lords day, the same most certainly was instituted by the Lord to bee observed, and his practice in
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Word of the Lord, and of equal weight as if the Lord by voice from heaven had spoken; and more sure for us than such a voice, 1 Pet. 1:21, 22, and 2 Pet. 1:19, 20, 21. Whence it is clear, that the Gospell preached by the Apostles with the holy Ghost sent downe from heaven, is the Word of the Lord that endureth forever.

Secondly, it was enjoyed by the Apostles' first precepts, and observed by them who had the work of the day in part prescribed; 1 Cor. 16:1, observed A.D. 107.

Thirdly, the Apostle saith, that which you have seen and heard in me, that do, and the God of peace shall be with you, Phil. 4:9. But this was seen, and heard of; to be done by him, A.D. 107. Therefore do it. Perkins on Gal. 4:16, ver. 16.

Fourthly, if the same reason, grounded on God's Word, be as well for the first day of the week, as it was once for the Sabbath of the Jews, then we are as certainly tyed by the Lord to the observance of this day, as they were for their Sabbath: for the same reason is of the same force. But there is the same reason; therefore we are bound by the Lord. That there is the same reason, is apparent by those three places laid together, Exod. 20:10; Matt. 1:21, Luke 2:2. The maine reason of the lesser Sabbath is, because it was the Sabbath of the Lord. In like manner ours is the Sabbath of the Lord Christ, when hee had finishd the worke of our redemption: for which cause he taketh this name, the Son of man is even Lord of the Sabbath; as in more words he should say: when God the Father had once ended the making of the world, hee refolded, and published himselfe to be the Lord of that refolded creation; and dedicated it unto himselfe, giving it the name of the Sabbath of the Lord. In like manner, when I shall have finishd the worke of man's redemption, I will refold the day of my refold dedicating unto my selfe; for which cause, I say, that the Sonne of man is even Lord of the Sabbath also; it shall be called the Lords day. And when the will of the Father shall be fulfilled, which is that as they honoured the Father in keeping the Sabbath between the Creation and Redemption; so they

touching the Lords Day.

should honour the Sonne, in keeping the Sabbath between the redemption and consummation of the world.

Fifthly, the judgments of God fearfully and to miracles lighting on the contemners and prophaners of this day by worldlines, the opposition of godless and most evil men; the Conscience working on men, for the observation and against the neglect thereof; the errors of Familists, Anabaptists, Papists, and such loose pleaders, as you and others have heend themselves to be, are strong and impregnable arguements for the Divine Authority of it; together with the contradictions, and the grosse opinions you are forced to run into, which argue that you rebel against the light in you, and your prophan Atheistical hearts would have that true, which yet your owne light disproved, in the truth that are forced thereby to drop from you.

Sixthly, ye shall (through God's grace) receive this, that it is of the Lords own institution: for besides that his revelation institutes it, as I said before:

First, as called the Lords day. Rev. 1:10. Which cannot bee for any reason, but because it is of the Lords institution: for so, first, the phrase, his day, not by creation, for so all dates are hisnot by definitem, for that intendeth a time yet to come; and in the day of general judgment is his 1 Thess. 5:2, but by consecration, and choice and institution; a fourth why I would have defined, and then I shall bee ready to make answer. Secondly, the like phrases of Scripture prove it in the same case in Exod. 20:10, the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord; in other ordinances of Christ, the Lords Supper,

1 Cor. 10:16, the Table of the Lords, 1 Cor. 10:21, his ministration.
1 Tim. 1:12, Thirdly, the manner of predicating the same, that this day belongeth to him by his owne affixing properly; for as predicated of him denominatively, because it is said to bee of the Lord denominatively, the man Christ is not the Lord, but the Lord; but his will, hand, and power is directly called, the Lords will, the Lords hand, the Lords power: for that which is of, and belonging properly to the Lord, is called the Lords.

R a. Secondly,
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The first day of the week, faith Tychonius, is distinctly

to holy assemblies; and that not alone observed of the

Apostles, Acts. 20.17. 1 Cor. 16.1. But also it may bee

known to be instituted by Christ himselfe, whom the evan-

gelical History doth tell us to have come this day into


Polyander, River, Volatus, Tychius, affirm that this
day began to be named not only the day of the Lord, but
also denominatively the Lords day, Act. 1.10. To wit, not
only because the Lord rose thereon, and preferred him selfe
alive, but also because it was made holy and dedicated to
that thing, tho, wholly to the Lord, yes, and of the Lord to
sanctified and dedicated; like as also the Supper of the
Lord is called the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 11.20. and the place
of assemblies the Lords, and the solemn prayer The Lords
Prayer, 3 as vitally Agnus Dei declarad in his fifteenth
Session of the words of the Apostle. But this were of Aposto-
like Instituable, it were also of Divine authentique.

Bishop Andrewes faith, 1 the Lords day hath testimony
in Scripture; for how came it to be the Lords day? But
that, as it is in the Blasphemy, he made it, and why
made he it? but because on the fourt day, that is
Christ was made in the flesh, one of the corner; and
that is, because the Lord rose, because his resurrection fell on
that day. Who altered it? I answer, (faith Master Atterstof) 2
Christ himselfe is the Author of this change; the Apop-
les oftentimes, that whatsoever they taught, they receiv-
ed it from Christ; they learned it at his hands before.

Emblem 1.1. God did change the dayes, and to

touch the Lords Day.

new

new

nothing the alteration, the Apostles gave this day the name of
the Lords day, they themselves kept it and ordained that
the Churches in their time should observe it.

Our renowned Champion Doctor Fuller, in the conflu-
tion of the Reformers faith, 3 To change the Lords day
and keep it upon Monday, Tuesday, or any other day,
the Church hath no authority; for it is not a matter of
indulgence, but a necessary prescription of Christ himselfe
delivered to us by his Apostles.

Christ did appoint the new Sabbath, faith Wolphius,
when our last enemy death being overcome, he made
an end of the labours of our Redemption, which in his hu-
manitie were to be borne, and the next day with the new
man reformed, he brought out a new time, the time of our
Redemption, and of the new Covenant.

Add to hereunto Doctore Brown of the booke of the Sab-
theth the Council and learned Divine, Doctor Tyler and Doctor June, in two latine epistles
prefixed.

To conclude this matter, the Apostles made this day
the Lords day, by a declaratorie consecration, which Christ
himselfe made before the Lords day, by a fundamentall
and binding relation, to wit, His resurrection thereto;
and by blessed and actual application to his use in his
apparitions and expostitions thereto, and by institution in
his decrees and words, for the Apostles taught to doe but

CHAP. XXII.


But when the first day of the week came, they went
unto the tomb, 2 after the Sabbath, very early in the
morn; and came bring to spy the sepulchre, 3 and the
stone that was before the sepulchre, 4 saying, the body
is not. 5 Master Atterstof, on Numbers, ref. 31. 4001. 6 On the
fourth Commandment. 68.186.
Secondly, but you go about to prove the Jews Sabbath ceremonial, because first, it was a signe of difference betweene Jews and Gentiles, and part of the partition wall. The first part of this proofe was answered before; it was a signe betweene God and them, that the Lord sanctified them; so the Sanctification of the Sabbath (understand it of ours) is still a signe that God sanctifieth a man, every signe is not a ceremonial, as every living creature is not a man. The Sabbath was a signe of the creation, faith Abraham, yet not therefore a ceremonial.

The second part of your proofe implied, when you say it was a part of the partition wall, is very unsound: the partition wall spoken of in Ephesians 2:14, was the Law of Commandments contained in ordinances spoken of in the next verse, which was not the Law moral, but the ceremonial; therefore you must prove first the Sabbath to be ceremonial, and then wee yield it is taken away, and so fare forth as you can make that good.

Thirdly, againe to prove it ceremonial, you allege the place in Colossians 2:16 but that the Apostle speaketh not there of the fourth Commandment is evident. First, because hee reasoneth expressly of those Sabbathes which were of the same mode with the New-Moones, and were ceremonial shadows of things to come in Christ; but the Sabbath prescribed in the Decalogue, is altogether of another nature, as hath beene, and shall be further thew'd. Secondly, he speaketh at the Apostles doth to the Galatians, chap. 4:10 but the place there teaches only the observance of the days, months, and yeeres, which pertained to the servitude and bondage of weak and beggarly rudiments; as in verse 9. appeareth. Now that any precepts of the Decalogue should bee so accounted and reckoned as a weak and beggarly rudiment, was farre from the Apostle to think, and is abhorred to Christian ease and religion.

Whatsoever also was Ceremonial in the Sabbath (if be granted according to the opinion of many Divines, that some ceremony was in the day) in respect of that precise day,
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The doctrine of the Sabbath as it was originally intended, was never intended to be a day of mere ceremonial observance, but was intended to be a day of rest and refreshment, a day of religious worship and spiritual growth. This is evident from the commandments of God, which clearly state that the Sabbath is a day for the worship of God, for the rest and refreshment of the soul, and for the observance of the laws of God.

In the New Testament, the Sabbath is cited as an example of how to observe God's commandments. The apostles taught that the Sabbath is a day of rest and refreshment, and that it is a day for the practice of God's laws.

Respecting the Lords Day.

The Lords Day is the day of rest and refreshment, which is observed by the church as a day of worship and spiritual growth. It is a day for the expression of gratitude to God for His mercies, and for the observance of God's commandments.

The Lords Day is observed by the church as a day of rest and refreshment, as well as a day of worship and spiritual growth. It is a day for the expression of gratitude to God for His mercies, and for the observance of God's commandments.
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By this also it will follow, that the Papists that in their Churches render the fourth Commandment unto this, keep holy the festival days, do render the full slate of it. Which being yeilded this also will follow, that you may swel, put it downe thus, frequent the assemblies.

Moreover, all the fast days of the Jews conteined this generall equity. Lastly, then God fould in this command nothing to particular men, because it lieth on their power to inuincible those days, and to nothing, unlawful commanded to them further, than what publike persons shall injoyne, be it but one day in the yeare: and for them neither is there any thing commanded in special, and they finde not if they appoint but one day in a Moore, or if they appoint but one in a quarter, then all the feast of Christes Nativity, of Easter of Whit, Easter, are of equal authority with the Lords day, which thing, what cares can he have with patience? These also are constitutions of the ancient primitive Church.

CHAP. XXV.

Brevetwood. Pag. 39, 40, 41.

But what of that? What if the consecration of the Sabbath was by the Church translated to the first day of the week? Was therefore the commandement of God transferred also? That that day ought to be observed under the same obligation with the Sabbath? For if the Commandement of God were not translated by the Church, together with the celebration from the seventh day to the first day, then is working on the first no violation of God's Commandement. Was the Commandement of God then translated from the Sabbath to the Lords day by the decree of the Church? No; the Church did not, let me see the authority: the Church could not translate the Commandement to the first day, which God himself had namely limited to the seventh. For could the Church make that Gods Commandement which was not his commandement? Gods Commandement, was to rest on the seventh day, and work on the first; therefore to
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touching the Lords Day.

But on the first, and work on the seventh, was not his Commandement? For doth the same Commandement of God enjoy both Labour and Rest on the same day? Is there rest and life in the same Commandement of God? Is it that work on the first day fail that, and work on the seventh gain this? Can the Church make the same Commandement? But by the Church hath this incredible and unaccountable power: say it is forbid to work on the first day, by the sense of the very same precept, That doth neither express command or licentce to work on that day. Say that the Church of God may translate the Commandement of God from one day to another at their pleasure, did it tharefore? I spake before of their authority whether they might doe it. I enquire now of the all, whether they did, did the Church (I say) ever determine, that the same obligation of Gods Commandement which lay on the Lords day, for keeping of the Sabbath day should be transferred and laid upon the Christian, for keeping of the Lords day? Did the Church slie, say so, they did it not, all the writ and learning in the World will not prove it.

Answer.

First, this reasoning is on false grounds supposed (as hath beene proved) and therefore fals to the ground.

Secondly, yet take their own grounds.

If the Church have power to translate the day and consecrate it a Sabbath, they may have power, and had so, to translate the Commandement: for the Commandement is but the consecration of the Sabbath, and determination thereof to a certain day.

And if they do not translate the Commandement, yet the Commandement stands in force for that day to which by just power they have translated the Sabbath. For the Commandement is in force as a law of nature; you conforme, for the celebration of a Sabbath, or else you deny a moralitie in any part of that Commandement, but if that your moralitie (and, without doubt it doth) then is working on that day equally a violation of the Commandement of God; as working on the seventh, from the creation, for then it was inuoluntary, because that day was then Sabbath; and now it is so because this is now Sabbath.

Thirdly,
236 The Doctrine of the Sabbath vindicated.

Thirdly, and for those quarters, let me see the Act. Let me see the Authority, as they may be returned to your conceit of their translating the seventh day, and consecrating it a Sabbath, so in the true sense of consecrating that day, you have seen before the Act and Authority, and may now see (if you will see) that the Commandment is not translated but remains the same it was, namely, to keep holy the Sabbath day. Neither is there a making of that God's Commandment which was not his, nor yet doth the commandment contain any impossibilities and contradictions. Distinguishing times, and the days, and the Sabbath, the Commandment doth make the Sabbath and holy as the other, and the commandment is not translated. If you, so as it is the Sabbath and holy, you will answer that it (the seventh day) is the Sabbath day now the Seventh day, and of both it is true. The seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Then the seventh day was it, and so enjoyed thereon; Now the first day of the week, and so enjoyed thereon. Hence this reasoning is easily answered. First, God commanded to work on the first and rest on the seventh, therefore to rest on the first, and work on the seventh was not his Commandment. It was not then, it is now, moreover, one day from other weeks, doth not point out, which five days, and the seventh day will contain both ours and theirs: and their seventh they knew then by the word of Creation as our seventh we know by the word of Redemption.

For the authority and Act of the Church we need it not, the Scripture as before, hath fared the labour. But that the Act of this power was put forth, the Church hath acknowledged and your felo doce while you yield, the first day consecrated Sabbath.

CHAP. XXVI.

触承的法令日。

By you may object, if the old sabbath sanctified and the commandment of God was limited and fixed to that day only, then is one of God's commandements perpetually, and I affirm that the general day of the commandment to keep a sabbath wherein God might be honoured, was not in all the speciality of it, it is a law of nature, and remains true. But as the speciality of that commandment implyeth plain contradiction, with the supernatural of the Lord's day, in the generality of it can enforce nothing for it, for those are unfixed commandments (indeed plain allegations of the commanded) that God hath sometime commanded vacancy for his honour, therefore he hath commanded the first day of the week to be that time, or this, God hath commanded us some time to rest, therefore that time we must precisely observe from all manner of works: can the Church make their good definitions? If he cannot, the celebration of the Lord's day can with no enforcement of reason be deduced out of the morality of God's commandments. But if you will reply, that the Church hath established the first day of the week to be the Christians sabbath, yet by way of consequence, as deducing it as a commandment, but merely by authority, appropriating and keeping God's moral commandments to it; you may say your pleasure, but I shall neither believe, nor you prove that such authority belongs to the Church; or that such an Act hath been established in the Church: which I am sure you can never do, neither of both; for seeing that all Divines acknowledge, that the flogging out of such a day to be sanctified, namely, the seventh rather than any other, was merely ceremonial, although it was God's own designation. I hope that you will confine the special designation of the first day of the week to that honour, before other days, being made only by the Church, to be also but ceremonial. But certain it is, that no ceremonies which come not under the obligation of God's moral law, should oblige to the observance of ceremonies. Therefore it will never confine with reason, that the moral law of God can by any authority of the Church oblige Christians to the celebration of the Lords day.
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It is not therefore the translation of the old commandment of God from the one day to the other (which yet if it were translated, can oblige servants no otherwise than it did under the old law) but the institution of a new commandment, of the Church her self (yet guided by the spirit of God) that conferred that day to the holy service of God.

Answr.

First, this objection we own, and for your diuision thus disprove it. Your granted Generality is commanded in the commandments fore-going, in which God that commands a worships, commands all time for it, as when he created the world, time was consecrated of necessity. Besides, this value concre was before blown up. Therefore if all your name and put into the sanctity of the Commandments be merely ceremonial, we have no fourth Commandmen distinct from the former.

Secondly, for your sanctity which you say is all merely ceremonial, we proved before that the light of nature would prove the contrary, and now we affirme every particular with the word of the spirit, that the sabbath of it may be wound up, and in the wedding of the same put our hands on the hands of the Lords Worshippers, to fetch the blowses with more force.

First, that one day of seven, and particularly the seventh, is not ceremonial, is evident by the commandment, which delivered with God one month in the mount, and charged by way of command, is no other then moral and indispensible. And by the celebration of the Christian Sabbath in the New Testament, which was on the seventh day, i.e. the first day of the weeke, and was contyned in weekly repetition celebrated. Catech. faith. God spares one day every week, from the rest, and will that it be free from all earthly busi- 

neffe and care. In this respect the necessity of the Sabbath is common to us with the ancient people, that one day were to be free, and for the better prepared as well to learn, as to sticke our faith to: Peter Martyr: Genes. 2. and Matt. Per- 

nons on Gal 4. 10. and inference many more. The Apostles knew and that by the Scriptures, faith learned. Fulks, that 
one day of seven was appointed to bee observed for ever, dur- 
ing the world, consecrated to the publick exercises of God's true Religion. The Church of Scotland faith, that the 
day commanded in the Law, formally still remaines 
and ever bee the seventh, after five dayes works. 

Chrysostom: (who wish the Lutherans, ascribed too much in this thing to the Churchers liberty) yet 
affirmeth truly thus much: This is that which is said usually 
and truly, that the New Testament in the commandment 
keeping holy the Sabbath day absolve not the 
generall, which is moral, but the speec, the special: that is, hath not taken away the generall, which is the Se- 
venth day, for this is natural: but the special or parti- 
cular, namely, that seventh day which the Jews kept in re- 
membrance of the first Creation. Alexander the third Pope 
of Rome, affirmeth that the page as well of the old as the 
new Testament hath specially deputed the seventh day to 
human use; that is (by the interpretation of Zuvrez) both 
Testaments have approved the manner of deputing every 
seventh day of the weeke to humane use: which is to de- 
pute the seventh day formally, although the same day ma-

terially hath not always been deputed: and by this means 
it is true, that every day in the old law was Sabbath, 
but in the Newtest Lordes day is Sabbath. M. Tertullian on the 
number of Manual or 

Numbers 15. 35. p. 65. is well observed, that if one day in 
seven be not moral and perpetuall, a man may say that one day in seven weeks or seven yeeres is enough, and so at certeriter non- 
length it shall be said, we are not bound to meet together 
den die jubiti 

tiis deue, but in 

divatis dieis. De stris cap. liter.

Gnem.
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Gomarus, a that holds the contrary opinion, thinketh he hath evaded, by these words, what he holdeth that not only certain days but also sufficient days be observed for God's worship. But this is still nothing, for are not one day in a year yearely certaine days, and so of the rest? and if some shall say they are enough, though others speak against it, who shall tell which of these two sides holds with the truth, when what is enough (you hold) God hath not particularly determined; yes, but Gomarist, that what days are sufficient may be gathered out of the precepts of the Sabbath, namely that they be either not more seldom, or else a little more often, than the Sabbaths of the Israelites, as the indulgence of God in giving that precept, feste. For when the Lord for his Clemency sake, took one of seven only to his worship for the Israelites, men of a Hufe-necke and prefuced with the heavy yoke of fasting and other ceremonies; how shall more seldom suffice among Christians, that are free from that yoke and burdens? Very good! Can any looke on this without griefe and laughter. If out of the precepts you must gather your sufficient days, why will you not take the days God hath in precept warranted for sufficient and sufficiently blessed; one of seven, the leaven. If this your sufficiency must be gathered from the precepts, and that too as you gather that they be more to us than were to Jews, then are we to have two Sabbaths a week at the least, and the Church ered this Anathematised, the keepers of Saturday in the time of the Gospel, and till ereth that never law this yet, much less observed it. Or if you say, no they must not be Sabbaths, how then gathe you this sufficienty of the days out of the fourth Commandement which concerneth the Sabbath and not hale holidays, and other fastes & if the Jews were yoke'd with observation of fastes, & therefore Gods Clemency would they should keep but the seventh day? What an insupportable yoke do you lay upon Christians, that must, as you say, keep more than one of seven, or else they keep not a sufficient number? all the Jews or Christians would hardly stic to the number that two in a week constantly do amount to; and what inter-}


touching the Lord's Day.

two in a week constantly do amount to; and what inter-

fearing is here? One of the seven days of the week in per-

petual revolution is not necessarily to be observed by force

of the fourth Commandement. And yet fewer than one a

week cannot be sufficient, and that by virtue of the fourth

Commandement. What? would you have more than one

a week by virtue of the Commandement, and therefore

you say, one is not necessary? Or is that which is only

sufficient, not necessary? Why then take that which is in-

sufficient, and let that be yet necessary, even one when you

will, and more when you will, now this day, now that, you

may do them all a favoure to take them over by turns. This

sare for Gomarist in this thing.

Secondly, this one whole day be kept holy, and so lefe is

more, and not ceremonially, yet ye side that the command-

ment for a Sabbath is moral; now God never mentioned

lefe; than a day, saying, Remember thou keepe holy the Sab-

bath day, the diuinion also of time by the Lord of sime

cleareth this, for the whole weeks is divided into seven days,

and every of thse days consisteth of 24. hours. David,

in his Psalm for the Sabbath day, describeth the time thus:

It is good to glory forth thy loving kindness in the morning,

and thy faithfulnesse every night (meaning every Sabbath day,

morning and night) as the title feste. The apparition of

our Saviour at the night of the day of his Resurrection in the

midst of the Doules assembled, proved, that the night

following the day of Sabbath (take here day for the day,

light betweene sunne and lune) is of the Sabbaths; lastly,

the celebration of the Lords day by Paul at Troas in

Ad 20. 7, out of which, with Mr. Perkins, I note two

things: First, that the night mentioned there, was a part of

the seventh day of Paul's absence at Troas; for, if it were not,

no then he had it at least a night longer, and so more

than seven days, because he should have thirs part of anoth-

er day. Secondly, that this night was part of the Sabbath

which they then kept. For the Apostles keepe it in manner

of a Sabbath, in the exercises of piety and divine worship,
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Answer.

This also suffereth just exception, both in it selfe, and in reference to the matter in hand: it bindeth you yeeld 3. because Gods command bindeth to obey the Churches just constitutiones. Consider, it is Gods Command that bindeth, and not the Churches, but as it is Gods. Now Gods Command bindeth equally: and so doth Christ, and the Apostles (as much as he faith, He that doth yeeld you, doth yeeld me:) alike sinfull: or what if it bindeth not equally? (to take your owne words:) if it bindeth enough to make the transgresser a sinner before God? For this was never questioned, whether the Master or Servant were the greater sinner, in the working on the Sabbath. Against, it bindeth equally, by your owne doctrine, because you say in pag.43.lib.1. it is of the Church: guided by the Spirit of God, unless you will say that the doctrine of the New Testament, preached and written by men with the Holy Ghost from Heaven, is of lese binding power than the Ten Commandments delivered on Mount Sinai; which runneth against, not only all Christian religion, but all those Texts in especiall. Heb. 2. 2. 3. 12.

触手，"The Doctrine of the Sabbath reindicated,"
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The words of the constitution to attend their sowing of grains, setting of vines, and other husbandry on the Lords day, if those works had been forbidden by the commandment of God, or decree of the Apostles, and first Church. Or would the Fathers in the council of Laodicea (one of the most ancient and approved councils of the Church) abolish the vacancy of the Lords day with this condition? And if so, can it be certain in Created, that if they be constrained by their duties to work, would they lay have added such a condition, had it been fully unlawful, for all sorts of people by the ancient sanctification of the first Church to do any works that day? It appeareth therefore that there were no such universal constitution of the Church. The actual forbidding of all works by some Christians that days (and none: nor on the exhortations of some ancient Fathers to that purpose, some remembrances of both are to be found I know, but these are particular examples, and perfections; constitutions of the Church they are not, edicts of synods, Councils like the, decrees of some provincial councils are extant: I confess in record to the same effect, and they are constitutions indeed, but partly none of the Church, partly not universal, not very ancient, and therefore are no foundations to oblige the whole Church, which be the law of God, and decree of the Apostles (to whom the government of the whole Church by our Saviour was committed) and the canons of the universal Synods, no positive constitution can doe.

Answer.

Having made it evident that the Commandment of God stands in force for our Sabbath, I might easily cast off all that you shall say to the end of your discourse: But to clear and found the cost, and make it appear that what you say is nothing, and all maketh for us, who in this thing hold the Truth, we proceed.

You say, you finde nothing for the general refraint of works on the Lords day in any history, canon monument, and register of Antiquities, but clear evidence to the contrary.

First, for the first, let the places you allege speake out that all may hear them, and not be blindly haddled up.
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concerning the accustomed reading of the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, in their publick assemblies on the Lords day, of which hee faith thus: We have forent (or passed through to the end of it) the Lords day to day, an Holy day. Now to spend the Lords day throughout, an holy day, is not to spend any of it in servile works: let Scripture, Heathen writers, and all men testify: this was done faith that Bishop ¥ 4100. After their ancient custom: Jutinh Martyr, after he hath recorded all the duties of their publick assemblies, addeth this, (having spoken in the precedent words of the administration of the Lords Supper) But we after these things for the remainder of the time do ever remember one another of these things, and those of us which have any thing, helps every one that wants, and are always together one with another. A little after he faith, that the assemblies on that day were frequent all in use and custom, prayer, preaching, and the Sacrament was administered. Collections for the poor, which was after the assemblies, distributed to the needy, imprisoned, strangers, with the like, whom they visited.

Tertullian, in his 16, chapter of his Apologie against the Gentiles, gives this a some cause of their conjure, that Christians worshipped the Sunne, because they kept the Sunday Holy. Wee give our selves to joy (faith hee) the Sunday, for another fine wide season than in honour of the Sunne are we in the second place from them which appoint Saturday, to idleness and feeding themselves, also wandering from the Jewish sabbath, which they know not. What meaneth he hereby, but that such a solemnity is kept and ought to bee by Christians, as should exceed in that kind the feasts of the nations and Heathen, as in his booke of Idolatry, chap. 14, he speaketh.

Ignatius speaketh enough to any man not prepossessed, for he faith, let every lover of Christ celebrate the Lords day as festival, iowth the Greek word signifieth a solemn feasting free from works and wroking day labour, That others also of the ancients did understand this celebration

touching the Lords Day.

For when to be with exact vacanct is evident.

Saint Austin faith, come ye to the Church every Lords day, for if the unhappy Jewes doe celebrate the Sabbath with such devotion, that in it no earthly works were done, how much more ought Christians to bee vacants to God alone on the Lords day, and come together for the Salvation of their souls?

Againe, Apostles and Apostolike men have therefore ordained that the Lords day be kept with religious solemnity, because in it our Redeemer rose from the dead: and which is therefore called the Lords day, that in it, abstaining from earthly affaires and the entertainments of the world, we may serve only in divine worship.

That of Saint Clement is also worthy note, neither on the Lords dayes, which are dayes of joyfulness, doe we grant any thing may be said or done, besides holiness.

Austin also in the first booke de Civitate Dei chap. 11, speaking of Senecas's fasting at the Jewes Sabbath, that they left the seventh part of their time in vacant, addeth this; Notwithstanding he durst not speak of the Christians, even them must converse to the Jews, on either part, lest either hare should prove them against the old customs of his owne Country, or reproce them perhaps against his owne will.

Saint Austin likewise reproves their telling of tales, their fancies, playing at dice, and such unprofitable sport, as if one part of the day were set apart for duties to God, and the reft of the day together with the night to their owne pleasures: In the same place also he condemns walking about the fields and woods, when they shouldest eat Divine Service with clamour and laughter, and faith the day must be considered, and solemn, & no com niggard; from country worke and all businesse, that wee may give our selves wholly to the worship of God.

Saint Chrysostome speaking of the festivity of the Lords day for almes, faith, it is a convenient time to practife liberality, with a ready and willing minde; not only in
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this regard, but also because it hath rest, remission, freedom, and vacation from labour.

Saint Ambrose approving the people's neglect of Church on the Lords day, faith. Whatever brother is not present at the Lords Sacraments, of necessity he is with God a forsoaker of the Divine Truth. For how can he excuse himself, who preparing his dinner at home on the day of the Sacraments, contemneth that heavenly Banquet, and taking care of the belly, neglegetheth the phyfiche of his soule?

The same Father in another place saith: Let us all the day bee conversation in prayer or reading; bee that cannot reade, let him ask of some holy man, that he may bee fed with his conference; let no secular acts hinder divine acts; let no Table-play carry away the mind; let no pleasure of Dogs call away the fancies; let no dispaire of a boisterous mind with covecousness. True, this Father in this place speaketh of a Faith, but we know that a Faith and Sabbath are alike for the point of rest.

The same Hierom alio: On the Lords day, faith he, they only give themselves to prayer and reading.

Secondly, now for your contrary evidences, what if they also make for us? You allege a constitutions of Constantine, large:

First the same Emperours Constitutions found in Ecclesiastical Writers. Eusebivs in his life faith:

Wherefore he ordained, that all that obeyed the Roman Empire, should rest from all labour on the day that are called from our Saviours Name. Further, five faith of this Christian Emperor:

He taught all his ffre to honour this day diligently; those that pompt of the Divine Faith, have given them pleasure to frequent the Assemblies, that no impediment should hinder their attendance on prayer, but others that had no power of Divine Doctrine, have given charge of them by another Law, that they should get into the openfields of the Suburbs on the Lords day, and that there altogether should use the same forms of prayer to God, when a figure was given of some one of them:

Reflecting the Lords Day.

them: for, said he, we ought not to touch fire, and place the hope of our offences in weapons, and bodily strength.

Saint John by his tripartite history testifieth thus: That day which is called the Lords day, which the Hebrews called the first day, which the Greeks attribute to the Sunne, and which is before the seventh day, he ordained that all should cease from labour and other businesse, and should truly bee occupied in prayer upon it.

Behold Constantine against Constantine. Secondly, your Constitution is read, Cod. I. tit. 3. p. 54.

This Constitution was reversed by Leo the 12th Emperor, and another made in their woods:

We ordaine according to the true meaning of the holy Ghost, and of the Apostles thereby directed, that on the sacred day wherein our integrity was restored, all day rest and joyous labour; that neither husbandman, nor other on that day put their hands to forbidden works: for if the Jews did so much reverence their Sabbath, which was but a shadow of ours, are we not more iniquitous and reproachful to our king, our Lord, who is our Lord and our Redeemer? That day which the Lord himself hath honoured, and which he therein delivered us both from dishonour and from death? Are we not bound to keep it singular and inviolable, well contenting our selves with the shaddow of the real, and not incroaching upon that which God hath chosen to his honour? What is it not unchristian neglect of Religion to make that every day common, and to think we may do with it as we wish?

The title of this Constitution is this:

Yet this may be said for that renowned Emperor, he gave that as a necessary Law, which proves nothing, unless it bee the hardness of mens hearts. So Moses permitted men to put away their wives, and Aaron agreed to it, and

X yet
yet none can reason thereon that they were not of Christ's mind in that matter. Say the same for
Communion.

The Council of Laodicea is subsumed by you in your Allegation thereof, for the Canons of that Council according to the Greek is this:

"Whosoever worketh on the Sabbath, or other days as to be observed by the Church, shall be accursed, so let him be Anathema, and his Sacrifice, and the Sacrifice of the Lord, and his Substance, and we may say, and his God, and the Lord, and the Holy Ghost."

The Annocation upon it is this, read it.

Of this Original I find three Latin Translations. The first: Quod non operetur Christianus, &c. He that shall not work on the Sabbath, and any other day as to be observed by the Church, shall be accursed, and his sacrifice, and the sacrifice of the Lord, and his substance, and we may say, and his God, and the Lord, and the Holy Ghost. (In English: That Chriftians ought not to Judaize, and to rest on the Sabbath, but to work on that day, and to obey the Lords day in reverence (if they will be vastus) as Chriftians doe this thing: but if they bee found to Judaize, let them be Anathema from Christ.)

The second: Non operetur Chriftianus, &c. He that shall not work on the Sabbath, and any other day as to be observed by the Church, shall be accursed, and his sacrifice, and the sacrifice of the Lord, and his substance, and we may say, and his God, and the Lord, and the Holy Ghost. (In English: That Chriftians ought not to Judaize, and to forfeet labour on the Sabbath, but to work on that day, and to prefer the Lords day before that day: if this please them, they may be vastus as Chriftians, but if they be found to Judaize, let him be Anathema.)

The third: Quod non operetur Chriftianus, &c. He that shall not work on the Sabbath, and any other day as to be observed by the Church, shall be accursed, and his sacrifice, and the sacrifice of the Lord, and his substance, and we may say, and his God, and the Lord, and the Holy Ghost. (In English: That Chriftians ought not to Judaize, and to rest on the Sabbath, but to work on that day: but preferring the Lords day, they ought to rest as Chriftians, if so be they can, and if they bee found as Judaizing, let them be Anathema with Christ.)

Here note three things: First, that the Sabbath here spoken of, is Saturday, which was the Jews Sabbath. Secondly, that the left is by all acknowledged for the worst translation: indeed they are all rather paraphrases and glosses than translations. Thirdly, the two first plainly carry this sense: that provided they prefer the Lords day in honour and revere above the Jewish Sabbath, and that they do not Judaize: if this please them, they may rest the Saturday too. And the last translation in my opinion, and according to the pointing thereof, as I find it in the Author foundeth thus, preferring the Lords day they must rest, if so be they can do it as Chriftians, not as Judaizers. Now how the Jews did rest on their Sabbath in those primitive times, is clear from Ignatius and others.

Martin Tomé, in the Preface, saith: "In the very beginning of the New Testament, the Sabbath was kept on the Saturday, and not on the Sunday. But since the time of the Church, and the great number of Gentiles that were converted to the faith of the Lord, it was thought expedient to change the day, and to keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week."

Therefore (said it blessed Martyr) let us rest on the first day after the Sabbath, or rather on the Sabbath, as rejoicing in the presence of God, and in the remission of the body, admiring the worshipship of God, and in the things of the day before, nor drinking things lukewarm, nor walking measured steps, nor rejoicing in dancings and mad stopings, and clapping of the hands, and feet.

Now it was not needfull to say, if they can, they should rest the Lords day like Chriftians, and not like Jews in an idle, wanton, luxurious, and licentious rest, which was rather idlenesse and sloth, than rest; rather madeness like those that keep Bacchus Feast, than rest.

But this Allegation taken to the worst Translation, and lasteth upon that clause, which by no means will be ad-
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touching the Lords Day.

The debt of thankfulness is great, had increased the obligation of the commandment, and our obedience to it; but now you yield, his commandment somewhat obliges on our Sabbath, though little, when before you utterly denied any breach of any divine commandment in laboring that day, and do any obligation.

To strengthen this argument, you express your wish, that most religiously with all abstinence, and all attendance what were kept. Doe you wish with all your heart, and yet bend all your might to overthrow the commandment of God? Would you, or could you think, that your wish should prevail more than Apostolical truth?

Fourthly have we in one breath these contradictory sentences. No contumacy of the Church obliging to the first deserting from labour, and the constitution of some ancient Councils restraining that prophanation.

Fifthly, you come in with the Edicts of Princes, as one that would have the observance of the Lords day depend upon constitutions of the Church, and Edicts of Princes only; and for not to differ from another holy day. Most wicked, Popish, worse than Popish, and against all the famous lights ancient and modern. Or do you mention Princes Edicts and Churchers constitutions to gloze with ours? Ours derive your Tenet, and you feake herein to wound Church and Prince. for how they hold of the Lords day, that it is directly grounded on the fourth commandment, appearing in the liturgy, in the booke of Homilies, and in the Statutes and gadly Provisions for redresse of prophanation.

This is the Doctrine of the Church: By this commandment (speaking of the fourth) we ought to have a time, as one day in the week, wherein we ought to rest, from our lawful and needful workes. For like as it is appeareth by the commandment, that no man in the first times ought to bee sinful or idle, but diligently 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 weekly day labour,
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of these laws, to reject their commandments touching matter of worke or service on the Sabbath or any other day.

Answer.

First, I might put off all this till, because it is upon this false ground, that the Commandment of God doth not enjoyn us to keep the Sabbath with the like. But I will also go on with you, to see if there bee one true stitch through your whole Discourse. And here before we come to particular, let all men take notice, that this obdurate and calamitising phrase of Servants rebellion against their masters, is your own, and common from an evil heart, and crafty head.

We teach, that Princes unlawful commandes are not to bee executed; yet we teach not, that any commanded must rebel, but not obey, and so fare from rebellion if it should be heard, that bee suffer even to blood patiently, without so much as reviling, judging, or loving one another, and so commit such causes to him that judgeth righteously. But to come to your matter you hold:

First, That the Churches Conventions, and the Edicts of Princes never intended to forbid light and labourable works, nor doe their censures take hold on men therefore.

Secondly, against this, what the Doctrine of our Church is, you hear before, which taught, that God condemned all weekly and workday labour, all common business, and to give themselves wholly to heavenly exercises. So the doctrine of the Church of Ireland is confirmed hereunto, which teacheth thus: the first day of the week, which is the Lords day, is wholly to be dedicated to the service of God; and therefore wee are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business; and so believe, that service upon holy exercises both publick and private.

In a Counsell, in the year 89, it was decreed, that no worke on the Lords day be done, but the eyes and hands fetched out to God that whole day, and that if a Countryman or servant should neglect this whole some Law, he should be beaten with more grievous strokes of the Clubs.

Concerning the Lords Day.

Clubs. For these things, saith that Counsell, pacifie God, and remove the judgements of diseases and barrenness. And againe, understanding while they use in the Counsell, that some abused them selves from the Assemblies, they decreed under paine of Anathema, that no Lords dayes all men both men and women received the Communion.

In another General Synod there was made this decree.

It is ordained, that the Lords in their several dominions day in their several dominions, and the Lords days the yearly and weekly Faires, also meetings in Taverns, Compositions (as Griffiths) Dies Curae, and divers the like sports, singing in Churches, as I have mention before, and now many in merry meetings have their singing of Catches and their rantings, as they are called, the use of musicalke Instruments and Dancing.

In a Council at Nice it was ordered, that those who either kept Court, bought or sold, or otherwise proclaimed the Sabbath, should bee prohibited the Communion, because that whole day we ought to rest, and spread abroad our hands in prayer to God.

Concluded, a King of France commanded, that on the Lords day no badly worke should be done, besides what was prepared to use, to maintain life conveniently.

Secondly, you affirm that neither constitution of the Church, nor edict of Princes, doth free servants from their Masters power to command them to worke, or their obedience to worke at their Masters command that day more than others.

Thirdly, what the Doctrine of our Church is in this point, is clear in the Homily of the place and time of Confessors, being delivered in these words:

Silence which time (meaning the time of our Saviours ascension) God's people hath always in all ages, without any grace, saying used to come to...
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ken of? (which was the point of the Apologists doctrine I especially remembered you of?) That God I say, which commanded, and that doctrine which instructed servants to disobey their masters, and by depriving them of their service caused their hindrance? The Apostle knew full well this was not the way to propagate the Gospel, and enlarge the kingdom of Christ; he knew it was Christian meekness and obedience, and humility, and patience that must do it; and therefore he commanded Christian servants to give their masters all honour, to obey them in all things, and to tolerate them in all things, that in their masters finding them more servile and profitable servants, and withal more zealous than others were, might sooner be driven to the like of the religion that made them thus, whereas the contrary would have but manifested a hard heart, and grievous irreverence to the propagation of the Gospel, and defaced it, for a doctrine of concurrence and disobedience, and for a schism (as it were) of dissidence and division of families and commonwealth. And not only alienated the affections of masters from their Christian servants, but inflamed them with indignation and hatred against the Christian religion and the professed of it. Such therefore, evidently is the importance and immensity of the Apologists doctrine (as impartial men, whose prejudice or false conceit leads not away, may some discourse) very far from diffusing this doctrine of yours. Touching which point of the Apologists instruction given to servants for the effectual and general obedience, you will not reply (I hope) as some have done, that at first indeed it was permitted for the good of the Church, left the interest of it, and proceeding of the Gospel should be hindered by offence given to the Gentiles. For would that have been permitted if it had been unlawful? Or could the Church of God have interested by the interest of men? His Church interested by that whereby himself was disconsolated. Or would the Apologists have permitted men to sin (as now felicitates do) for the good of the Church, (was exhorted and commanded to a) who had himself expressly taught, that we must not do evil that good may come of it. No, neither of both can be, because either of both were a flame and destruction to the righteousness of God; the interest therefore of the Apologists was simple, without all tricks of policy to teach servants all exact and entire obedience to their masters, teaching all things that belong to the duty of servants, namely that else were in themselves honest and lawfull, without excusing of any day.

Anser.

touching the Lords Day.

Anser.

First, here you would prove your Tenter, for servants obedience to their masters commands for works on the Lords day, even works prohibited, to be more agreeable to the Apologists doctrine, than the contrary: and to this end you allege Texts to prove their obedience in all things to all matters, at all times, and thence conclude the answerable benefit of yours, the answerable benefit of ours thereunto.

First, object that you bring no proof of Scripture to confirm this your universal obedience at all times, nay, on the Sabbath day: though you should have done it, especially the doctrine of the Commandement touching cessation of works lying so fully upon the servant. If you reply that there is no exception of time: I answer, there is exception of obedience to unlawful commands, and such are works, otherwise lawfull, enjoyed to be done on the Sabbath: and if we have equivalent exceptions to that of time.

Your ground therefor which you lay, and say it is founded on Apologists truth, namely (that Apologies permit servants no point of libertie, but command them obedience without exception of matter, of labour, or of time;) we thus impugne:

The Apologists doctrine touching servants obedience both admit of three limitations by themselves expressed;

First, it must be an obedience in the Lord; that is, according to the will of the Lord, in all things in which godliness may not be overthrown, in all things provided, that is, so far. We admit of nothing against the Lord. If the masters command should cross the covenant of the servant, as he is a man and Christian to his God, it is indissoluble; if such should be made and words in the keeping, and always void of fields. The ground of this limitation is this, that all authority in superiour is derived from God, and subordinate to him; therefore the command of an inferior power binds not to obedience, when it is contrary to the precept.
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precept of the superior power, as Durand's well noteth. That therefore of Gregoric touching wives, must bee held touching servants for ever. Let the wife to please the will of her husband, that the done displeaseth the Will of her Creator. This limitation excepteth the servants labour, in servile work on the Sabbath or Lords day.

Secondly, it must bee an obedience wherein they abide with God in their service, that is, in the observance of the Commandments of God, faith the ordinary Ghost, and faith Lyra 8 as farre as pertaineth to those things which are not repugnant to the state of Pahy, that so your doctrine is plainly condemned: for God hath provided by his unchangeable Law, that one day in seven the servants shall rest from their labour, and with their matter attend on God, with whom there is neither matter nor servent.

Thirdly, yea, but the master commands him to work then, otherwise indeed he ought not? Nay, the Apostles doctrine hath yet a third limitation: That they be not the servants of men: Upon which place faith Chrysostome: 9 There are bounds set God to servants, and how faire they ought to keep them, this is also ordered by Law, and they may not passe over them: for when the master enjoyneth none of those things which are displeasing to God and disobliged, he ought to follow and obey; but beyond this by no means, for then the servant is a free man. And if these yeold any further, although they were free, then not became a slave. This is also instructed by those who saw the Lord, and not faire after he briefly expounds it thus: Obey not your masters, if that command against things, which are not with your own selves. Are not these Commandements of the master despissed for servile work, done without place, and forcing in Gods Word? are they not of things displeasing to God? These, these are the servants limits, beyond which if he passe, he is the servant of men, even of meane humour and a very slave: because he hath rejected the Lord, and of the things of God; and those that heareth, and observeth, Chrysostome. 10 In 1 Cor. 7: 21-22. free.
those days to such things, and wherein that manner did wrongfully bind and buffet for well doing. Tell me, was it for working, or truth and fidelity, and not for piety and the worship of God? And therefore, may not I say with better probability than you have spoken, that it was for intermittence of labour on the times of the holy assemblies? Will any correct their servants for performing the duties of the second table, or the secret duties of the first? It must needs be then, that that well doing was public worship of God, for which chiefly Heavens matters blessed Christian servants. And thus your very Texts have impliedly this particular in them, that servants should not do ill, or leave the doing well for the proverbial idle of the master, and not obey unlawful commands, but bear wrongfull stripes, for thereunto are they called; & for piety & the duties of God worship submit to the stripes, rather than the service of God.

Now in that you say, it cannot be that the Gentiles that did not believe should respect religion so, as not to exact their servants' work: I answer, they certainly did in that point of the Sabbath through a special providence of God and the inclination of soul to this law of nature, which is in part written in the hands of all men for S. Augustine tells us so much, who relating the passing of Swedes concerning the Jews and the Sabbath thine words, truly when he spakest of that Jewish the faith, when in the mean while the custom of that most wicked nation hath so far prevailed, that now through all lands is received: the conquered give laws to the conquerors. Speaking these things he wondered, & being ignorant what was wrought of God, he set downe plainly his opinion, in which he might figure, what he thought concerning the reason of their sacrifices for faith, but they know the causes of their rites, and the greater part of the times decrees. Observe this: See how the Sabbath had prevailed among all Heathens, doctors, & good divinites ageretur Ignorans, subiecti plant. Fuscis viis, quod spectant, quod divitiorum sacramentorum ratione festivitatibus, tam illius tempus consulatur, tamen in negotias, & major pars populi, fuisse, quod curante Ignorant. Augusti. De Civit. Delib. de car. cap. 11.

In Scripture's days, who lived in the time of the Apostle Paul, but what is that to the Lord's day? Yea, therefore easily you may gather how they could well afford one day in a week to worship: and Saint Augustine in the same place faith, that though Simon reproved the Jews for losing a seventh part of their time in keeping Sabbath, yet would not mention the Christians to reproove their rites in any kind. Now, as he should either praise them against the received custom of his Country, or reproove them against his own heart. Now, it was (as this Father) a special work of God, that the Sabbath should have that prevalence among Hebrews. For the Christians' rites of worship, he could not praise them but in praise, unless he should have gone against his conscience, and therefore sufficiently passeth them over.

But secondly, you affirm, that their withholding of their obedience would have caused the name and doctrine of God to bee blasphemed. I answer, their modest and humble refall of the worke, would adore the doctrine and not disapprove it, and if they should forsake the assemblies, they forsake their God and religion, the Hebrews well knew it, who were so obseruant in their superstition. It may seeme by the Apolityes rules given to servants and wives, that more of them were converted, than of masters and husbands, and the assemblies of the Lord's day more constantly frequented of all that had given up their names to Christ. Now as the rendering a reason of the hope that was in them to the Magistrate, performed with meeknesse and ease, honoured God and his Doctrine, so the rendering of an account how they worshipped God on the day of assemblies, upon the Lord's days: (as may appere by the Apolityes of Infidels Adversry for them) who in that Apolityes, renders a reason of their worship of God and of the day spent wholly in that worship. What the Apolityes faith upon the Christians, and because this might give a reason of his hope, may rightly be applied to the Christian servants to yield themselves wholly to God that day, and to render

2
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the reason thereof with meekness and fear: And who is that will harm thee, if thou doest that which is good? 1 Pet. 3.

But this submissive withdrawing, you learn by the ordinance name of disobedience very wrongfully; for he is to be obedient to his lawful command that day, and to the unjust corrections for the Lords sake, which will break the heart of any Master, and win him, but your course would take away the very practice of religion in the servants; for where is religion, if the publique worship be gone? Nor will this deprive them of their service, but make them in higher esteem, as Joseph was, and the famous courtier Daniel, for refusing to obey the king’s decree: when Parthens shall be loathéd and cast out. Yet if this should not always be, the Spirit of glory and of God will rest upon him that suffers in these cases: if this be the blasphemy, we must averse, we all are undone, while we are faith Tertullian’s, let his name be blasphemed in the observation, and not the exobigation of discipline, so long as we are proved, not reproved, this malicefull of preferred discipline is the benediction of God’s Name.

This would propagate the Gospel; as in Daniel’s case is to be scene, and in the case of the three children.

This is absolute meekness, obedience, humility and patience, and such servants for their vertue, and the profit that cometh to their masters, by their faithful service in the times and seasons due, and their unlawful respect, even when they receive wrong, shall carry in the eyes of the earth, high respects and praise; but if your course were held that the servant should neglect the assemblies to doe his matters worse on that day (we speak of workes unlawfully to be done on the Sabbath) and should design an heart to God, while his feet and hands carried him to his matters worse, (which is all one, as if one should sleepe with his tongue and think to keep his heart unforsen:) then where is the solemn worship of God? And that gone, where is Religion? And that gone, what vertue? And that gone, what profitable service? Masters that required...
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Answer.

First, that the subjection due to men in respect of obedience to execute their commands extendeth only to such as it may not diminish the empire of God, hath been sufficiently proved: but you call for antiquity to beear out the servant in refusing his master's commands of servile works on the Lord's day. I show you before out of Chrysostome, where he taught, that men are not to make use of Cæsar, but that a servant's command or ought against them, he may by no means execute his master's command. Testament shows, that a servant's word may be enforced by the sacrifice, he shall be accounted a minister of the time of idolatry (he speaks of them as attending on their masters, and that the place, Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, binds no subject to do the same on the same day; for, the day consecrated to idols, not to set up lights at their doors or Epistles or their doors and points. And then faith, is it well added, and to God, the things that are God's. Into which lay but that which went before in Chapter 14, where here faith, the Epistles, but every faithful day ye are one, the Christian hath his on the eighth day, lay them together, I say, according to the true meaning of that Author, and it is clear, that the servant might not for his master's command keep a day in honour to an idol, nor any way be minister of that time, nor might he neglect the day consecrated in honour to God, for his master. Clemente Alexandrinus saith, he was necessary to all sorts of men, and verse, since all tend to felicity. And after quotation of these in Ephesians 5, Colossians, and 4. He concludes out of these, therefore it is manifest, that what the notes of faith is, and is esteemed also who is perfect, whereof the servant and the man shall profess philosophy, he may against it, and exceedingly refuting, although punishment hang over their heads from their masters and husbands. The freeman also, though the

touching the Lord's Day.

The tyrants threaten death to him, though he be led to judgment; and damnation to unrighteous, and render the hard-ward of all his goods and fortunes, shall by no means abstain from pity and the true worship of God, nor shall ever depart from it: the woman likewise which dwelleth with an evil husband, and the same, if he have an evil father, or the servant that hath an evil master, profiting together with a violent and generous mind. But as it is comely and honest for the man to dye both for overseers and for liberty, and for him self, so also is it for the woman, for this is not proper to the nature of maids, but of good folk. Therefore both old and young, both woman and servant shall live, and if need be shall dye, being faithfully obedient to the commandments, which dying were but to be made alive by death: we certainly know both children, and women, and servants to have been no less than excellent in their parents' and husbands, and masters bring for against it. They ought therefore which would lead an holy life, not to be of a lefthandfull and ready mind, when they see some to choose them from it: but it is more much more that they contend and strive forly, that they fall not, as conquered, from the best and most necessary counsels for I doe not think they admit any compare, whether the better to be received into the fellowship of the Almighty, or to choose the darkness of divers. Things which are done off for others sake, we will always do, endeavoring to have an eye to them for whole sake, they seem to be done, taking for means to be, that which is acceptable to them: but things which are done rather for our own sake, than for others, shall be done by us, and with a full mind, whether they seem, or seem not to please any men.

Second, it is neither of my duty, nor befitting a work of this nature, to alledge all that might be cited here to this purpose, this shall suffice to the ye either your willfull blindness or daring prevarication, upon your great reading. It is very dangerous to oppose the truth and to truth unto your opinions of Sciences falsely so called: no man ever attempted it, but God polluted him in his gifts, in a just
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Judgement in this Treatise it may be seen, and in this particular passage. For Clements Alexandria, 1. Inflex 2. Augustine 3 and almost all the ancients which published Apologies for Christians, testify that among other causes why the Gentiles persecuted the Christians, this was one, that they withdrew themselves from obedience to their superiors under pretence of Religion. Now this was only in matter of the public worship of the true God, whereas in all did their disobedience (as they called it) against. They did the true God on his day, and refuted communion with Idolaters on their day, dedicated to their idols: but this you could not see. You know moreover, that the histories of the first three hundred years are all little weight for their brevity, imperfection, and the iniquity of those times through rage of persecutors, and malice of falsifying Heretics and Seducers. Therefore your bold and large affection herein is of little worth.

Thirdly, had you remembered that there is the same proportion in matter of obedience in one sort of inferiors as in another, you might have known what servants did in those times towards their masters for all Antiquity teacheth, that it is perverse to call that obedience wherein the obedience to God is forborne to obey man, and that the superior of any sort to be obeyed in whatever he commandeth that is not contrary to Gods Command, not otherwise. Thus taught Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Fabian, Baill, Bernard, the like. But Saint Augustin 4 chiefly is most notable in this point, both for his lively expressions and instances, and for his reasoning from humane things to divine, where obedience is denied to the inferior magistrate, wherein is contrary to the superiour.

Fourthly, I am sure godly superiors will never thank you for this doctrine, which cannot will to be obeyed of inferiors, if they command ought against Gods Law and Reason. Heathen Princes have refused such an obedience and defied the contrary. Antiochus the third wrote to the cities, that if he should command by letters any thing repug

 touching the Lords Day.

next to the laws, they would not care for it, but take it as if it were written, he not knowing of it. Antiquitas kings of the Macedonians answerd a Flatterer, who said, All things were honest and just for kings to doe: They are for only to kings of Barbarians; but to us those things only are honest which are honest; and just which are just. Provided answer to is known, that no man ought to doe for his friends but yet so farre as he may not sre against God.

Fifthly, the Papists can see, where the light did put our eyes they teach that the father and mother of the household which have servants and maids, sons and daughters, and do not see that they obey the precepts of the Decalogue, or which is worse, hinder them from the observation thereof, and worketh them to hard the Eyes, that on the festivals and Lords days they are by necessity of their own one in manner compelled to worke, or that give them not time to be present at the Assemblies, without promise of amendment they shall by no means be absol
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CHAP. XXXIII.

Bretheren, P. 33, 44.

And therefore Sis, to draw to an end (for I grow weary, and have already both dulled my penne, and my reason) I would advise you in the Name of Jesus Christ, whose Minister you are, and whose work you have in hand, to examine this doctrine of yours, what foundation it may have in the Word of God, and what effect in the Church of God, left the foundation happily be your own plantatiue, nor God's Word, and the effect prove the poising, not the nourishing of the Church. I know Sis, you are not the first that for this doctrine abracada, nor the only man that draws of the vessel, although few (as I am told) draw freely as you. But I would advise you Sis in the Name of God, to beware beasts, and draw not too deep. It is all right, it is sufficient already with those that have good taste, like the water of Meribah. It will prove like that of Maribah, a little lower, and if you hope to draw to the bottom, you will find the deeper to bee nothing but disturbance and sedition, both in Church and Commonwealth. But I lay in the beginning, I would neither confute nor disprove the evil consequence of this Doctrine; let them confute (if they will) to whom the government of the Church and Commonwealth, and prevision of peace in both, doth belong. And in divine (no thence) there is little neede; the events are too evident, even to make foreigner already to require divination: for when he feareth that idle swine doubts what grace will be reap'd in heaven, when I will therefore neither confute, nor disprove the fruits of your Doctrine, but omit both and make an end.

Answer.

First, now judge whether this Doctrine bee the water of Meribah, and belies all that has been spoken, consider, that it teacheth no forsaking of God, nor diffusion of said from his favours; that were bitter indeed, your doctrine doth it. Consider, it teacheth no neglect of righteousness or judgement: but to yield subjection with patience, where it may not yield obedience, with a good Conscience: but you make the Lords day, that day of rejoicing to all Christians in the faith of Christ, with whom there is neither bound nor free, to be the servants' sabbath, who left under the command of the master, nor to, but from the assemblies, yeth under a better fountain of the word, yea, those others have it; and with faith to him, and him alone setteth at naught day, whilst ye shall feed in his glory to others: how will you escape that woe in Elisha, Where thou shalt put bitter for sweetness, and sweet for bitter:

Who then are that you say have good tastes? I know not, the Publisher is one it seemeth, but he was not thus knowne to you, one may probably conjecture; how ever hee will not willingly bee knowne to have this good taste, and is not unlike but many more are of this sort, that drink your sweeter waters secretly, and cite Mather Bretherend was right for his judgement, but they would not teach it publickly for a thousand pounds. This calls to mind the intimated fool in the proverbs, *that faith, rotten waters are sweeter, and brown eaten in secret is pleasant. Secondly, and for your Meribah, thus I lay, if your writing were not intended to this end, certainly the publishing is it. It is no new thing to hear Christian Doctrine charged for sedition, and disturbing both Church and State; but it is much andadoubtfull and perversel to charge this Doctrine fo, having beene taught, and printed, and found in the hands of the whole kingdom, I never breed the least disturbance in any family. But you will not divine of the event; nor You doe both encreas and disme, and then say you will not. You would exasperate authority against painfull and confusible Ministers, you would suggest hard things against the quiet of the land, you would cast Jealousies caudelly. You would doe more than divine, if Divines were under your power. I spare to say more, only 1 desire all to weigh whether the fruit of your Text can bee any other then disturbance and sedition is for:

First, it calleth servants (and by the same reason all inferiour) under an insupportable burden, which hath alwayes

1 Tim. 2:19.

Amos 6:12.
of Chester, his Cozen, the ninth of June, 1617. One passage of which Letter I annexed out of that Letter which I have with me, in the original under his own hand. It is this: If I satisfy not Master Byfield, I would desire him to satisfy me, by answering my reasons, and producing better to prove his own conclusion. The one or the other must be done (now he hath provoked me to write) or else some blame will stick by him. If he answer my arguments faithfully, and there be of the reasons which published his own Doctrines, I have done done, he shall satisfy and silence me, I will presently yield, and without both love and praise him; but if he be not able to doe it (as I suppose he is not) and will not persevere in the same, I shall both defend and dispute him for his part, and perhaps displease him in the end.

The request was satisfied in an answer of Master Nic. Byfields, written to him then, which had been published here if we had met with a perfect Copy, in the same time while he was in the same place. The Admonition of this work, and strange audacity, as shall appear by the occasion of this Letter in this man's spirit, which in the beginning of the Treatise he layeth down, viz. the wound in the advice of one John Broomwood, by Master Nic. Byfield. First, it is evident, those works be stuck at, were never in question. Secondly, it is manife-
st by the letter of Master Broomwood, written to the above-
said Master John Bristow, that the servant confessed, that he received the first touch at Master Brown's of Stapleford, but his conference after with Master Byfield was such as re-
solved him. And yet it is clear, that there was never any case proposed to him at Chester about fervent worke on the Sabbath at Master Bristow's, and he never to that time delivered his opinion touching it unto any. Thirdly, it is no less clear, that the occasion was foolish and weak, as shall be manife-
est, by giving to all the world a true infor-
mation how the case then stood with this John Broomwood, which I give you in the next Chapter for a conclusion to this first part of the book. Happy had it been for him, if
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Answer.

For the occasion, three things will lively respett into the world, a brief relation concerning the condition of John Brewerwood at that time: secondly, the comparing of some passages in Master Brewerwood relation with the former: thirdly, the beginning of Master Byfield's answer to this Treatise, containing a short and satisfactory answer to this particular.

First, this was the true state of things concerning John Brewerwood at the time while these things fell out. John Brewerwood was servant and Apprentice to one Master Thomas Shipton Grocer in Fridaysreet, in the Parish of Saint John

the Evangelist: He was employed by his Master on business to Chefter: and going downe, hee fell in love with a Maid that accompanied him downe at the same time. Whereupon when he was returned (as was manifested by the consequents) hee cast in his mind which way to wind himselfe out of his Masters service. For the attaining of his disorder'd desire, when yet hee had not spent halfe the time of his Apprentiship in his Masters service, hee made therefore many excursions: some about the Sabbath, pretending his conscience had been much wrought upon by Master Nicholas Byfield in that his foresaid journey: some about his calling in the weekes dayes. About the Sabbath, when his Master bade him fetch a pint of wine, or see his horse have provender, or call the invited Guest to dinner, he would refuse to doe it; which thing his Master (supposing it had been indeed upon some trouble of conscience) with joy related to the Master of the parish, Mr. Walker, and thereupon sought means to bind and retain him in his service: for his Master was a commectionable and religious man, and careful of the Sabbath, and hoped that here would begin the discovery of some good wrought in him, who before was many ways unworthy. But this John Brewerwood law, that this would take no place, he calls other excursions about the works of his Calling, to get off that way, by his pretexts of the evil he saw attended Trades in the City: and this turned not off his Masters from his desire to retain him, but rather increased them the more. Afterwards, perceiving that Religion pretended wrought up his intended plot, and for it, hee fell to impudent and vile libelousnesse. One time, his Master, for some libelousnesse of his, gave him a booke on the case: then he found out this project to lay his Dagger under his pillow, that when the maids should find it there, and relate it to their Masters, he might conceive he had some intent to play some vile part; and being a timorous man, might be moved to turne him out of his service. After this, his Master upon his earnest desire, sent him downe againe to Chefter to gather up monies; who there gathered up to the summe of an hundred pounds, or thereabout, his Master fearing to lose it, gave way to his motion to leave his service, and fetch for himselfe in Chefter, that if he might get his money of him. This John Brewerwood thus released, married the former woman: and since, putting her to shift for herself, hath been so and fro beyond Sea, and hath played many pranks.

This Relation was taken from Master Walker's mouth, March 50. 1612; as a briefe of those things that might bee more largely set downe: the Christian Reader for his further satisfaction, if hee desire it, may enquire of him who was very well acquainted with all those passages.

Now consider with me some passages in Master Brewerwood Relation:

First, he saith, the true cause of his dissembler was a Case of Conscience about works on the Sabbath; yet hee law, that at the first discovery of his strange alteration, were discovered obstatine resolutions, by faire or foule means to forsake his service. Hee is little skil'd in the plight of a wounded conscience, that can think such a conscience, and such obstinate Resolutions are compatible to the same man at the same time.

Secondly, hee talketh of his Masters great offence; yet
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This was no other, but that as one joyed to see hee made some shewe of confidence in that thing, he sought all means to tie him the faster to him and his service.

Thirdly, hee talketh also of his Kinismans afflication: What? From such a man as was so milde as his Master was?

Who can believe that this matter about his Kinismas was any more than an occasion, no cause in truth of Master Brewood's attempt? Some thing there was besides this, as rightly he acknowledged.

And to put it out of doubt, heere M. Byfield speake after long silence under these injuries, beginning his Treatise thus,

Let us fix Mr. Brewood and Mr. Byfield.

Sing you an Adversary, whom you could confute at many ways none of the aboves, that if you might enter into almost all the degree of triumph before any field was pitched. But it is not the Champion pride himselfe, this frest of the Brooke that refresheth the Sanctuary of God may smite the forehead of his pretension.

In your writings I consider matter and manner. In the manner I find strange to find, unbridled censures, confident, bold and swelling words of the close context of your Conclaves with an unseasonable deal of such unkindly stuff: all this I wholly pass over as unworthy to be considered in the bulk, permitted in the writing of any Scribe. The matter is but profligate, and of purpose repeated many times over in several Tracts of eloquence: the better to give a place to opinion selfe. The repetition I omit likewise. In the propounding of the matter these two things are principally, fall and opinion. In matter of fall you are troubled, that your Kinismas should be seduced, and ruined by the power of ill advice fuddled from my mouth. This you would be answered in. And to this you have been answered, that it is a frailness raised by your Kinismas (it is no offense it.) and magnified and blown to the height by your selfe. And you doe well to hold fast the pretense of your opinion, that such counsel was given, and else I cannot see so much as a glimpse of any colour, why you should in this falsefull manner move me, or any Minister of the Gospel, when you have no occasion given you. And so you may be answered as touching matter of fall.

Thus faire Christian Reader, I have spared Master N. Byfield. Answer to this Treatise, the rest hath been rated, and I had saved my labour, if we had had a perfect Copy: it is likely they that feele forth Master Brewood's have one, which they conceal, and put in stead thereof a Letter writing to Master Brewood, reliance on good grounds to give an ADVISE, which they call, Master Byfield's answer. So indiscreet every way that worthy man been used in this business.

Out of this that hath been set downe, I leave every one to judge of the occasion, and of the spirit of the man.
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...solution, they are abundantly discovered in their knowledge, in those brief grounds for the Sabbath which be hath laid: his scale that (literally guided) misdirected that fire of contention beginning to flame, so that it brake not forth; and therefore small measure of charity to the state of the Opposer, which being resip and set to contend, wanted but one to answerer, that matter might be confirmed for him to work upon; and to the faults of all, when these belligerent winde shall be kept in their desires of privacy, and laced with a short and grave repulse. What want of scale for the truth could there bee in this case, when the opposition being privit, was dangerous only to the Opposer, and if hee should make it publicke would have raised in holy armies of defenders, in both the famous cities and other parts of the Kingdom, to the great imputation of the Opposer's reputation, who disperseth his fools and Atheistical sentences upon an occasion occasioned? Or what want of Charity? It never commanded to attend the saying of every Prayer, nor requires more than a reparation in the error with arguments to confirm the truth; this is Dissimulation. There may bee ever the lefte scale for the truth, where is wanting a scale for the errors, and there may bee no want of Charity, where yet the erroneous person remains unaffectated.

What objections of exceptes his letter contained shall bee sent, God willing, in time and place convenient. But this I say, your exceptes not only becometh in your Reply, but also in this Preface stand out to the view. For you say, you are hopeful of him, and yet you will provoke him to give satisfaction and to disclaim his errors. Would not satisfaction and disclaiming of an error answer your hopes? Or delight you to provoke to give that which you cannot hope for, only that you might provoke? What? Hope left if he cannot be provoked, and hope enough if hee bee provoked enough? What? Nothing satisfaction with you, but to call the truth error, when you call it error.

The first Section of the Reply answered.

First, herein Master Browne being charged by Master Bysfield, that he opposed God's Sabbath, cryeth out (Fairly be it from him): he acknowledges the Sabbath of Jews and Christians to be both of them God's Sabbath. Compared then, what he faith here, with what he said in the former Treatise, and believe your own eyes.

Here be faith: I acknowledge no the Christian Sabbath the worship of God, and vacancy from all worldly affairs which may impeach that worship, to bee by the moral Law.

Before hee said, pag. 41. The celebration of the Lord's Day may with no enforcement of reason he drawn out of the moralitie of the fourth Commandement. Is not the Lord's Day the Christian Sabbath you speak of? And is the celebration thereof any other than the worship of God thereon, and vacancy from labour that may impeach that worship?

Pag. 37. To work on the Lord's Day, is no breach of any divine command.

Pag. 33. Oney works of soyle, and towards to gain, are retainned by the commandement.

Again, he said, he never taught worke of God's Sabbath.
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enjoy himself? No, the Lord rested on the seventh day, that he might teach thee to rest the seventh. Or did God ever condescend to himself either day or place for any other cause, than that he might benefit mankind and benefit them, when he did in a holy manner observe them?

Gods personal sanctification of the Sabbath, say you, was nothing else but his resting in himself, that resting from creation was his Sabbath, that resting in himself, was the sanctifying it; other institution or sanctification will never be proved. Tell me, why did you not see on in your new interpretation, and thence how he blessed it? and wherein that consisted? Do you not see the blessedness is also, and those who hold against the antiquity of the Commandment of the Sabbath, that it was not given to Adam, yet give no such interpretation of those words, God sanctified the seventh day. Not Malsor, not couchalias, not jomaraka, not tomas, nor porson, nor any that I have met withal, but they make it an institution by anticipation, of which afterwards your selves perceived it was too bold an assertion, to say, that the ever blessed Creator laid down a Law for himself, with an answer of blessedness annexed, and therefore confess, that both Gods resting and sanctifying that day were exemplary to men, though you would not they should be obligatory, till the commandment in Sin and Sine, but what then have you done? If the Sabbath be inculcated in Paradise, as you acknowledge from that place in Gen. 2: and this be exemplary to men, as wife, you confess, how can it be less obligatory to men, though it be not, delivered in a form of words expressly mandatory. God's action which he would have exemplary, cannot be less obligatory.

Secondly, but you say, this sanctification might be in defilement ordained them to holiness, but not to be applied till the time of the Law. Was it ordained then to holiness? It was not then at mans liberty to spend it to other employment, than that to which it was ordained. God prepared for it.

touching the time of Institution.

ration of a time to sanctification, 2000, years before it should be sanctified; is without example, intimation in any text, or solid reason. Had he ordained it then to holiness? What God hath sanctified, why call you it common? What can you think that Adam and the Patriarchs would make more common?

The word signified a preparation as well as an actual application to holiness. I could tell you that the word sanctified both in way of praise and dispraise, as Rabbi David Kimchi oblique, in dispraise here, but I do not wish to the word signified to prepare, apply it now to the seventh day, and I know that God blessed and prepared the seventh day above other days of the week, and that the memory of the great work of the Creation, that to piety and religion for ever among posterity, Gentiles as well as Jews might be nourished. Had this been done out of the memory of the Holy Seed as it was among the Gentiles, Satan had soon thrust out them also, as he did on the Gentiles, the fiction of the worlds eternity, and had blown away as all memory of the Creation, to all piety and true piety out of the minds of men. Now such a preparation which is the actual separation of a thing to use, is not of definition but present readiness, and such is the preparation this word signified, as may be seen in Rabhi Mardochaeus, and his successor. When this word connotes holiness (for sometimes it signified preparation in general), as in Midr. 3. 5. to prepare want? it signified to make holy, Lev. 13. 39 to declare holiness, Ezek. 39. 27 to set a pass to an holy place, Joel 1. 14 to command it be sanctified, Exod. 13. 2. But it denoted beforehand without present and actual separation of the thing to be so annealed and doth exist, and is capable of that to which it is separated (which must needs be your meaning), but I have no warrant of Scripture or Author that I know of, for those places in Exo. 13. 10. Josh. 3. 5. and 7. 3-4. As they all mean by sanctifying, to sanctify by command that they be sanctified, so they speak not of a De-
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This Anticipation never came into any mans mind, who was not first anticipated with some prejudice about the observance of the Lords day; the Jews never dreamt of it, and in the new Testament, no such thing is taught or intimated. The Authors of that opinion yield it is probable that the seventh day was observed by the beginning of Zonar. de dieb. festis. Moreover there can be produced out of Scripture no example of such an Anticipation; there is no Anticipation of the names of some places, with the like, but not an anticipation of an institution. Besides, the perfection of the creation on that day, is twice joined with the sanctification of it, in the same manner and phrase, in which the creation both of man and of the living, Creatures is joined with the blessing of them, Gen. 2. 2. 3. with Gen. 1. 26. 31. 27. 28. The new Testament confirms our Text which teacheth that the people of God partake in the Old Testament of a twofold rest in this life, the rest of the Sabbath, and the rest of Canaan; but David speaking in the 45. Psalm of a rest, speaketh not of the Sabbath rest, for that was from the beginning of the world, nor of that in Canaan, for that was past; therefore of a third rest he must needs speak. Lastly, the Prophet gathered a perpetual Rule and Law for marriage, from the first example in the creation of married persons, Mal. 2. 15. Male has not one? And wherefore one? Because he is not a godly seed. So here did not God rest the seventh day, but why the seventh day that we should sanctify to God the seventh. Yes, but the Prophet made no such collection. Yes such a one, though not that very one. And a greater than that Prophet, God himself puts into us that very collection, when he that he Rested, and that he blessed and sanctified this his resting day.

Fourthly, you would make good your conceit, by flowing the needle and current of such a command, when there was no place to the body, coalescence to the mind, that called for Rest or sanctification one day in seven.

There was labour in Paradise, Gen. 3. 15. And therefore there might be need of a Rest. There was danger of sin to D d

Penticost.
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Paradise and therefore need of some special time by God's ordinance, and that time blessed of God, to uphold the sanctification of the sabbath. If you reply, there was no such toyle in labour, I answer, it was no toyle to God to weoke the five days, and yet God religion the seventh.

Besides, God doth know many eftates, known reasons for his commandment; and therefore it is still divining against the light of God's truth.

And if it had been for any commandment of trauell, man ought to have obeyed.

Fiftly, hitherto of the verson of your Tenet; now for the Text in Gen. 2, 2, 3. That the true sense of the Word is this; The Lord blessed the seventh day; that is, hee appointed it to be a Fountain of blessing to the observer of that day; and sanctified it. That is, Commanded it to be set apart by men from common busines and applied to holy uses. That this, I say, is the true sense, not only the Hebrew and Grecian words do both give, but the univerall opinion of Divines, ancient and modern.

Cyriar writes thus; The sacred number of seven obtained authority from the creation of the world; because the first works of God were made on five days; and the seventh day was sanctified to rest, as holy and holyday, honored with the solemnity of a hailing; and entitled to the Spirit, the Salutar, Epiphanius speaks thus of these words in the Gospel of Saint Luke. It is to passe on the seventh. For the Sabbath; that the first Sabbath is that which was deduced from the beginning, and called of the Lord in the Creation of the world; which returned by circuit according to the revolution of seven days, from that time until now; but the second Sabbath is that which is described by the Law.

Origen answerveth Celsus objecting against the History of the Creation, that God, like some Artificers that were wearied, should need a resting and vacation, in this manner: Truly this men (seeth not) after the creation of the world, as soon as the world was made, what a one the day of the Sabbath, and of God resting was, in which both men rested to God, and
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...and keep this day a sabbath unto him, which have dispatched their works in the five days; because they set aside no thing that is unjust, they obeyed by contemplation to the last day of the last and blessed men.

...Israel horizon. The sense in Genesis 2:3: What is this; and how sanctified it? The sense of it is called the seven day, for which it is said, being sanctified it, added, because in it be rested from all works which he began to make. Now hence God gives unto men keyed by this institution that we (for apart) and separate one day in the circuit of every week to the life of spiritual things; for, for this sequestered the Lord saved all the fabric of the world in six days, and bowed the seventh with his blessing, sanctifying.

Hierom was of the mind that the Sabbath was instituted in the beginning, who represents the seven deadly on their Sabbath and enjoy rest in which yet they gloried, from the example of God, who, in the beginning wrougth on the day which he blessed, and brake the Sabbath in the Iewes seven.

Learned Mercerus upon this place, following the choise and greatest Lights,faith, I doubt not but by the first fathers before the Law this day was solemn and sacred, God himself being their teacher. &c. That the people of God might know that the Fathers observed it not of themselves, but as taught of God to receive them in the exercise of it: so.

Ambrose also giveth his voice, Who saweth that that seventh day had its observation among all men of those generations from the creation to the reformation of our Saviours. And Alleme was of this mind. When God (as he) saw him, in the seventh day, because inst rested from all his works, he expressed not any thing concerning its rest or dinner of the Sabbath.

The Fathers alleged by Gemmarum, that plead the Sabbath was not kept by the Fathers before Moses, as Infinito Martyr Terrullianus, Irenaeus and Justinian are to bee under-
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...lood of the Ceremoniall observation thereof; and so the Fathers were no observers of the Sabbath as those ancients rightly maintained against the Jews, and were readily subscribe unto it; and that they thus mean is apparent by some passages in their forefaded books, in the Dialogue with Titus, the Jewish, Neither thinkes it grievous that we break some worships on the Sabbath, seeing God also gave us the world on that day in like manner as he did another days. And Tertullian in his booke against the Jews, that the temporeall observation of the Sabbath ceaseth, as if it were a type, because also affirmed in his booke against Heresies, lib. 4, c. 3. That the precepts spoken by God to Moses were not to be abrogated, but to be observed by his children. And in his 50. chap. of the same booke he faith, That the gods of the world are the substance of the Decalogue written in their hearts and souls, and that they themselves the righteousnesse of the Law.

Bede therefore upon the first chapter of Luke, maketh a definition betweene the observation of the legall Sabbath, and the liberty of the Natural Sabbath, which till Moses time was like other days. See, hee acknowledgeth a Natural Sabbath under those first times of liberty.

Annexed to thefe the Jewish Doctors, Philo thus openeth the Text: After that this Universe was perfected according to the perfect nature of the first, the Father added another in the following seventh day, which when he had perfected, prefently he was called holy. For it is the feast of the people of God, but of all universal, which alone is worthly to be called a solemn festival, and the birthday of the world. Brought in the context of Scriptures allegorically, Romans upon Genesis, fol. 46. And Aben Ezra upon Exodus the twentieth to prove that the Lord appointed the seventh day from creating to be an holy rest, and that the six days observed it before Moses. Peter Martyr allegorically allegorically, hee breakes the Ten Commandments for that same point.

Thomas Aquinas interpreteth this on his wife, be sanctifideth it, that is, be deputed to be sanctifie: for he willed that the Lords day be kept holy of holy, therefore that especially we be also vacant to Gods holy worship, and in it and in the memoriall thereof, we call to mind the continual benefit of our creation and therefore in the old law it is commanded that on that day we cease from all servile works, that we may intend more freely God and his divine worship, whence that day is called, Sabbath, which is the same that rest is. Subsecuens faith, that God would by this very sanctifying of the Sabbath institute a certaine worship, in which man kind even in innocencie (that is, although Adam had not sinned) should worship the goodness of God, and celebrate worship acceptable to God, when any other things on other days were to be looked upon. And then he giveth four causes or ends of the instituting of the Sabbath, it was instituted, First for rest. Secondly, for the excellency of men. Thirdly, for the upbuilding of a certaine worship. Fourthly, for the testament of immortality. And here faith he, Children may learn the answer of that Schoolers argument: the Apostle in Col. 2, bids that we judge in the Sabbath dayes: therefore we are not to keep a Sabbath. Answere the antecedent: Paul speaketh of the sacrament and the observation of outward circumstancies hee speaketh not of the general or the principal meaning of the precept, and the familiar thereof, which is natural and unchangeable. This Author calleth our Sabbath, the Sabbath of Redemtion.

Marinus is full in this thing, in Heb. 1:1, hee comfirmed it to be his blessing to be kept of men, and sanctifie it, not as the other pompous business is, but because hee appointed it to his sanctification and praise, and to the holy conversation of men. Because the Hebrews, to sanctifie it the same as to separate from pollution: a day is said to be sanctifie, which we ought to be separated from pollution. It was made expressly from that day every day of the World, and as the letter thereof, the following precept giving to us all Parents concerning this thing, which we pass over in passivity by tradition.
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As in the Church, the celebration of the first or eighth day is passed over; for since it is of the Law of Nature, that some time be peculiarly consecrated to the worship of God, it was meet, that that should be determined in the very beginning by a positive law, wherein even among the Gentiles, the Sabbath on the seventh day was famous.

Beca. 359n. 1. In lob. 15. This being, faith reverence Calsb, was nothing else but a solemn consecration, whereby God claims to himself the services and employments of men on the seventh day. First, God rested; then he blessed this rest, that in all ages amongst men it might be holy, or he dedicated every seventh day to rest, that his example might be a perpetual rule.

Moreover, we must know, this exercise is not peculiar to one, either age or people only, but common to all mankind. Wherefore, when we hear that by Chrifts coming, the Sabbath was abrogated, this distinction must be taken. Was appertained to the perpetuation of human life, and what peculiarly affected the old figures, that the Sabbath signified the mortification of the flesh, I say was temporal: but that from the beginning it was commanded men, that they should exercise themselves in the worship of God, diversely it ought to endure even to the end of the world.

Paraph. in lob. 15.

Calvin, Com. v. 15.

General.

The time of Institution.

Sabbath. I doubt not (faith he) but that the Sonne of God, taking him the shape of man, was bufted that whole seventh day in most holy colloquies with Adam; and that he did also fully make himself known to Adam and Eve; and did reveal the manner and order, in which he had used in creating all things; and did exhort them both to meditate on these works, and in them to acknowledge their Creator, and to praise him, and that by his owne example he did admonish them to employ themselves in this exercise of godliness, setting all others businesse aside, and also that they would to instruct and teach their children. To be short, I doubt not but that in that seventh day he taught them all Divinitie, and did hold them in hearing of him, and in praying God their Creator for so many and so great benefits. To this interpretation I am led by these two reasons: the first, taken from the Sanctification of the Sabbath which God hath preferred in the Law: the second, because Adam ought to understand this sanctification of that day; therefore it is probable that the Sonne of God did open it unto Adam and Eve, both in plain words, and by his owne example. For even God is said to rest upon that day, and in Exodus, he doth exhort to the sanctification of the Sabbath by his owne example; therefore he did sanctifie it with Adam and Eve. Of this the Sonne of God gave us a shew: for having finished the workes of our re-creating or Redemption, being raiied from the dead, he conversed with his Disciples, appearing to them through forty days (pace) and speaking the things that concerned the Kingdom of God, and fully instructing them, and teaching profound Theologie, so much with words, as with the efficacie of the Spirit: He restored from both workes, that he ceased not yet to teach men, and instruct them in the true worship.

The time would fail me to tell of our English worthies, famous Weletens Light, that teach all this Truth, as Willis, Perkins, Greenham, Babington, Bawe, Gihberts, Dods, Scobury, Stowe, Williams, with many more: Behold what a cloud.
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For further confirmation, consider that place in Exod. 20.

For first, before all mention of Moses Law concerning the Sabbath, it is proved that the People gathered on the first day twice as much bread, two Omeres for one man, which thing was observed by the Rulers of the Congregation, who came and told Moses of it. To what end was this, but that they might apply themselves wholly to the observance of the Sabbath the day following?

Secondly, the very phrase and words of Moses, in giving admonition about the Sabbath in verse 25, is such as clearly sheweth that Moses spake not of the Sabbath, as some new thing unheard of; but call to mind the ancient sanctuaries of that day, which they had been compelled to neglect of late in Egypt, through Pharaohs cruel taskmasters. This is that which the Lord hath said To morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.

Thirdly, the very command of Moses appointing them for after-times to gather twice as much every first day as they did other days; and giving this reason, on the seventh day which is the Sabbath, in that shall be none; sheweth that Moses himself was mindful of the Law of the Sabbath, delivered from Adam to the Fathers. Out of this Text then it is evident, that the Sabbath was from the beginning.

The third Section answered.

Viz, the Argument of Moses himself, for the moraletic of the Sabbath, taken from the manner of giving this Law, by lively use of Sted, and by divine ingrossing in Tables of Stone, by the finger of God, and therefore differented from the Lord from a ceremonial Law, which were all given meditately by Moses; and from Gods own testimonie by Moses, that it is one of the Tenne words, or Tenne Commandments: you make here such an answer as doth not once come}
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Some one the force of the argument. It became say you, one of the Tenne perpetual words then, when it was given on Mount Sinai for the moral part perpetual, bow faith sanctifye the Sabbath; for the ceremonial part not perpetual, bow faith sanctify the seventh day for the Sabbath. If it became so, because ingraven by the finger of God in Tables of stone, then that part, bow faith sanctify the seventh day for Sabbath, is so, because so ingraven. If it became so but then, that it suffice us that have lived ever since, and that that shall arise after us to these of the world. But this that you affirm, that then, when it was delivered on Sinai, became one of the perpetual words, hath no warrant in Scripture, alledge the place nor in reason; for as the other nine Commandments became not then first perpetual, though then first delivered in forme of lawes, so more did this. Were they perpetual, because written in Tables of stone, and not rather, because perpetual, so written? This also is strange, that you say, that the moral part of the commandment, bow faith sanctify the Sabbath, (as you will have it) became but then on Sinai a perpetual word. Was not obligeing from the beginning, and written in the heart, that then should bee a vacant time for the worship of God? If you deny it; See your own confession in pag.14.of the Treatise.

The fourth Section answered.

That place in the fifty fifth Chapter of Esay, vers.4, 5 Verll., affords a strong argument against you; for there the Christian Sabbath is prophesied of, as that which every mortall man, every one of Adam, that would bee blessed, must keepe in obedience to God. It is therefore an ordinance of God, charged in the fourth Commandment, and no Command of men. The stranger and Eunuches there spoken of, were not such as became proficients under the law, but Christians under the Gospel. You object that the preceolege of Sons and Daughters was not rendered to strangers, and
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fo Maner Byfield mislouke the Text. This is but a cavil, the intent of the Prophet is to shew that the Lawfull over strangers and Eunuchs shall not, in Christ's Kingdom, do where they are abolished, hinder their election and elect unto the number of his people; but any of all sorts are accepted with God, that thus take hold of his Covenant. The Prophet exprestly pronounseth them blessed, v. 2. therefore it can be no writting of the Text, to say the stranger shall be a sonne, and the Eunuch made joyfull in the house of prayer; nay if you take the Promiseg applied in v. 3, to the Eunuchs, exesquitly flouting out the stranger, how doth it answer to well the stranger's objection, who said, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people, ver. 3. You object further, that the burnt offerings and sacrifices mentioned in ver. 7, have no place in the New Testament; therefore the Text must be understood of the time of the Old Testament. You might as well say that that place in Malachi, 21. is not spoken of the New Testament, though it be said, God's Name shall be great among the Gentiles, from the rising of the Sun, to the going down thereof. Because it is added, in every place incense shall be offered, and a pure offering, Christians have their burnt offerings and sacrifices, Rom. 15. Num. 2. But you say, that then all the chapter must be understood in a mystical sense, and so of a mystical Sabbath. This consequence is utterly infinite, as may be seen by that Text in Malachi already added; and that conceit of a mystical Sabbath cannot have place here, for these are made distinct, to keep the Sabbath from polluting it, and to keep the hand from doing any evil, ver. 6.

To speake fully, there is noe word in Scripture that speakseth of a mystical Sabbath; for what is spoken of a Spiritual Sabbath is concerning our rest in Heaven, and not a Spiritual Sabbath on earth; and to say that servile works condemned in the fourth Commandment are no other than sines, or sines at all, is nothing but an Allegorical dressing with Gods Word; for sines are not unlawful

on the Sabbath only, but alwayes, and in all places: nor doth the fourth Commandement intend to give a prohibition of all sines; though it be true, that in some sines, sines receive an high aggravation when they are committed on so holy a day, Hebr. 3:12.

Now how this mystical and spiritual Sabbath of yours should serve to this purpose which we intend, I know not, they are words of a misjoyned mind.

The fifth Section answered.

Concerning the arbitrarie that translated the Sabbath, you say it is certaine, that the translation thereof was actually and immediately prescribed by the Church. Dale ingeniously, and feare me where; if in Scripture, then answer that it was not immediately prescribed by the Church; for the Apostles were not Authors of the institution, but Ministers of Christ, and posterities of the holy Ghost. If in Eclesiastical writers, I answer they all referre us to the Apostles and the Scriptures. This opinion therefore is so farre from certaine, that it is certainly false. You say againe, that certainly Christ never gave his Apostles particular charge of instituting a new Sabbath, either while hee conversed with them on Earth, or afterwards by Revelation. How know you this? The Apostles delivered many things that the Evangelists did not yet say, nor themselves expressly say they received them from the Lords mouth; that they conversed Christ's Command from the Church, that is, this particular explication into many words, that Christ commanded it; this makes to prove it was given them in charge by Christ, for else while the Apostles expounded it, they would have said of that their instruction, as of other things, We speake this by permission, not by commandement; we have no commandement of the Lord, but wee speake our judgment: Hebr. 3:6, not the Lord. This institution then (so use your owne language of a new day of solemnity, in stead of the old Sabbath) was of the existance Ec 2:3.
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Many later Divines by Sabbath understand all inconveniences of flight caused by the necessary and enjoyed attendance on God's worship. This little favours your opinion, and most understand the place of the Christian Sabbath.

And that this is the proper sense of the place, will be manifest to him that observeth three things: First, the person to whom these words were spoken, i.e. to the Disciples privately, and apart on the Mount of Olives, ver. 3. Secondly, the time, immediately before his death, he spake of that which should fall out for many years after. Thirdly, the intent of our Saviour, which was to show the great evils should come to pass, and the miserable extremities the enemies should put them to. Now, if it be not spoken of the Christian Sabbath, what force could there be in our Saviour's speech, saying, pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath; who thereby intended to signify that it should be a singular grievance to them to fly on that day. If the Sabbath had not been in force, what vexation had it beene to the Disciples to fly on that day more than any other? may it have been an argument of comfort, and our Saviour might have shewen them then, that it was a singular mercy of God to them in such times, that now they were spared of the obligation to the Sabbath, and so might fly on that day, as well as any of the rest; otherwise they had more need of have prayed for knowledge to see their liberty in Christ, than to pray that they might not fly on such a Sabbath, as should bind them but only in grieues and conscience.

Thus Chrift in this place acknowledgeth this day as a holy; for it is manifest that this flight happened about forty years after, when the Jewish Sabbath was gone. As therefore when God gave to the people the Law of the Sabbath on Mount Sinai, he said, Remember the Sabbath days to keep it holy; so to the Lord Jesus in the Mount of Olives, commands that they should faithfully remember even in their prayers, the Christian Sabbath many years before, lest

Ecc 3:7
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when the calamity came, its holy rest should be intercepted with the noise of wrangling tumults, and with a tumultuary flight.

Secondly, you say, that the fire was officer on the Lord's day in case of necessity was never held unlawful, but on that Sabbath it was.] If it were not unlawful to fly on the Lord's day in such cases, doth that make it is not inconvenient, and a grace to a Christian heart, to be forced that day to forget the worship of God, and move the Lord in his ordinances, and to take that day of his heavy wrath, in which he expects good news, to the end of his comfortings and foresight blessings? It was not unlawful to fly in the winter, yet it was needful to pray, that this flight might not then be; and was it ever unlawful in case of danger to fly on the Sabbath? Have you forgot all while you eagerly purify your own phantast? Then hold that being set upon by Thorns or enemies, it was lawful to fly that day, as Rabbi Thaibolwa teacheth in Horamis. St. 4. the old rule amongst them is known to all, Peril of life driveth away the Sabbath; and as well known is its practice in the Maccabees.

The Sabbath's day's journey, was not an allowance in case of danger, and a finite beyond which if they went, their judicial laws condemned them to death; as you ignorantly saugh.

Thirdly, you say that the name of Sabbath was never applied to the Lord's day, by any Apostle or other Christian, for many hundred years after Christ. The Apostle in Heb. 4. 9. doubted not to apply the name of Sabbath to the Christian people and our self, saying, That the People of God, have their Sabbath, and that name, or form, them.

Yet admit your strong consent had bin as strong a truth, what would follow thence? That our Saviour intended our Sabbath in that place of Matthew, because the Apostles call it the Lord's day? In no case. For the name of dedication in time of the Church, wherein the Saturday was called Sabbath, cannot either make the Apostles fail.

The seventh Section answered.

First, that at the time of the siege of Jerusalem all cere.-Zurah de sigis.

monies of the old law were deadly you deny, and we affirm: By sect. 10. (for our Saviour's death be not the time of the ceremonies deadline, you confess you lost your labour to the one half of your reply hereeto; indeed St. Hierom tells that for the period, but you have not answered one of his arguments but (so let that pass) the terms prefixed is this: Look when the Ceremonial law was dead throughout the whole world, it began at the same time to be deadly also through the world: now the ceremonial law was dead when the Gospel was published, for that obliging the other ceased to oblige, and that published, the other was utterly evacuated; therefore in that point of time in which a sufficient promulgation of the Gospel was accomplished, infantly the old law was deadly. This you partly allow when you lay in this Section; and not only dead they were, but deadly also (I confess) to Christians, to whom he was certainly revealed to be the Saviour. This time was before the eversion of Jerusalem as the Apostle testifieth in Col. 1. 6. that the Gospel was come unto and brought forth fruite also in all the world, and proclaimeth to the Churches that the Ceremonial law was deadly both in that Epistle to the Colossians and in the Epistle to the Galatians & 4. Galatians.

Secondly, for your assertion about the old Sabbath, that it did remain and was observed in the East Churches three hundred years and above, after our Saviour's death: it is utterly false, that it was observed either legally, or as a Sabbath, or in Obedience to the tenth Commandement. No such observation was Anathematized in the Council of Laodicea, and Ignatius charged the Christians to make much of that day. If you mean this observation was the performance of some religious duties publicly, then you might say.
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Dry every day in the week was observed religiously by them for that is known to many of the Greek fathers, as well as the Latins, preached every day, and Augustines and divers customs in the Churches. Some communicated at the Lords table every day, some on certain days, some on the ancient Sabbath and the Lords day, some on the Lord's day. But you must needs attend the Jewish observance of the Sabbath, for these words you add all ceremonies therefore, and particularly of the old Sabbath at the time by you mentioned, were not deadly.

Thirdly, and when you say that the name of Sabbath was not given in the Church to any other day than the Jews Sabbath for more hundred of yeers than three hundred, Augustines faith, So we also sanctifie the Sabbath he Lord saying, To shall not do any work therein.

The eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth Sections answered.

In the eighth Section you set forth (lamentable reports of Master Byfield, which you tooke in by recite, some about his Doctrine concerning last repentances of this the Church of England knoweth his wholesome propositions, implied in his books, on the Coflff, and on the first Epistle of Peter.

Some about his Discipline, as you terme it, but those in about Chester know his going in and out then among them.

In the fourth page of the Treatise, you tell of Rebellion against men laws and mischief to the commonwealth; and in the 53. page, that few drew for freely of this vexted age; all which cannot agree to a resolution of a private case; and those words whereby M. Byfield chargeth you, and you deny, viz., that this doctrine tended to the corrupting of the estate where your kindness and acquaintance and your life had lived, see express in a letter written, since the ninth, 1661. Therefore be fully charged you for charging him unjustly in these respects, and did not caluminate you.

The thirteenth Section answered.

That you did adjure Mr. Byfield, which yet you deny, will be manifest if your forms of speech in the end of your Treatise, and the nature of an Adjuration be compared together.

*An Adjuration* is an action in which the Name of God, or by his Name either we require an oath of any one whereby he should bind himself to do or not to do something: or we bind him to it by command or incency without an oath exacted, and that our desire may be more fully obtained, we interpose the Name of God.

Your words are thence, I challenge you as you will answer it at the judgment Seat of Almighty God, when your accounting shall come, to repair the error you have made in your Conscience. True, here you require not an oath to bind him to this; yet you require it with an interception of the Name of God, and a denunciation certly of God's anger, if he do it not, and so you fall under the second kind of Adjurations.

The fourteenth Section answered.

Here begin Mr. Byfields reasons, why he would not yield to answer the Treatise though adjured: Mr. Greenwood would relit them.

Take M. Byfields words together and they are a sufficient reason, for every stranglers vain challenge ought not to
be answered. Now this challenge of Mr. Burrewode was
vaine, because the injury was but a conceit, no reality,
and the doctrine of Mr. Burrewood abundantly answered in
writers at his hand. Thus all Mr. Burrewode's words are to
no purpose, and are mere heatings of the air.

By the way I note Mr. Burrewood's parentheses (no
man last curious or insatiable of other men's affaires) (neither was
I ever greatly inflamed with ambitious heat) they contain
in briefe large justifications of himselfe, but how rightfull,
this Treatise and Reply doe manifestly let one inference
here he required a reason for the injury and name done to
his Nephew and him for vexing his Conscience, and to con-
fuse the errour and injury, and in pag. 25. he confusth
and retracteth his own errour in judgement and manners
for provoking Mr. Bysfield about this point.

The fiftenth Section answered.

To this reason that Master Burrewood sought more
victory than truth, Master Borewode replieth that victory
will attend truth. I answer, it will, but one that seekes
victory more than truth, will winne over truth to reach at
victory: and that in your writing it may bee seene you
sought victory more than truth, appareth, for else you
would have answered the arguments found in the writings
of Divines in these cases about the Sabbath. And whereas
you say, if Master Bysfield nestle to Truth, be not as fer-
vour to Truth as your affection to victory, if it should not,
be no more than that which is found off-times in the best,
his nestle was as truth as fervent, though not attended
with an affection to it.

The sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth
Sections answered.

Master Burrewood undertakes to give him warrants to
warrant him in this worke, which Master Bysfield pleads he
could not finde; To which I answer, All his warrants
warrant not a Minister to leave the instrution of his charge
to write controversys of a private opinion, that infecteth nei-
ther his charge nor the Churches of Christ, no, nor where
the contending parties liveth: the case is altered, now this
Treatise hath broken prison.

Master Bysfield was no lover of contention, neither by na-
ture inclined, nor by custom purchased, and the Woe to them
by whom offensys come, is the wobbull portion of them that
give the offence. The Doctrine of our Saviour was an on-
ference to the covetous, envious, proud, hypocritical and blind
Pharisees; but yet no Woe, I hope, to him for this: Herein
this Worthy man was conformed to Christ, and yet is now
more conformed. God's Children suffer not all their affi-
sions while they live. Both these reasons therefore are
good and reasonable.

Furnishing with gifts is not always enough to make an
inward calling to a particular action, there must bee the
furnishing bee the action, the evidence of good to
issue from such an action, some sufficient notes of God's
separation of that man to that action; for all that are able
are not presently inwardly called to an action, and in a
word, a man's inclinations which may not be forced, and if
they springing not from a corruption ought to be heeded
nexte abilities. Master Bysfield then, though able might
not finde himselfe inwardly called.

How farre Master Bysfield was from Enthusiast (with which
you charge him proudly, contemptuously, and falsely, as
always lying lips can speake grievous things against the
Righteous) let all those that knew his preaching, and yet
found them could

may see it in his writing no man ever so exact in keeping
Scriptures, close to the express Word of God, so free from venting
or upholding matter of opinion.

Ps 2  The
The nineteenth Section answered.

Mather Byfield pleads necessities of his Answete, and referreth Mather Brewood to Master Greenham: he replieith Master Greenham impugneth not any of his Conclusions. No doth. Let us try the matter.

Mather Brewood teacheth our Sabbath day to be an ordinance in the Church. This Master Greenham impugneth as the Doctrine of the Papists, pag. 159. Master Brewood teacheth that light works were never forbidden on the Sabbath, and that the rest for Christ's sake was ceremonial. Master Greenham teacheth that light works are forbidden in the Commandment, as light oaths are in the third, pag. 161. (A light in keeping the Sabbath and full of light, oaths.) and that the rest of the Sabbath is as needful for us as for the Jews, pag. 156. Mather Brewood teacheth that servants have not the Commandment given to them, and that they are for labour equally in subjection unto beasts. Master Greenham teacheth that no envious calling (and such for the servants) implies any necessity of forgoing the worship of God on the Sabbath: and that to make the servants equal to beasts on the Sabbath is but to tell, not thinking whether they are going, pag. 163. your reasons also are answered most of them in that Treatise of Master Greenham.

That way, shall I say, with the tricking in of Master Greenham, that his affection was better than his judgment, abundantly refutes the pride of your friends. But this is ill with the loose Atheistical spirits of our times, to account of all they call Particular, for no great Scholler.

The 20. and 21. Section answered.

These give sufficient testimony of Master Byfield: modesty and wit done, and of Master Brewood's boldnes and rash confines, and therefore I turn them over.

The 22. and 23. Section answered.

That Master Brewood would quittance God's people, (as Master Byfield chargeth him,) was apparent (though he goeth so) for he had sent the Treatise to Master Ratcliffe of Cleverfield, with these words in his Letter with which it was sent: I have sent the Treatise unto you, that you might, if you please, read it, and after make it up, and as soon as you can deliver it. And afterwards in that Letter he giveth him informations in the reading of it, to read with leisure and attendance, with the like I have the original of this Letter, dated June 20. 1611.

And that Master Brewood's opinion is private, is clear, because no man ever so interpreted the commandment touching servants, save himself; and how ill it agreeeth with the reason of the commandment, let the indifferent judge by the answere I have given to this Treatise. When you say therefore, that those determinations of yours have every where resounded in the Church of God, this is false, unless the Papacy be the Church, or Anabaptists, and Familists. For what if Master Broad, and two or three more make a declaration, is that sufficient to make the Doctrine public? The publick Doctrine of the Church of England I have heaved out of the book of Homilies and the Commonbooke, and all other famous Lights in our Church. For my pains I look not for thanks from your side, much lees such a reward as a 1000 of books worth a 1000 French crowns.

The 24. Section answered.

Mather Byfield would that Master Brewood should have spared his verdict about the fitnesse of Doctrine that should here be taught till he had charge of foules. Master Brewood hath now to, Ordination conferred outward abilities to exercise the position of a Pastor or Deacon in the Church, but no inward ability: this is somewhat of truth, but
but not all the truth, for it causeth more adopted thoughts for the people's edification, in cherishing a special interest in God's promises to ministers, in the discharge of their function, which are not few, or of small effects.

The 25. Section answered.

What a childish exception is this, Lastly after finally. Could not you see that finally ends the reason against your demand and challenge of an answer, and lastly concludes the letter? Your spirit would not have spared Paul but have given him a jeer if he had stood in your way. In the Epistle to the Philippians he faith finally my brethren, chap. v. ver. 1. and again, finally brethren, chap. 4. ver. 8.

Why charge you him of ignoble boldness to deceive others, when yet your selfe never faile but one sense infected, namely your sinfulness, pag. 80. And there too your selfe failest you, and your selfe acknowledged it a little before in pag. 97.

And where is your zeal and charity to hide such a precious truth as you thought this to be, and not to impart it to others for their good?

The conclusion of the Answer to the Reply.

But it may be the Publisher's zeal and charity was great and good, he would not, nor take such a piece. His zeal, to the law to fire out one precept of the decalogue, & make God a liar who said, with lively voice ten commandments, he gave his charity, to servants that they might be under their masters, and not under God's command up the day of the Dale of God's grace and blessings chiefly spiritual. His zeal to the Lord Christ, to great sinner to afford him his right in Royalty over his own day. His charity to M. Byfield that in such a distance of time found both opportunity to vent this hastily yet dead, rotten, and forgotten birth. His charity to the Church, that this should be the Doner of such a gift out of a plenary power to elevate it to its Dignity, worth, and use, and then below it on the Lord. His zeal to his own promotion in the Church, for can any think it some pure love to M. Byfield, and not rather to his own ends? Balaams wages would guilt even Balaams way. But I hope thee will find no Balaams in this famous Church. His zeal and charity to M. Brewerwood, that would have none of his writings perished nor, this which himselfe had buried in oblivion, or else entombed his own faith and promise before himselfe was interred for thee, I produce thee here a letter of his own hand writing, imprinted after the original word for word, which runneth thus:

To my approved very good Friend and loving Cofin, M. Byfield, John Ractcliffe, Alderman of Chester, at his house in the North Gate Street, give this with speed.

At Chester.

God Cofin, I heartily salute you, and your Wife, and little Ones, and beseech Almighty God to bless both you and them. I have received the money by Grange with your Letter. For the twenty pound I have lent my Mother an acquaintance here indebted, which I pray you to deliver her. There was thirteeen pound over, which I delivered to my Nephew Robert, and will him to have the like care of your discharge. I heartily thank you for your care and pains in my behaile, about the sending of that money. Touching my Nephew John, whether he justly charged M. Byfield or no, (the one affirming it) let the just Judge of all men, and of all causes determine, to whose sentence, and the testimonies of their owne consciences I leave it. Notwithstanding, I think I had good reasons to persuade me, it was as my Nephew said, For, first, I saw he loved and respected M. Byfield very much. Secondly, as it seemd, it came from him some-

a I think he should have befriended M. Byfield before his Nephew's thes.
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somewhat unwillingly, as if he were a fain to procure Master Byfield any displeasure. Thirdly, other Chefter men reported the like opinions to have grown in their servants, and they laid the blame on him. "Fourthly, I perceived by Master Byfield's last letter, his judgment was, that works on the Sabbath (chose at least that might imply breach of Sabbath, whatsoever works those were) thought not be performed by servants, albeit their Masters commanded them. Confounding, as I thought, many things unskillfully, which should more carefully be distinguished. As first, the persons to whom, and the persons of whom the commandment was given. Secondly, the workes which servants do of their owne free motion, and those which they doe by their masters imposition. Thirdly, the Lords day (in relation to God's commandment) with the old Sabbath, as also the breach of Sabbath, with breach of the commandment of the Sabbath, and the like. And although you remember not for your part, nor my own, your wife, the proposing of any such cafe at your table, where hee saw it done; yet it is like he should best remember it, whom it nearest touched: that it should, I say, have deepest impression in his remembrance, as it had been in your mind. And yet whether in truth the vexation of his conscience, were the cause of that discontent, or he made (as you say) A stratagem of religion, to cloke some other secret device, I am not able to determine, but must referre it to him that is the seacher and Judge of all secrets. But yet I should be for his hee should add also that horrible hypocrisie to his other faults. And yet as I dare not accuse him, so neither am I able perfectly to clear and excuse him off. (Notwithstanding the outward show and pretence, hee continued to make of religion more than ever hee did.) I flow with all his disobedience, his deuention, his impudence, his felle conceit, his contempt of his friends and their counsel, not to be continued only, but increas'd: Evil Enriquest indeed as it feemes to me, of a sanctified and religious heart, knowing, as I doe, the fruits of God's spirit, to be meetenes, peace, long...

touching the time of Institution.

suffering gentlenesse, and fuch like, which can not inhabit with the other in one soule. Gods holy will bee done in him, whose mercy I daily by my prayers sollicite for him, and in the infiniteness of Gods mercy alone is all the remainders of my hope. Now touching the difference between Master Byfield and my selfe, the protecting whereof you earnestly will me to cease, you shall obtaine of me, Sense, to cease, were it a greater matter, so there proceeded from him no further cause to provoke mee. Evil I with him none at all, not the falling of a hair from him, although I have freely reprehended that, which I look to bee amiss in his Doctrine by my first letter, and in humbleness by my letter, which I hope above this, you have receiv'd and deliv'd him. If my writing of all too much sharpnesse contrary to my ordinary disposition, the grief I conceived of my Nephews mildtemper, of which I know no other occasion, and his refusing to satisfie me, where I had reason to require, and his returning me in head of that satisfaction, hard language, were the causes of it. But seeing he hath not the minde, or (as you say) the leisure to yield me that satisfaction, which I wished, and which I should have indueved to have given him on the like occasion; and withall I see you do desire to appease the quarrel, I am content to leave all as it is. Let him satisfie himself, and I have done. Yet thus farre will I let me, if not satisfie, yet excuse my passion to you, Colen, who have some Nephews of your owne, and know the condition of my Nephew, how hard it was to bring him into a good course, and how apt he was to runne into an ill, being withall a fatherless and motherless Orphan. Imagine, I say, how the rue, or great likelihood of ruine of such a one, having the like relation to your selfe, that that Youth to me, and being left by his dead Friends to your care, would have affected you so, or this case of this very Youth, would have affected his Father, or Grandfather, if they had been alive. But howeyer, I tremit all with all my heart. Master Byfield shall never have more of it from me. And so I would speech.
advice him alfo, to lay aside all rancour and bitterness, and in the Name of God proceed in the Ministry and service of God. As for me, he may without any impeach- ment, notwithstanding this, or any other dislike of mine, concerning the sending of his letter back, out of which I charged him with some points; I must intreat you to give me some respect to advice for my last letter to him; I have charged him with these points, whereas, while I have the letter, I am able to justify I have not wronged him; but if the letter were out of my hands, I stand at his work for the imputation of a slander, in charging him with that, which I cannot (the letter gone) be able to prove. But this I will promise & assure you Colen, on my honest word, which I never have for ought I know, and never will by the grace of God break with you, that his letter shall never turn him to any prejudice at all; and therewith I pray you rest contented till I can otherwise determine. The other letter of my Nephews to your wife, I am forced also a little to defere, Master Stilpon cannot yet finde it, yet he is assured it is in his Counselling-house, and promiseth he shall affirme have it, on his next leisure to search it out. I am glad with all my heart of the forme God hath given you, which I believe to send you more, to increase your comfort more, and to bleffe this he hath now given you, with long life, and with the grace of his holy spirit, which may ever grow up with him. To God good nad; I commend you all, in much haste, July 27.

Your ever true and affered loving friend,

Edward Brewood.

Mr. Brewood kept his word; but the more hath this Publisher wronged him. He shewed in truth neither charity nor meafure in writing this book so long after the decease of their two learned men, & in this finking at the repute of a grave Divine, that through indignity cast on his person, witty.