



Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

BV 130 .C7 1853
Cox, Robert, 1810-1872.
Sabbath laws and sabbath
duties

Number

SABBATH LAWS

AND

SABBATH DUTIES.



SABBATH LAWS AND SABBATH DUTIES

CONSIDERED IN RELATION

TO

THEIR NATURAL AND SCRIPTURAL GROUNDS.

AND TO

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

✓
BY ROBERT COX.

“ I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say.”—*St Paul to the Corinthians.*

EDINBURGH :
MACLACHLAN AND STEWART ;
AND SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., LONDON.

MDCCCLIII.

NEILL AND CO., PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

P R E F A C E.

THE circumstances which have led to the publication of this volume, will appear from the "Plea for Sunday Trains" which holds in it the most conspicuous place, but which serves chiefly to introduce a series of dissertations upon subjects of far wider and more permanent interest than its own.

The leading topic here discussed is the Sabbath question; but around it, and for its elucidation, many kindred themes of much interest and importance have gathered. What I have aimed at producing, is a treatise in which the lights of modern science and modern biblical learning should be brought to bear upon the matters in dispute. If by means of those lights it is possible to expose and counteract the unobtrusive errors of some, the disingenuous misrepresentations of others, and the well-meaning sophistry, ignorance, and presumption of a third class of zealous Sabbatarians, the cause of truth may be a gainer by the discussion.

I have endeavoured, moreover, to recal the attention of divines and serious laymen to the much neglected but increasingly fruitful field of Natural Religion. From its diligent culture there is reason to hope for a rich harvest of good to mankind. In particular, we may learn in it more and more how to spend beneficially the leisure of the Sabbath.

Lastly,—and above all,—I have embraced so fit an opportunity to enforce those lauded, but imperfectly

practised principles of religious liberty, which are involved in this and several other questions of the day. In executing this part of the design, I have laid largely under contribution the writings of those great men by whom, in former times, the foundations of our freedom were consolidated; and it is hoped that the sound sense, noble sentiments, and vigorous diction, which the selected passages display, will tend to foster the reviving interest in so solid and admirable a department of English literature.

In the Plea for Sunday Trains, I have forborne, as carefully as when it was originally spoken, to introduce any inquiry into the theological basis of the Sabbath. The sole ground on which my stand continues to be taken there, is the *civil right* of the public to the use of the Railway on Sunday—a ground thought sufficient, independently of theological questions, to support firmly the conclusion that is built upon it. In the subsequent portions of the volume, however, the Sabbatarians are encountered on their chosen field of Scripture; and I humbly suggest that should the agitation be resumed in the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, it may conduce alike to the advancement of religious truth, and to the saving of much valuable time to men of business, if the theological part of the controversy be henceforth conducted exclusively through the medium of the pulpit, the platform, and, best of all, the press. For what good purpose can be served by reiterating, to intelligent men, assertions and arguments which to many of them are superfluous, and to others are merely what they have long since considered and rejected?

Of the few theological discussions which occur in Note C, some may at first sight appear to be altogether out of place in a treatise on the Sabbath. But if

a chief purpose of our weekly holiday be the refreshment and enjoyment of man—as that of the Jewish Sabbath assuredly was—it cannot be impertinent to inquire into the tendency of any doctrine that is frequently delivered from our pulpits, to promote or to hinder so important an end. And this I with the less hesitation maintain, because we are constantly told by teachers of the views criticised, that it is a Christian duty to attend regularly the churches where they are the instructors, instead of following our own judgment (if at variance with theirs) as to the most beneficial way of spending the day of rest. Nay, the present clerical crusade against the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday, and the sailing of a steamboat on the Clyde for the recreation of citizens of Glasgow upon that their only day of leisure, is an invitation to every man capable of thinking, to discuss, in connection with what is more strictly “the Sabbath question,” the quality of the spiritual food administered by the agitators. The opinion is now rapidly spreading amongst us, that much of what is delivered as religious truth in Calvinistic churches not only has no title to the character it assumes, but counteracts the beneficial influence of the Sabbath; and holding that opinion myself, I cannot but consider it a duty to oppose (as I have done with the help of theologians whose talents, erudition, and piety, well entitle them to be heard) certain views of the character and government of the Deity, which, if at variance, as I believe them to be, with natural religion and the doctrine of Jesus, ought to be freely and openly examined. Another object which has occasionally been in view, is to lead some to consider whether it is worth while to occupy so much time, and to excite so much bitter feeling, as we do, in discussing abstruse points of scholastic divinity

about which the best and wisest men have come, and apparently will always come, to discordant conclusions. Surely it is high time that Christians should cease to torment themselves with the notion that a right decision upon such questions is of vital importance to their welfare ; and that the clergy, instead of wasting their strength in fruitless logomachy, should labour more exclusively and earnestly in that department of duty which Bishop Butler lays out for them in a sermon elsewhere quoted: “ Our province,” says he, “ is virtue and religion, life and manners ; the science of improving the temper, and making the heart better. This is the field assigned us to cultivate ; how much it has lain neglected is indeed astonishing.”

EDINBURGH, *11th September 1853.*

CONTENTS.

A PLEA FOR SUNDAY TRAINS ON THE EDINBURGH AND GLASGOW RAILWAY,		Page 1
Civil right of the public to the use of the Sunday trains,	2	
Protestant principles applicable to the case,	3	
Exceptional Sunday labour, including that of railway-travelling,	4-6	
Grounds of the public right to Sunday trains,	7	
Utility of those trains,	10	
Suppose that Jews had the management of the railway, and were to stop the trains on Saturday,	10	
What reply could you make to their reasons (which would be your own), but an assertion of the principles now practically repudiated?	13	
Let us do as we would be done to,	15	
The Sabbath not endangered by Sunday trains,	16	

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—THE VICTORIES OF THE SABBATARIANS,	17
Agitation in the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company for the re-establishment of passenger-carriages in the Sunday trains,	17
How the Board managed to give the Sabbatariaus a victory at the Meeting in August 1849,	19
Protest of certain Shareholders against the manœuvre,	20
Comments of the Press, &c.,	21-25
Proceedings at the Meetings in March and August 1850,	25
How the Directors may easily ascertain the opinion of their constituents,	26
NOTE B.—THE RIGHT TO ACT ACCORDING TO ONE'S RELIGIOUS BELIEF,	26
Reply to a charge of the Rev. Dr Lorimer,	26
The charge retorted upon him and his friends,	27

The principles of religious liberty long since shewn to give
 no such sanction as is alleged to vices and atrocities, Page 28
 Locke's exposition of the sphere of the Magistrate's authority, 29
 Application of the principle to the question in hand, 30

NOTE C.—GOD'S TRUTH AND MAN'S TRUTH, . 31

Two meanings of " Truth " distinguished and illustrated, 31
 The private judgment of every man is his standard of re-
 ligious truth, 32
 The " religious truth " of individuals often undergoes change, 34
 Cases of Baxter, 34, 49; Milton, 36; Whitby, 37;
 Chillingworth, 39, 50; Clarke, 42; Sir Isaac
 Newton, 43; Lardner, Belsham, &c., 47; Usher,
 48; Hales, 48; and a scholar mentioned by Dr
 Owen, 50
 Reflections on such cases, 51-53
 Doctrine of original sin and the corruption of human
 nature, 39-42
 Influence of extension of one's religious studies, 50-53
 Contrasts between the " religious truth " of different na-
 tions; as England and Scotland, Scotland and Germany, 53-54
 The Sabbath in Germany and Holland, 55
 Sabbatarian practice of ignoring certain passages in St Paul, 56-61
 The " truths " of one generation frequently become errors
 in the next, 56
 Romanism long the " religious truth " of all Western
 Europe, 58
 The motion of the Sun round the Earth, once an in-
 dubitable " religious truth," 60
 The existence of witchcraft, formerly a " religious
 truth " in Britain, 64
 The creation of the universe in six days, a " religious
 truth " down to the present time, 72
 The Hebrew cosmogony now discovered to be
 at variance with established facts of science, 74
 Effect of this discovery on the interpretation
 of the narrative of the creation in Genesis, 89-93
 The copy of the Fourth Commandment in
 Exod. xx. 8-11 must be abandoned, and
 that in Deut. v. 12-15 preferred, 95
 Both copies cannot be genuine, 97
 Extravagant assertions of sundry evangelical
 writers as to the Hebrew cosmogony, &c., 99
 The argument that Geology is an immature
 science considered, 106
 Difficulty of ascertaining God's truth, 106
 Consequent natural tendency of mankind to repose on some
 fancied infallible authority, 107
 Roman Catholic notion of the Infallibility of the Pope, 107
 Protestants not exempt from the error of implicit reliance on
 human authority, 108

Abject deference formerly paid to the authority of Aristotle and Hippocrates in Philosophy and Medicine,	Page 109
Men of Science now liberated from such bondage,	110-111
In Theology, emancipation is still to come,	112
Alleged tests of truth,	113
Test of "general consent,"	113
Its uselessness,	113
Employment of this test by a Sabbatarian writer,	114
Reply to his argument,	115-116
The rights of laymen asserted,	117
Doctrine of the Church of England and the Reformers concerning the Sabbath,	118
Doctrine of John Knox,	123
Difficulty of knowing which is "the true Church,"	125
Divine right claimed alike by Episcopacy and Presbytery,	126
Who shall decide when doctors disagree?	128
Practical lesson from the diversity of religious opinions,	128
Loeke on the duty of unprejudiced investigation,	130
In Scotland, the Westminster Confession virtually the standard of religious truth,	132
History of the Westminster Assembly,	133
No such authority claimed by it as that with which it has been invested,	138
Completion of its Confession and Catechism,	139
Circumstances tending to bias the assembled Divines in their interpretation of Scripture,	141
The distracted character of the times,	141
Reaction against the Prelatic government of oppressors,	141
Reaction against their aggressive Arminianism,	142
Reaction against the Anti-Sabbatarianism of the authors and abettors of the Book of Sports,	142-154
History of the Book of Sports, and exposure of Sabbatarian misrepresentations concerning it,	142-149
The old Puritans ignorant of the principles of religious liberty,	150
Two different systems of "religious truth" endowed by the State in England and Scotland,	151
Demand by members of the dominant sect in Scotland, that the public funds shall be applied to the exclusive support of the tenets of that sect, as "God's truth,"	153
The infallibility thus virtually claimed is nevertheless disavowed in the abstract,	154
Noble protest of Milton against the authority of Ecclesiastical Councils,	155
Superiority of modern helps to the interpretation of Scripture over those enjoyed by the Westminster Divines,	155
The true principles of interpretation unknown to the Puritans at the time of the Assembly,	158
Their introduction by Owen and Locke,	158
Folly of setting up the Westminster Confession as a standard of truth,	160

Effects of the erroneous mode of exegesis of the old theologians,	Page 162
Their mistaken notion that the Jewish law is in some degree binding on the Gentiles,	164
Whether <i>now</i> binding even on the Jews,	166
Special proof that the Fourth Commandment was an exclusively Jewish law,	167
Revival of Judaism in the Christian Church about the beginning of the 16th century,	173
This corruption transmitted through the Puritans to ourselves,	174
Belief of Knox and others that idolaters ought to be extirpated,	176
Notion that the Fourth Commandment is of universal and perpetual obligation,	180
Notion that the capital punishment of murder is prescribed to us by the Bible,	189
Notion that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is sinful,	190
Old notion that the Divine right of kings is countenanced by the Mosaic law,	195
In what respects the Mosaic Law is of value to the Gentiles,	196
The Decalogue represented by the Sabbath Alliance as the only stable foundation of morality,	196
This notion controverted,	197
The law of nature and the law of Christ are the true foundations of duty to Christians,	197
The law of nature the perpetual and universal law,	198
Its obligation acknowledged by the Sabbatarians when they find it expedient to do so,	200
Resemblance of their conduct to that of the Jesuits,	210
The proposition controverted, that, if you slight the Sabbath, you slight religion, and strike at the roots of morality,	212
Bad effect of setting up factitious sins,	213
Prevalence of religious insincerity, or cant,	214
Alleged favourable influence of Sabbath-observance on sobriety,	215
Alleged moral character of the Sabbath law,	217
Natural laws embodied in the Jewish code, bind us only by their own independent authority,	222
Stated seasons of repose from labour, the spirit of the Jewish Sabbath,	225
Ambiguity of the word "moral,"	227
The opening of the Crystal Palace on Sundays, improperly affirmed to be "immoral,"	228
The reverse is the fact,	229
Recreations on the Sabbath were not forbidden to the Jews,	229
Church-attendance <i>versus</i> Visits to the Crystal Palace,	229
Reform needed in public worship, and in the doctrines preached by the clergy,	230

Not the Fourth Commandment but the law of nature enjoins public worship,	Page 234
The law of nature prescribes also rural recreation on Sundays to the inhabitants of towns,	235
Health conducive to happiness and virtue,	237
The province of the clergy declared by Bishop Butler to be virtue and religion, life and manners,	239
Means of attaining success therein,	240
A Layman's observations on the Crystal Palace,	240
Uniformity of religious opinion impossible,	242
Consequent unreasonableness of persecution,	243
Natural diversity of minds,	244
Beneficial effects of variety of opinion,	251-3
Disingenuous subscription of Articles of Faith,	252
Protestant intolerance,	254
Knox's Confession abandoned by the Scottish Puritans 200 years ago : May not, and ought not, we to abandon theirs ?	256
Protestantism a protest against the principle of <i>authority</i> in religion,	256
Its character is <i>movement</i> ,	256
Confessions and Articles have signally failed to produce uni- formity of faith,	259
No opinions can much longer survive, unless capable of stand- ing the test of reason and morality,	260
New Reformation of Religion now in progress,	261
Encouragement to proceed boldly in the work,	263
Probability that among the notions about to be generally abandoned, is belief in the obligation of the Fourth Commandment upon Gentile Christians,	267
NOTE E.—THE DUTY OF PRESERVING HEALTH,	
Man's need of rest from labour,	268
Evidence of Dr Farre on this subject,	268
The clergy, railway-servants, and others who work on Sunday, should rest on another day,	270
Admirable provision made for the health of the work-people of Price's Patent Candle Company, London,	270
Repose needed by mental as well as bodily labourers,	272
Importance of physiology as a branch of general education,	273
Bad effects of keeping people (especially children) within doors on Sundays,	275
Sunday's leisure needed for intellectual cultivation,	277
And for the enlivenment of the social and religious affections,	278
Natural grounds of public worship,	278
Active recreation needful, as well as rest,	279
NOTE F.—HISTORY OF MODERN SABBATARIANISM,	
The Mosaic Sabbath long continued to be observed by Hebrew Christians,	279
But the general opinion in the early Church was, that all the Mosaic ordinances were abolished,	280

The Lord's Day not then identified with the Sabbath,	Page 281
Afterwards it was figuratively so called,	281
Origin of observance of the Lord's Day, and ancient mode of keeping it,	282
Doctrine of the Church of England respecting it,	282, 291
How the Fourth Commandment attained its prominent position in modern times,	283, 288
Views of St Augustine and the Schoolmen about the Sabbath,	284-5
Views of Continental Reformers,	285-7
Views of English Reformers,	287-9
Effect of placing the Fourth Commandment in the English Liturgy, A. D. 1552,	289
The first Confession of the Church of Scotland free from Sabbatarianism,	292
Till the close of the 16th century, Sabbatarian practice exceptional in England,	292
Plays and bear-baitings there on Sundays,	293
Other recreations,	294
Progress of their decline,	295
Seventh-day Sabbatarians in the reigns of James I. and Charles I.,	297
Sunday recreations in Scotland during the latter half of the 16th century,	298
Rise of the Puritan Sabbath,	301
Progress of Sabbatarianism in England,	304
Opposition to it there,	305
Its origin and progress in Scotland,	306
Punishment of Sabbath-breaking by the Kirk-sessions,	307
Prohibition of walking and other modes of recreation on the Lord's Day,	311
Salmon-fishing on Sunday at Aberdeen,	313
Earthquake thought to be a judgment for this,	313
Great and sudden calamities viewed by the ignorant as punishments for sin,	313
Tyranny of the Kirk-sessions in Scotland,	314
Presbyterian intolerance in the 17th century,	315
Civil and ecclesiastical regulations for Sabbath-observance in divers parts of Scotland,	317-18
Dr Cook's uncandid observations on the Book of Sports,	218
Southey's accurate representation of the case,	321
Controversies excited by the republication of the Book of Sports in the reign of Charles I.,	321
Leading varieties of opinion then maintained about the Sabbath,	322
Opinion preferred by the Westminster Assembly, and handed down as "God's truth" to us,	325
Folly and arrogance of <i>imposing</i> it as such upon those who regard it as error,	326
Baxter's treatise on the Lord's Day,	327
How far do apostolic precepts and practice bind <i>us</i> ?	328
Tyrannical legislation of the Puritans for Sabbath-observance,	331

Their ordinance in 1647 for the abolition of Church-festivals,	Page 332
English Acts of Parliament for the observance of Sunday,	333-4
Sabbath-observance after the Restoration,	334
In the eighteenth century,	335
Influence of the French Revolution in reviving Puritanism in Britain,	335
Efforts of the Church of Scotland since 1794 for the promotion of Sabbath-observance,	338-41
Old Scottish Acts of Parliament and of Assembly,	339
Hell-fire threatened by the Assembly in 1834 for walking in the fields and taking recreation on Sundays,	341
Sir Andrew Agnew's agitation for the better observance of the Sabbath,	342
Report of his Committee of the House of Commons in 1832,	342
Duty of the Legislature in regard to the Sabbath,	343
Sabbath-breaking said to be the first step to crime,	345
Opinions of the Bishop of London and Sir R. Peel on Sabbath legislation,	347
Sir Andrew Agnew's Bill,	348
Its preamble discussed,	348
Alleged necessity of "protection" to traders and servants,	349
"Weak brethren" have <i>duties</i> as well as <i>rights</i> ,	351
Popular objection that Sir Andrew proposed to interfere with the enjoyments of only the poor,	352
Cases of a barber's apprentice and a Sunday steamboat at Dundee,	353
Discussion on Sir Andrew's Bill at his moving its second reading,	354
His policy of reiteration,	355
Debates on the Bill in 1837, when its second reading was for the first time carried,	357
Elation of the Sabbatarians at so large a measure of success,	357
Sudden and "inscrutable" termination of Sir Andrew's career as a legislator,	358
His subsequent ubiquitous activity out of Parliament,	358
Agitation under his auspices against Sunday trains,	360
How success was suddenly achieved in the case of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway,	361
"The eyes of all God-fearing people" turned thereupon to "the wonder-working hand of the Almighty,"	362
Dr Arnold's opposition to "all God-fearing people,"	363
How do the Sabbatarians <i>know</i> upon what special occasions miracles are wrought for them?	364
Baxter's rebuke of the modern Pharisees,	365
Selden, Bishop Newton, Dr Chalmers, and Samuel Butler, quoted to the like effect,	365-6
Agitation against Sunday-labour in the Post-office,	366
Foundation of the Sabbath Alliance in 1847,	367
Diversity of opinion in the Evangelical Alliance about the grounds of the Sabbath,	367
Sabbath-desecration in France and Germany,	368-370
Death and character of Sir Andrew Agnew,	370

Agitation about the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday,	Page 371
Resolutions of meetings of working-men in London,	371
Chimerical fears for the safety of the Lord's Day,	372
NOTE G.—CLERICAL DOGMATISM AND LAY SERVILITY, 373	
Natural grounds of authority and obedience,	373
The love of power too weak in some, and too strong in others,	373
Utility of that affection, and of the passions in general,	374
Consequences of excessive love of power, especially in the ignorant,	375
The clerical station conducive to growth of self-complacency and love of power,	376
Arrogance of the Romish priesthood,	376
Liability of Protestants to belie their principles by a tacit assumption of infallibility,	376
Treatment of Jews, Dissenters, Roman Catholics, Deists, and Atheists in Protestant Communities,	376-7
Popish spirit of the Reformers,	378
“ Authority in matters of faith” claimed by the Church of England,	379-81
Authority of the Church of Scotland,	379
Baxter's recommendation of humility to the clergy,	381-2
Ridiculous figure made by them when they carry pulpit-airs of superiority into secular life,	382
Advice given them by Sharon Turner and Bishop Watson,	383
Servility to the clergy a prevalent vice among laymen,	383
Dr Chalmers' rebuke of this and other Popish vices, to his congregation in Glasgow,	383-5
Servile deference to human systems of theology,	385
The <i>proper</i> influence of the clergy lessened by their own slavery to Articles and Confessions of Faith,	386
Other bad effects of subscription of Articles,	387
Corporate and party ties impair the influence of clerical teaching and advocacy,	388
It is diminished also by their exposure to “ pressure from without,” applied by weak and ignorant devotees,	389
Urgent solicitation of the clergy by the Sabbath Alliance,	389
Disingenuous timidity of <i>learned</i> theologians,	391
Necessity of candour in the present age of free inquiry,	391
Source of clerical antagonism to secular instruction,	391
Short-sighted impolicy of this opposition,	392
Improvement of the American clergy consequent on the education of the people,	393
They still, however, suppress known truth in deference to the prejudices of the ignorant,	394
Imperfection of religious liberty in the United States,	394
National education the remedy,	395
Necessity of un fettering the clergy in Great Britain, in order to make them cordial friends of popular education,	396
Their character must deteriorate, unless the present tests be relaxed,	396

Demoralizing tendency of disingenuous subscription of Articles of Faith,	Page 397
Other evils from the practice of subscription,	397
Creeds and Confessions fathered by Baxter on the devil,	398

NOTE H.—WHAT ARE “THE FEELINGS AND OPINIONS OF THE SCOTTISH PEOPLE” IN REGARD TO SUNDAY TRAINS?	400
---	-----

Professed inducement of the Directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway to their Sabbatarian proceedings,	400
Instructive discussion at a meeting of the Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway Company, in March 1853,	400
Indications of public opinion through the press, Town Councils, and Mr Blackadder’s canvass for a civic honour in Edinburgh,	403
Appeal to the Directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company	404

NOTE I.—THE GROUNDS OF LEGISLATION FOR SUNDAY TRAINS,	404
---	-----

Mr Joseph Locke’s Bill in 1849, to secure to the public on Sundays a limited and reasonable use of railways,	404
Speeches of Mr Labouchere,	404, 405, 409
Speeches of Sir G. Grey, and Messrs Wortley, Ellice, and Aglionby,	405
Speeches of Sir F. Buxton and Mr H. Drummond,	406
The principles of the question discussed,	406
Vote-manufacture carried on by the Sabbatarians in Railway Companies,	408
Second reading of Mr Locke’s Bill,	408
Speeches of Mr Hume and Lord Advocate Rutherford,	409
Ground of Mr Labouchere’s hostile vote: That the measure was offensive to the feelings of a large body of the Scottish people,	409
The Sabbatarians much more noisy than powerful in Scotland,	409-10
Legislation now proved to be imperatively necessary,	410
Selden on the pious shift of escaping from contracts by the aid of Scripture,	411

NOTE J.—PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE LICENCE OF SUNDAY TRAVELLERS,	411
---	-----

The proposal publicly and seriously made, that a Committee of Saints should be established for this purpose,	411
Scotland has need of a Burns,	411

NOTE K.—THE CAUSES AND CURE OF DRUNKENNESS,	411
---	-----

First cause—morbid propensity for intoxicating liquor,	411
Second cause—defective nutrition, accompanied by hard labour,	412
Third cause—a flow of exuberant spirits in want of an outlet,	413

Remedies proposed,	Page 412-15
Need of increased attention to sanitary improvement in Great Britain,	414
And of a diminution of hard work, with an increase of the means of recreation,	415
Knowledge of human nature needs to be diffused,	415
Causes of the comparative sobriety of the French,	415
Importance of recreation as a means of diminishing intemperance,	417
Gloomy religious views foster this vice,	417
Religious insanity,	418
Drunkenness can be cured only in accordance with the maxim, <i>Sublatá causá, tollitur effectus</i> ,	418
NOTE L.—RECREATION A SABBATH-DUTY,	420
To the refreshment of <i>repose</i> (which was the only thing expressly provided to the Jews by the Fourth Commandment), that of active <i>recreation</i> should be added,	420
What is meant by recreation,	420
Its necessity to those who labour,	421
Religion not hostile to amusement,	423
The natural desire of excitement and enjoyment should be reasonably gratified,	424
The most agreeable kinds of recreation are the most attainable and improving,	424
Study of Natural History and Philosophy,	424
Reading,	425
Eloquence and the drama,	427
Society and conversation,	428
Music,	429
Natural scenery and sounds,	430-2
Gardens,	432-3
Doctrine of the Westminster Catechism that recreations are forbidden in the Fourth Commandment,	433
On the contrary, it virtually <i>enjoins</i> them,	433
Generous feeding, a sufficiency of sleep, and the refreshment of bathing, are also virtually enjoined,	433
Joyous character of Mosaic festivals, including the Sabbath,	433-6
Misinterpretation of Isaiah lviii. 13, 14, by the Puritans,	437
Michaelis on the necessity of festivals to mankind,	437
His defence of amusements on Sunday,	438
What kinds of work were forbidden in the Fourth Commandment?	439
Were <i>mental</i> labour, and <i>fighting</i> , prohibited?	439
Visiting and feasting said by a Puritan writer to be "awful violations" of the Sabbath; if so, Jesus himself set an example of its profanation,	439
Cooking unlawful on the Sabbath among the Jews,	440
Principal Lee's denial of the gloomy character of the Puritan Sabbath in the 17th century,	440
His assertion that "the time of the Covenanters was a period	

of great religious light, and of great strictness and purity of morals,"	Page 440
Its inaccuracy shewn from the evidence of the General Assembly, Oliver Cromwell, Nicoll's Diary, the parochial registers, Hugh Binning, Principal Baillie, and several Acts of Parliament,	441-6
Attempts of the two Drs M'Crie to lessen the weight of portions of this testimony,	444-5
The Sabbatarianism of the Puritans condemned by its fruits,	446
Happiness conducive to virtue, and misery to vice,	448
Benefits derivable from Sunday trains,	449
Evidence of the Rev. John Griffith on their behalf,	449
His appeal to the Clergy,	450

NOTE M.—GOD'S VENGEANCE AGAINST SABBATH-BREAKERS, 450

Pernicious errors promulgated by Sabbatarians about Sabbath-observance as the passport to worldly prosperity,	450
The true sources of prosperity quoted from Solomon,	451
Dr Bruce's notion of the method of God's government,	452
The Puritan Sabbath acknowledged by Wilberforce to be a heavy day, even to well-disposed people,	452
Dr Lorimer's theory of the downfall of the Stewarts,	453
Arrogance and ignorance of pretenders to knowledge of the secret counsels of the Almighty,	453-6

NOTE N.—THE SCOTTISH MEMORIALS AGAINST SUNDAY TRAINS, 457

These memorials signed chiefly by the ignorant,	457
Many of the signatures forged,	458
Exposure made at meeting of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company in 1842,	459
Further exposures,	460
Unseemly assertion of the present Dr M'Crie about the fabricated memorials,	461
His reference to 213 memorials from "public bodies,"	461
Le Clere's satirical advice to ecclesiastical historians,	461

NOTE O.—PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE AND PROTESTANT PRACTICE, 462

The Rev. Sydney Smith on modern forms of intolerance,	462
Grounds of Protestant ill-will to the Roman Catholics,	463
Protestants vied with Papists in the work of persecution,	464
Both parties ought now to forget and forgive,	466
The Protestants less excusable than the Papists,	467
Most of the Reformers advocated freedom only for themselves,	467
Zuinglius and Dudith rare instances of men who understood and practised the principles of religious liberty in the 16th century,	468

Discussions in England, excited by persecution of the Non-conformists,	Page 469
The Brownists not the first who entertained correct views of religious liberty,	469
Mr Bancroft's claim for Roger Williams equally untenable,	469
The Independents, &c.,	469-70
Writings of Locke and his followers on toleration,	470-1
Religious liberty in the United States,	471
in Scotland,	472
Hopes for the future,	473

NOTE P.—THE DUTY OF ACTING ACCORDING TO ONE'S
RELIGIOUS BELIEF,

Even mistaken people ought to act according to their judgment,	473
What if they should judge it right to injure others?	474
Duty of <i>disseminating</i> opinions,	474
Proper mode of doing so,	475
The right of proselytising belongs to all sects alike,	475-6
Beneficial effects of free discussion,	476
Laws against the publication of blasphemous works,	477
The maxim that "Christianity is part and parcel of the Law of England,"	477
Its origin and practical working,	477-8
The Law of Scotland more rational,	478
Lord Jeffrey's decision of a lawsuit about a legacy for the promotion of Unitarian principles,	479
Expediency of allowing equal rights to advocates of all phases of religion,	480

NOTE Q.—CURIOSITIES OF THE SABBATH ALLIANCE, 481

The Alliance founded on the Fourth Commandment, as a "clear and unquestionable" basis,	481
This the ground most generally <i>rejected</i> by theologians,	482
Financial hopes and realities of the Alliance,	482
Its narrative of the Glasgow struggle for Sunday trains,	483
Its charge of dishonesty, ignorance, or stupidity, against the rejecters of its principles,	484
Its gigantic misrepresentation as to "the common consent of the Christian world" to a Sabbatarian doctrine,	485
Its desire for controversy has been gratified,	485

NOTE R.—THE SCRIPTURAL GROUNDS OF THE SABBATH, 485

Sabbath-doctrine of the Shorter Catechism of the Church of Scotland, and Scriptural Proofs adduced,	486
Commentary thereon,	489
The statement acceded to, that the rule at first revealed to man for his obedience was the moral law,	489
Opposite doctrine of the Sabbath Alliance,	489
Are the Ten Commandments a <i>complete</i> and <i>mere</i> summary of the moral law?	489

Preface to the Ten Commandments,	Page 491
Fourth Commandment,	492
The copy of that precept in Exodus preferred to the other copy by the framers of the Catechism,	492
The reasons annexed to <i>both</i> copies, said by a Presbyterian Reviewer to have been written by God on the tables of stone,	492
The probable inducement to place the Exodus copy rather than the other in the Catechism, is now extinguished,	493
Declaration of Jesus that his Father had worked continually, Answer in the Catechism to the question, "What is required in the Fourth Commandment?"	493
Implied but unwarranted assumption that the Commandment was imposed upon all men,	494
Doctrine of the Churches of England and Scotland, and the Sabbath Alliance, that the Decalogue is still in force, and the only part of the Jewish law which is so,	494
Inconsistency of the Alliance on this point,	495
Some theologians contend for the continued obligation of the whole Mosaic law upon the Jews,	495
Views of Hengstenberg as to the extent of its obligation on the Gentile Christians,	496
Fallacy pervading his argument,	498
Arbitrariness of the practice of making a distinction between the Decalogue and the rest of the Mosaic law,	500
Confusion from oversight of the difference of position of the Jewish and Gentile Christians,	501
The Decalogue and the Law of Nature,	501
Luther's denial of <i>our</i> subjection to the Mosaic law,	502
His opinion of the Sabbath,	503
Did Jesus adopt the Sabbath into the new Dispensation?	504
He addressed the Jews only, and confirmed (to them alone) their whole law equally with the Decalogue,	504
His injunction, "Pray that your flight may not be on the Sabbath-day," proves nothing for Sabbatarianism,	505
The passage in Heb. iv. 9, 10, equally unserviceable,	506
Arguments of Sabbatarians from prophecy,	507-8
Declaration of Jesus, that "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,"	508
Alleged sacredness of the seventh day of the week among the early Gentiles,	511
The division of time into weeks no proof of a primeval Sabbath,	512
Probable origin of weeks,	513
Doctrine of the Apostles to the <i>Gentiles</i> about the Sabbath,	514
Decision of the dispute between the Jewish and Gentile converts at Antioch,	514
Passages in the Epistles of Paul to the Romans, Colossians, and Galatians,	516
Rare attempts of Sabbatarians to explain them away,	517
Alleged transference of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week,	518

Universal admission that no enactment of the transference is on record,	Page 519
Circumstantial evidence appealed to by the Sabbatariaus,	519
The Six Texts in the New Testament :—	
(1.) John xx. 19 : Christ's appearance at a meeting of the disciples in the evening after his resurrection,	519
(2.) John xx. 26 : Another appearance of Christ after eight days,	519
(3.) Acts ii. 1 : Meeting of the disciples on the day of Pentecost,	521
(4.) Acts xx. 6, 7 : Incidents during Paul's visit to Troas,	521
(5.) I Cor. xvi. 1, 2 : His injunction to the Corinthians to lay by alms on Sunday for the poor saints at Jerusalem,	522
(6.) Rev. i. 10 : "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day,"	524
Inconclusiveness of these Texts,	526
Counter-indications in the Christian Scriptures,	527
In the Acts of the Apostles the seventh day is always called "the Sabbath," a phrase implying that no <i>other</i> Sabbath was known,	527
Denial by Sabbatariaus that Christians in the Apostolic age observed the Mosaic Sabbath,	528
The fact that they did so, established by the history and writings of St Paul,	529
In the controversies between the Jewish and Gentile Christians about the Sabbath, no reference was ever made to its transference to the first day, as must have been the case had any such transference been known,	530
The history of the Acts of the Apostles, comprising 32 years, nowhere mentions, or alludes to, a custom of meeting on the first day of the week, or records any instance of a meeting for religious purposes on that day,	530
Such is the "Apostolic example" so confidently appealed to by the Sabbatariaus !	531
Neither in the Epistles nor in the Apocalypse is Sabbath-observance even once enjoined, or neglect of it reprov'd,	531
Nor does Paul enforce his injunction to the Corinthians (as he naturally would have done if the Sabbatarian doctrine were true), by any reference to the sufferings and resurrection of Christ,	531
Reflections on the baselessness of the Sabbatarian system,	532
Revelations in Scripture said by the Sabbatariaus to be sometimes not express but by implication,	533
This principle, however, is no less available to their opponents than to themselves,	533
And their charge of dishonesty, ignorance, or stupidity, can be retorted with aggravation,	534
Their averment, that no more than the existing evidence of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first is needed, or to be reasonably expected,	534

Claim for the Puritans exclusively, of the "immortal honour" of reviving the true Christian Sabbath,	Page 535
Rebuke by Mr Godfrey Higgins, of the dogmatism of the Sab- batarians,	536
Origin of the religious observance of Sunday,	536
What did the Fourth Commandment require of the Israelites?	540
Reference in it to a previous injunction to them to observe the Sabbath,	540
Occasion on which that injunction was given,	540
Was the Sabbath made known for the first time in the wil- derness?	541
Resting from work, the sole prescribed way of keeping holy the Sabbath,	542
Public worship no part of the Sabbath-duty of the Israelites,	543
Synagogues of comparatively late origin,	543
Grounds upon which recreations are said by the Catechism to be forbidden in the Fourth Commandment,	543
Meaning of "keep holy," "hallow," and "sanctify,"	544
To keep holy the Sabbath means simply to abstain from work,	546-550
Doctrine of the Sabbath Alliance and others, as to its sanctifi- cation,	547
Notion of some, that the Fourth Commandment enjoins labour on six days, as well as rest on the seventh,	548
A recent attempt to reconcile Genesis with Astronomy and Geology,	548
The Sabbath a joyful festival among the Jews,	550
Misleading changes of the signification of words,	550
Old meanings of "solemn" and "solemnity,"	551
Locke on the proper business of commentators, and the misin- terpretation of Scripture,	552
Purposes of the Jewish Sabbath :—(1.) Rest and refreshment to man and beast; (2.) Commemoration of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage; (3.) To be a political badge and reminder, and a test of allegiance,	553
Only the first of these purposes can be applicable to Gentiles,	554
Mental as well as bodily means of refreshment might be in view when the Fourth Commandment was given,	554
Various uses of the leisure of the Sabbath,	554
Sabbath recreations advocated by the Rev. Mr Holden,	554
Meaning of "doing thine own ways," and "finding thine own pleasure," in Isaiah lviii. 13,	555
Gloomy observance of the Sabbath opposed,	556
Dr King's sound observation, that when pure enjoyments are denied, impure are resorted to in their stead,	557
He objects, nevertheless, to Sunday trains,	557
Remarks on his reasons for doing so,	558
Mr Macfarlan's admission that "whatever is necessary to the recovery or preservation of health, or even to our comfort, is lawful on the Sabbath-day,"	558
Stability of our weekly holiday,	558
Bishop Horsley's interpretation of the statement that "God <i>blessed</i> the seventh day,"	559

Meaning of the phrase, "Sabbath of the Lord thy God,"	Page 559
Consideration of the remaining evidence adduced in the Catechism, for the duty of abstaining from recreations on Sunday, and spending it wholly in religious exercises,	559
Mr Macaulay's character of the Puritans,	562
Conclusion,	563
INDEX OF TEXTS RELATING TO THE SABBATH,	564
INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS,	566

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

- Page 3, at the bottom, *delete* † Note C, and for Note D read Note C.
- 29, line 3, *insert* a comma after Protestants
- 49, line 1, for have seen read shall see
- 50, line 6 from bottom, for Sidney read Sydney
- 60, line 6, *delete* Jewish
- 61, line 3, after in *delete* 1
- 62, line 7 from bottom, after divines *insert* See *infra*, p. 503, note.
- 73, line 8, after uneasiness *insert* and its opposite
- 91, line 6 from bottom, for 13 read 3
- 96, line 21 from bottom, for Gesenius read Gesenius
- 119, line 17 from bottom, add and vol. xii., p. 412
- 136, last line, for Ib. read Lightfoot, vol. xiii.
- 145, line 15, after wonder *insert* at being further told by Fuller
- 166, line 34, after Sermons *insert* vol. iii., p. 359, and
- 173, line 8, before Christian *insert* modern
- 219, line 9, after sign *insert* and a memorial
- 233, line 27, for that solemn read a solemn
- 258, last line, after notes *insert* also Priestley's Theological Repository, vol. ii., p. 195.
- 283, line 26, for the read divers; for the comma after assumptions *substitute* and; and for and read with
- 287, line 6 from bottom, after 276 *insert* See *infra*, p. 515, note*.
- 328, line 4 from bottom, for precepts read precept
- 337, line 5, for Taylor read Tayler
- 358, line 6, after Railway *insert* bill
- 365, line 1, after bondage *insert* ?
- 429, line 21, for Politics read Politic
- 437, line 19 from bottom, for simply read only
- 456, line 7 from bottom, for Science and Scripture read Religion and Science
- 492, line 19, after copy *insert* of the Decalogue
- 492, line 20, for these read the others
- 514, lines 23 and 35, for Sommerville read Somerville
- 546, line 9 from bottom, after feel *insert* a semicolon instead of the period
- 547, line 16, for ace read are
- 553, line 17 from bottom, after bondage *insert*—an end for which, in its own nature, it was highly suitable; and *delete* these words at the top of next page.
- 554, line 30, for properties read proprieties
- 559, line 28, after interpretation *insert* of

A PLEA FOR SUNDAY TRAINS.

TO THE PROPRIETORS OF THE EDINBURGH AND
GLASGOW RAILWAY.

GENTLEMEN,—At our half-yearly meetings held on 12th March and 27th August 1850, I moved, “ That a morning and evening train be run on Sundays from each terminus of this railway to the various stations along the line, for the accommodation of such portion of the community as may find it necessary to use these trains ; and that the accommodation be effected by attaching first, second, and third class passenger carriages to the Sunday trains now employed in the carriage of letters, parcels, and newspapers for the Post-office ; or that it may be otherwise effected, as the directors may deem expedient.” That this motion should be rejected on both occasions was a matter of course ; for, while not a single proxy was issued by the party with which I acted, expensive and successful efforts to collect proxies were made by our opponents.* But in spite of defeat, I am more and more convinced that the motion had reason and justice on its side, and that by reiterating, in the language of reason, appeals to your “ discretion and common sense,” the re-establishment of carriages for passengers on Sundays will at length be effected. In this belief, I again respectfully urge upon your notice the arguments which some of you have already listened to with more or less attention, in circumstances not very favourable to deliberate and candid judgment. Another inducement to address you in this more suitable form through the press is, that I shall have an

* See Appendix, note A.

opportunity of making such additions, and appending such illustrations of the subject and its collateral bearings, as it may seem desirable to introduce. In the following pages I shall of course speak merely as the expounder of my individual opinions, and not as the representative of any *party*, though I am aware there are many who fully concur with me.

The argument which I employed on the occasions referred to was, that the public are *entitled* to demand and receive from us the amount of accommodation which the motion specified ; and I confined myself to this point exclusively, because, if the argument can be successfully maintained (as I think it can), all further discussion of the question upon other grounds is plainly unnecessary. On the present occasion I do not mean to depart from my former course.

The question as to Sunday trains has usually been argued, at our meetings, as if it might or ought to be decided on theological grounds. Clergymen and laymen have alike exerted themselves to shew what is the will of God in regard to these trains, and, having concluded to their own satisfaction that the systematic running of them is at variance with the divine will, have maintained that therefore the demands of other people who have come to a different conclusion should not be complied with. Now it is quite true that, as individual men, each of us is called upon and entitled to decide, for the regulation of his own conduct, what is the will of God in this as in other religious matters, and, having done so, to act in accordance with his notions of duty. But it is equally true that this liberty of action is restricted by the paramount obligation, which all lie under, to respect the rights, both natural and express, of every other man. Whether, in the circumstances of the case, the public has a natural right to the use of Sunday trains on our line, it is unnecessary here to inquire ; seeing that, as I shall endeavour to shew, there is an *express* agreement binding us to give the accommodation demanded—which agreement, every just man will admit, must overrule any notions of religious duty which we may happen to entertain. What I beg you to consider at present is a *civil right*, and nothing but a civil right—a right which stands on precisely the same foundation, whether the truth lie in one man's religious views or in another's. All men have equally free access with our-

selves to the sources of knowledge of the divine will ; and it is not only the *right* but a recognised *duty* of every intelligent human being, to avail himself of those means of religious knowledge which are common to all, and to draw his own conclusions from what he discovers. And not only so ; but, when he has drawn his conclusions, he is as clearly and undeniably entitled as we are to shape his practice in conformity with them—under this sole restriction always, that he shall abstain from violating by his conduct the rights of his fellow-men.*

In a Protestant country like this, it may seem unnecessary to utter a single word in defence of the right of private judgment in religious matters ; but I must be allowed to say, that so long as this grand right, though freely acknowledged in words, shall continue to be so generally denied as it is, in practice, to all who differ in opinion from ourselves,† it will be the duty of the friends of liberty to demand on every fit occasion a *real* and *practical* recognition of the principle, that for our religious opinions and practice, while they violate no man's rights, we are responsible to God alone. It is the palpable and highest interest of every human being to gain correct knowledge of religious truth ; and when a man has done his best to acquire such knowledge, the opinions he adopts are the truth to him, and must, nay, ought to be the guiding principles of his conduct. To whatever extent this truth of his may chance to coincide with that absolute and eternal truth which can be authoritatively pronounced to be such by one Supreme Tribunal alone—a species of truth which men have ever been prone to confound with the *opinions* apprehended by them to coincide with it—I say, however much or little of absolute truth may be in a man's religious views, the sincere holder of them is entitled to reduce them to practice whenever and wherever he pleases ; nor, so long as the rights of society are uninvaded, has any one a right to say to him, “ What doest thou ? ” ‡

But let us see what kind of practical recognition this right of private judgment obtains from the party who object to the running of the Sunday trains. “ This Company,” say they, “ is bound by a Divine Commandment delivered to the Jews at Mount Sinai, to abstain from carrying passengers systemati-

* Note B.

† Note C.

‡ Note D.

cally on Sundays ; therefore it would be sinful to re-establish the trains which in more sinful times used to carry them ; and therefore we will not re-establish those trains.” This, I think, is the substance of all the arguments employed on that side of the question. But what say the opposite party to this ? They tell us that, without in the least calling in question the right of those who hold this opinion to believe as they do, and to act in their own private affairs according to their belief, they, on their side, after carefully studying the Fourth Commandment and the other patent sources of knowledge of the divine will, are convinced that the running of the proposed trains on Sunday, for the conveyance of all who judge that they have good reason to travel, is *not* at variance with the law of God. We all agree that although the Fourth Commandment expressly forbids those who are bound by it, to do any work whatsoever on the Sabbath-day, a strict and literal interpretation of it would be unreasonable, inasmuch as *total* abstinence from labour is not only inexpedient but beyond our power. We all perform, or countenance others in performing, many kinds of labour on every Sunday in the year. It is rare to meet with any one who objects to the doing of certain kinds of work on Sunday by sailors, ferrymen, physicians, surgeons, domestic servants, coachmen, ostlers, dairymaids, scavengers, policemen, lamplighters, and persons in attendance at gas works, chemical works, smelting furnaces, and I might add malting houses, were it not that the large and respectable sect of “total abstainers” see no need for making malt either on Sunday or Saturday. In short, it is admitted that works of necessity and mercy may and ought to be performed on Sunday ; and it may safely be affirmed farther, that a hearty desire is prevalent among all parties that labour of this kind should be restricted within the narrowest limits that circumstances will allow, and that, by suitable arrangements (like those formerly adopted upon our railway when the passenger trains were run, and still, I believe, in use with respect to the trains which carry the Sunday mails), it should be made to fall as lightly and as seldom as possible upon individuals. But here we reach the critical point where disagreement begins ;—we come to the question, What is the meaning of that well-worn phrase, “works of necessity and mercy ?” What works or classes of

works does it include and sanction? Who is to determine whether a certain act, which somebody in certain circumstances proposes to do, but which another man tells him he ought not to do, does or does not in reality fall within the limits of these privileged classes of works?—As the discussion proceeds, it soon appears that there are hundreds of acts concerning which extremely different opinions are entertained by different people in regard to their necessary or beneficial character. In the case under consideration, one party affirms that neither the systematic running of Sunday trains, nor the using of them when they ply, is a work of necessity or mercy; while another proclaims its belief that precisely the reverse of this is the truth. Who, then, is to sit in judgment? For my part, I know not any authority on earth that can be competently appealed to; and if none there be, the only practicable solution of the difficulty is to allow each party to decide for itself—to recognise the principle that neither has the shadow of a right to interfere with the decision of the other, or with the conduct regulated by that decision. I assert the right of every man to determine freely for himself what (within the limits already pointed out) he may do upon Sunday, consistently with his religious duty: if he err in his decision, he is responsible to God alone.* Now, it is perfectly well known that numerous cases occur in which people judge it right and proper to travel on Sunday. No statistics are necessary to prove that; for when our Sunday passenger-trains were run, they were actually used to a moderate extent by the public, and at this day the public avail themselves, to a similar extent,

* The only approach, that I can think of, to a correct *definition* of “works of necessity and mercy” is—*works whose performance is calculated to save the community from greater evils than those attending a moderate and exceptional amount of labour on Sundays*; in other words, works which the exigencies of human nature and human society demand the performance of. Most people agree that such works are not only lawful, but *positively incumbent*, on Sundays; but when they come to apply the definition to individual cases, the greatest possible disagreement is found to exist. The evils which A thinks greater than those of a particular kind of Sunday work, B thinks no evils at all, but evident advantages; while what seem disadvantages to B, are looked upon as advantages by A. Such differences of opinion will exist as long as men differ in the extent of their knowledge of human nature, and in their ability to see beyond the obvious and immediate effects of a principle or custom, to the more remote and indirect consequences which flow from it.

of the Sunday trains on every Scotch railway which affords the accommodation. In a populous district like ours there cannot fail to occur, so frequently that non-occurrence is the exception and not the rule, cases where travelling is required for the performance of the duties of benevolence, relationship, and friendship, the duty of preserving health and strength of body and mind,* nay, even the duty of attending the ordinances of divine worship—for the last of these was the motive which induced many persons resident near the railway, and who either were not within reach of a church, or had not one of their own denomination in their district, to travel regularly to Edinburgh, Glasgow, Falkirk, and other places, in the Sunday trains formerly run upon our line. And who will deny that every one of these individuals was entitled to decide for himself whether it was consistent with his duty so to travel? Just consider for a moment the endlessness of the controversies as to the extent to which the Fourth Commandment delivered to the Jews is binding on Christians,—how such controversies have abounded from the days of the Apostles down to our own times, and have elicited the expression of the most diverse opinions from men all excellently qualified by learning, ability, and integrity, to judge in the matter.† In the face of such facts as these, is it not astonishing that in this so-called enlightened age and Protestant country, any party of religionists should assume the position of infallible interpreters of the divine law, whose dicta must regulate not merely their own conduct (as it ought to do), but also the conduct of their fellow-mortals who cannot see with their eyes, or discover the right of any man among them to sit in Moses' seat?‡ Contrast the effects of our present railway-arrangements with the working of those which existed under the former *régime*. Then, every man was free to follow the dictates of his own conscience: if he thought he had a good reason for travelling on Sunday, he travelled; if not, he staid at home. But in these later times no such even-handed justice is dealt out to the community; for although he who objects to Sunday travelling is still as completely at liberty as ever to remain at home, he who wishes to travel must hire a special conveyance at an expense which it is ten to one he cannot afford, or stay at home

* Note E.

† Note F.

‡ Note G.

against his will. It is in the hope of persuading you to abandon this partial dealing, so discreditable to the Company and injurious to the public, that I now once more take the liberty of addressing you.

My proposition is, *that the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company lies under a civil obligation to the public (and, of course, to every individual member of the public) to afford them accommodation for travelling on Sundays, to the extent proposed by the motion which has been rejected.* The question, Does such an obligation exist? is, I submit, the one which ought all along to have stood foremost in our deliberations about Sunday trains, instead of being, as has somehow happened, almost entirely lost sight of and forgotten. If it ought to be decided in the affirmative, there is plainly no means, short of re-establishing the Sunday trains, of escaping from the reproach of injustice and tyrannical abuse of power; and even if it could be fairly decided in the negative, which I hope to shew it cannot be, we should still have to consider whether it would not be right, and reasonable, and expedient, to *bestow freely* what the public could not *demand as their due.*

I admit that if we were an ordinary carrying company like the proprietors of stage-coaches, no man would be entitled to demand that we should establish conveyances on Sunday for his accommodation. But a little consideration will shew that our Company stands in a very different position from such individuals and associations as these. It has been incorporated by an Act of Parliament for the express purpose, among others, of giving the public "additional means of communication between Edinburgh and Glasgow, and adjacent places." These are the very words of our Act of Incorporation; and it was in consideration of our engaging to fulfil this and other purposes that we were invested with extensive powers and privileges, which we have abundantly exercised in compelling individuals to sell us their property, in destroying their pleasure-grounds, and in many other ways which it is needless to specify here. On six days of the week we have all along satisfactorily and creditably fulfilled our engagement to Parliament and the public; and—to the honour of the original Board of Directors be it said—for several years our pledge

was redeemed upon the seventh day also, in a manner which there is every reason to believe was satisfactory to those members of the public who had occasion and were inclined to avail themselves of their right to use the trains. But ultimately, by means of a certain remarkable coalition of parties, a decree was issued that the conveyance of passengers, even by the Sunday trains which were still to carry the mails, and which to this day have continued to carry them, should forthwith and imperatively cease.* In this proceeding the right of the public seems to have been altogether forgotten; for among those by whose aid the decree was issued, were gentlemen of known honour and respectability, who cannot be supposed capable of wittingly and wilfully committing a breach of faith, or lending their sanction to a seen act of injustice. Surely it will not be argued, that because the "means of communication" which we afford during six days of the week, are in the aggregate greater than those which, before the railway was opened, the public enjoyed during the whole seven days, therefore our engagement to give "additional means of communication" has been fairly and adequately fulfilled. To such an argument as this there would be the obvious and conclusive reply, that we are no more entitled to make an exception of Sunday than to suspend the running of trains on Monday or Tuesday likewise, on the plea that the aggregate accommodation given to the public during the remaining five days is greater than it used to be on the neighbouring roads during the entire week. I beg you to consider what sort of reception Parliament would have given to our bill if its preamble had set forth, not simply, as it did, that we were to furnish "additional means of communication," but that we were to give additional means of communication upon six days of the week, while on Sundays it would be our religious duty to withhold even such limited means of communication as the public were at that time actually enjoying in the form of two mail-coaches, which the opening of the railway would of course entirely put a stop to. Will any man of business deliberately assert, in his character of a man of business, that the Legislature would ever have sanctioned such a proposal as that? And if not, how can we escape the conclusion, that for several years we

* Note H.

have been abusing our powers by doing what the Legislature never intended or expected us to do—what the promoters of the bill never contemplated we should do—what a large body of the public would have successfully opposed our being empowered to do—and what we have therefore just as little legal right as we have reason and justice to support us in doing?*

The plain truth is, that we are breaking faith in a manner which I for one, as a shareholder and a Scotchman, am ashamed of, and of which, as a member of the public, I shall not cease to complain; and the sooner we wipe away this reproach, by restoring to the community the use of those Sunday trains which we have so long persisted in “sending empty away,” the better for our character in the eyes of every intelligent admirer of fair and honest dealing. Nor will our reputation for consistency at all suffer on the occasion; for it is not without cause that a sneer usually accompanies the question, whether our desecration of the Sabbath would be materially greater if our engines drew four or five carriages after them, instead of the solitary one which from week to week they actually draw.

I repeat that, to all appearance, the public were satisfied with the amount of Sunday accommodation which they formerly received from us. It is likely that they will be equally content if the same amount be restored to them, and that such opportunities as we may again give them of travelling on Sundays will not in future, any more than formerly, be abused. There is no rashness in saying, that any man who should travel by the trains on Sunday, while believing that he sinned in doing so, would in all probability be at least as sinfully occupied at home if compelled to remain there. But, sinning or not sinning, he alone is accountable for his conduct; and neither we nor our directors, nor any tyrannical “standing committee for Scotland,”† have the smallest right to prevent him from acting as he does, however much we may be entitled to express our disapprobation of his behaviour, and to endeavour by reasoning and expostulation to lead him into a better path. Great exaggeration has been indulged in as to the misconduct of persons travelling by Sunday trains. If some few cases have occurred of individuals who

* Note I.

† Note J.

were found drinking to excess after such travelling, surely it does not follow that the Sunday trains were the *cause* of the drunkenness ! *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, is the lamest of all arguments. What reason is there to think that the drunkards would have led a sober life if cooped up in Glasgow or Edinburgh—nay, that they would not rather have been still more drunken, for want of the amusement of travelling, and by means of that additional quantity of spirits which the saving of the railway fares would have enabled them to purchase ?* The truth, I fear, is, that if the means of healthful and innocent recreation be withheld from the people, they will ever be prone to betake themselves to vicious indulgences—to practices which do not the less exist because they are less within the observation of the virtuous portion of the community than Sunday travelling. And it is a question which might be advantageously discussed, how much of the drunkenness and profligacy which notoriously prevail to so lamentable an extent in Glasgow and Edinburgh on Sundays, is in truth the effect of that peculiar tendency which the people of Scotland have to surround their religious observances with repulsive gloom, instead of performing them in that cheerful and thankful spirit which, in other parts of Christendom, is thought to be more accordant with the precepts and example of our Lord. Perhaps a few prize-essays on this neglected branch of the subject of Sabbath-observance might supply us with useful information and valuable materials of thought.†

Let me here put a case, which may serve to illustrate the principles above maintained, and perhaps be more effectual than any extent of mere argument in giving them weight with some who are disposed to reject them. It is proverbially the best way of obtaining a clear view of the rights of our neighbours, to imagine an exchange of places with them, and to ask ourselves with what degree of satisfaction we should then accept from them the treatment they are receiving from us. This, I say, is the best way of bringing ourselves to the practising (in addition to the preaching) of the commandment, that we should do to others as we would that they should do to us. Suppose, then, that the stock of this Company has been purchased to such an extent by Jewish capitalists, that

* Note K.

† Note L.

they have been able to establish a Jewish majority of directors at the Board ; which majority, we shall suppose, are not less sincerely attached to their religion, and not less zealous for the honour and glory of God, than the Board to whose hands the reins of power are at present confided. And, to complete the picture, let these Jewish directors be farther supposed to entertain a confident belief that they possess so certain a knowledge of God's will, that other men's opinions concerning it must of necessity be erroneous if different from their own. This, to be sure, is a supposition not very complimentary to the Jews ; but, as it is a mere assumption for the sake of argument, I hope that if there be any of the Hebrew faith among the readers of these pages, they will be good enough to pardon the liberty that is taken. Well, then, what do our Jewish directors proceed to do ? Why, the very day of their instalment in office, they issue a peremptory order that no trains shall be run upon the seventh day of the week—this being, as they announce, the day appointed by the divine law to be kept holy by resting from every kind of labour. The new regulation, of course, excites a universal outcry among the Christian members of the community ; they are up in arms against so flagrant a violation of their rights ; and, at the next meeting of the shareholders, one of them moves that the Saturday trains be resumed, in order that the inhabitants of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and the intermediate districts, and her Majesty's subjects in general, who are all alike interested in the matter, may go about their lawful business as usual. But the conscientious directors are inexorable : they have the efficient support of a large muster of Hebrew shareholders and proxies ; and the scruples of every waverer among them are dispelled by the presence of sundry eminent rabbins, who have bought shares of the Company's stock with the declared and sole intention of promoting the honour and glory of God. This compact phalanx is numerically irresistible ; but argument, as well as the strength of numbers, is relied on for victory. A learned rabbin proceeds to expound to the meeting what they ought to believe. " Here," says he, " I hold in my hand a copy of the Fourth Commandment, which you yourselves acknowledge to be divine. What are the words of this Commandment ? ' The seventh day is the Sabbath of the

Lord thy God ; in it thou shalt not do any work.' Now, what can be plainer than this—'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God'? And is not Saturday the seventh day? and are we not, therefore, bound by the Commandment to rest from all labour on Saturday? No doubt, you tell us that the original Sabbath-day has been abolished, and a new one put in its place. But, really, you must pardon us for adhering to our own deliberate and confident belief, that not one tittle of the Mosaic law has been repealed or modified; and we must plainly tell you, moreover, that even supposing the books of the New Testament to be an authentic history of alterations of the Mosaic law, we cannot see how this admission would at all strengthen your case. For we have been told by many among yourselves, and have read in the writings of some of your most learned men, that the Christian Scriptures contain no record whatever of the appointment, express or implied, of a new Sabbath-day;—and upon looking closely into the matter for our own satisfaction, we have found, with surprise, that such is actually the case. Now, if you really do admit the Fourth Commandment to be divine and of universal application, and if you cannot shew that it has been altered by the supreme authority which enacted it, you are clearly bound to observe it to the letter; the reason annexed to the Commandment obliges you, equally with us, to keep the *seventh* and not the *first* day of the week holy; and any Sabbath, except the one observed on the seventh day, must have quite another foundation than the Fourth Commandment. Your demand is most unreasonable, that we should substitute a festival of human appointment for one which is confessedly divine. It is the Sabbath which *we* observe, and not the new Sabbath observed by *you*, that is spoken of by our inspired prophets where they threaten its profaners with the divine wrath; and as good citizens, desirous to avert that wrath from the British people, we esteem it our duty to prevent the desecration of the true Sabbath by our countrymen."* Such, we may fairly suppose, would be the reasoning of a Jew, holding principles similar to those of the late Sir Andrew Agnew. Of the soundness or unsoundness of such reasoning, it is unnecessary to speak—that is a point with which we have *here*

* Note M.

nothing to do: I am willing to assume either that the Jews, or the followers of Sir Andrew Agnew, or the advocates of Sunday trains, have the good fortune to hold opinions that coincide with absolute and eternal truth; and I am equally willing to assume that any or all of them are so unfortunate as to mistake error for truth. Granting that Sir Andrew Agnew was the favoured possessor of sound theological views, and that everybody who rejects his doctrine is in error,—still I ask, What effective answer could any disciple of his make to the supposed Jewish argument?—what effective answer can be made to it by any man who repudiates the principle that all are entitled to judge for themselves what day is the Sabbath, and what they may without impiety do upon the day? Not a shred of argument could such a man employ with the slightest prospect of success. He has thrown away the only weapon with which it was possible to assail the enemy and if he has any regard for consistency his plain and only course is quietly to retire from the field. But unless I widely mistake the character of certain of my opponents, no intruding thought about consistency would for a moment impede the outpouring of their indignation. Even if there were a synagogue in every parish, and if every synagogue (at the urgent instigation of its rabbin—himself still more urgently roused by a circular from the head-quarters of the Jewish Sabbath Alliance), had sent up a memorial exhorting the Directors, with ready-made eloquence, to be firm in obeying God rather than man—if the strongest expressions of “grief and indignation” had come from the synagogues of Stornoway, and Knock, and Lochcarron, and Oban, and Trumisgarry, and scores or hundreds of other enlightened places*—would our clerical copartners have looked upon these respectable documents as of the slightest avail in settling the controversy? It is pleasant to imagine the scornful glance which they would throw upon the ponderous pile of proofs of public opinion before them, and the eagerness with which they would turn their backs upon their former selves, and resort to those very weapons which heretofore they had treated with disdain! Most refreshing would it be to witness the energy with which they would inculcate upon their Jewish adversaries, that it is the privilege

* Note N.

of every man to decide for himself whether or not the Fourth Commandment ought to be observed on Saturday—that although the trains should be run on that day, no Jew would be compelled to travel by them, or to assist in working them—that the Company had asked and received its powers from Parliament on the express condition that certain services, including the conveyance of passengers on Saturdays, should be performed to the public—that the Directors had therefore no right to close the railway on Saturdays—that to refuse fulfilment of a bargain on the ground of religious duty would be preposterous in almost any circumstances, and was supremely so where the pious individuals had deliberately become members of a company by whose previous engagements they knew they would be bound, but whose stock they had nevertheless bought for the express purpose of stopping the performance of those engagements—that if any Jewish shareholder could not conscientiously sanction, or refrain from actively opposing, the traffic on the seventh day, it was the easiest thing in the world for him, by selling his stock, to rid himself of all responsibility and self-reproach for the acts which might be done by the Company in the honest fulfilment of its obligation—and that, in like manner, if any Jewish guard or engine-driver should think it unlawful to perform the work which his employers desired to be done, he might leave freely the service which he had freely entered, and undertake some other employment in which no Saturday labour would be included. These appeals would be found unanswerable even by the most ingenious adherer to the Mosaic law. But if the speaker proceeded to urge upon the Directors, as a reason why the Saturday trains should be restored, that a great majority of the people of this country desire them, and believe them to be lawful, he would at once quit his vantage ground, and be met with the *argumentum ad hominem*,—That error, even if held by ninety-nine of every hundred persons, is still error notwithstanding—that truth is truth, although but one man in a million should embrace it—and that it was the clear duty of the Board to obey to the utmost what they knew to be a divine commandment. And it would add but little to the satisfaction of the rebellious shareholder with such reasons as these, that they were very much of a piece with the reasoning

which he and his friends had for a series of years pertinaciously employed against the *Sunday* trains.

Gentlemen—We read that when the prophet Nathan delivered a certain instructive parable to King David, the anger of that impulsive monarch was kindled against the oppressor, and that when the emphatic announcement was made to him, “Thou art the man !” he acknowledged the justice of the charge, and fasted, and repented of his sin. Is it too much to hope, that the parable which has now in all humility been propounded to the opponents of Sunday trains, may be in some small measure successful in producing a similar effect ?—and that the proof of repentance may speedily appear among them, in the shape of a *real and practical* acknowledgment of the rights of their fellow-men,—the right of those to travel on Sunday whose conscience *allows* them to travel, and the right of those to stay at home whose conscience *forbids* them to travel.*

Every one of us, I presume, has taken the trouble to consider for himself, with greater calmness and deliberation than it is easy to enjoy in an excited meeting of partisans, whether the running of Sunday trains, and the using of them when they actually ply, be consistent with the duty of a Christian, as discoverable from the Bible. We all, it is likely, think ourselves entitled and able to judge of this for ourselves. Each of us believes that, amidst the conflicting diversities of opinion, his own views are the truth. We all conform, or at least acknowledge that we ought to conform, our individual practice to our individual religious convictions ; and we are all alike disposed to resist the pretensions of our neighbour, if he tell us that we ought to act according to his belief of religious duty, and not in pursuance of our own.† In all this we but reduce to practice the fundamental and admitted principles of Protestantism ; and what I recommend is simply this—that each of us should allow his neighbours to practise according to these invaluable principles as freely as he does himself. In the noble and pregnant words of Locke—“Absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty, is the thing we stand in need of ;”‡ and it is only by establishing and respecting this

* Note O.

† Note P.

‡ Letter concerning Toleration, preface.

genuine liberty, instead of that spurious one-sided liberty which is so frequently put in its place, that justice can be done to all, or that men of opposite religious opinions will ever be brought to regard each other with that charity which is the chief of Christian virtues. The question, let me say once more, is not, "Shall the Sabbath be observed in Scotland?" I know of no man who desires the abolition of the weekly day of rest—an institution so plainly adapted to the bodily, intellectual, and emotional wants of human nature, that any attempt to abolish it among us would be a ridiculous failure, even if aided by that round sum of £10,000 which our Sabbath Alliance expected to drain from the people, but which so strangely refused to flow into its treasury.* What I oppose is not the observance of the Sabbath, but that kind of observance of it which some call its "better" observance, and others its "bitter," and puritanical, and UNCHRISTIAN observance—a mode of observance which, in the opinion of many earnest friends of religion, is much less calculated to promote respect for so admirable an institution, than to excite a general distaste at religion itself, and to drive multitudes into the *unmistakeable* Sabbath-desecration of vicious indulgence.† I cordially respect the zeal and sincerity of every one who demonstrates his sincerity by the accordance of his practice and professions. I admit to the fullest extent the right of all who differ from the advocates of Sunday trains to argue and expostulate with them from the pulpit, the platform, and the press. But no amount of respect for zeal and sincerity can blind me to the fact that you are trampling on their rights, and that the friends of rational liberty ought to exert themselves on every fit occasion for the recovery of what they have been unjustly deprived of, and for their own and their children's security from still more intolerable encroachments.

I have the honour to be,

GENTLEMEN,

Your most obedient servant,

ROBERT COX.

* Note Q.

† Note R.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, page 1.

The Victories of the Sabbatarians.

When, in conformity with the regulations of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, I gave previous notice that the motion for Sunday trains would be submitted to the meetings referred to in the text, I had good reason to believe that arrangements would be made by certain influential Shareholders who approved of it, for procuring an adequate supply of proxies in its favour; but on both occasions the intention of those gentlemen to do so was accidentally frustrated. Had the case been otherwise, the motion would probably have been carried; and there is little room for doubt that were it again brought forward with such a backing of proxies as, it is believed, could easily be mustered if the necessary funds and a little personal trouble were applied to this object, the result of the division would be decidedly in its favour. At the conclusion of the meeting in August 1850, having no *positive assurance* of this needful support, and finding that such of my friends among the Shareholders as there was an opportunity of consulting at the time agreed with me in thinking that, in the circumstances, it was expedient to comply with a suggestion thrown out by the Directors in their Report, "That whatever should be the result of this meeting, no motion should be made, or notice given, on the question of Sunday trains, at least for a year," I forbore to renew the notice on that occasion, in the hope that ere long the Directors would, of their own accord, adopt the only effectual means of putting an end to an agitation as troublesome to the Shareholders at large, as it is uncongenial with the tastes and habits of the writer of these pages. This hope, however, seems doomed to disappointment; for as yet there is no perceptible symptom of a coming change of policy at the Board.

That the motion would probably be carried if the wishes of the whole body of Shareholders were fairly collected and given effect to, will appear pretty evident from a retrospect of what took place when something like a fair opportunity (for a *perfectly* fair one it cannot be held to have been) was last afforded them of expressing their inclinations in the matter. The circumstances were briefly these:—

On 31st July 1849, the following requisition, signed by 426 Shareholders, was presented to the Chairman and Directors of the Company:—

"GENTLEMEN,—Since the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway was closed, in November 1846, to the Public on Sundays, three leading Lines, all connected with and running into it, have been opened for

Public Traffic, viz.—the Edinburgh and Northern, the Caledonian, and the Scottish Central. On these Lines (as well as on the North British, previously opened) it has been resolved, by large and repeated majorities, to carry Passengers on Sunday. The subject has thus acquired a new aspect. On this ground, as well as for other important reasons to be hereafter stated, we are of opinion that the question of affording to the Public the means of communication on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Line, upon that day, should again be brought under the consideration of the Proprietors.

“ We, the undersigned Shareholders, therefore hereby request you to convene, on an early day, a Special General Meeting of the Company, to reconsider the question of running Sunday Trains; and that, prior to such Meeting, for the purpose of ascertaining and giving effect to the sentiments of the Proprietary on the subject, you issue a blank Proxy to every Shareholder, coupled with distinct instructions for filling up the same.

“ To prevent misapprehension, we may take this opportunity to state that it is not our wish that Trains should run to the same extent on Sundays as on other days of the week, but simply that a Morning and Evening Train should run as formerly—which practically would be merely attaching a few Carriages to the present Mail Train.”

On 2d August there appeared in the newspapers an advertisement by the Directors, calling a special general meeting of the Proprietors, “ to reconsider the question of running Sunday Trains, and to come to such resolution thereon as the Meeting may determine. Blank Proxies,” it was added, “ will be forwarded to all the Proprietors who are registered in the Books of the Company on the 10th instant, and, in order to be available, they must be filled up and returned to the Secretary, at least two days previous to the day of the Meeting.”

On 3d August, I, as honorary Secretary of certain Scotch and English Shareholders who had formed themselves into a Committee for the purpose of trying to get the Sunday trains re-established, and by whom the requisition had been prepared and circulated, wrote to Mr Latham, the Secretary of the Company, expressing the Committee’s thanks to the Directors for the prompt manner in which the requisition had been complied with, and for the resolution to issue a blank proxy to each Proprietor, so that the general wish might be fairly and satisfactorily made known. I farther said :—“ The Committee infer that the Directors will not use their influence on either side with the Proprietors; so that, whatever the result of the meeting may be, there may be no doubt in any quarter that the opinions of all have been freely and independently expressed.” It was of course expected that the option of voting for either of *two* motions only,—*for* or *against* the trains,—would be given, this being the only way of ascertaining unequivocally the opinions of the Shareholders.

On 10th August, however, the Directors, to the surprise of the Committee, forwarded to each Proprietor, along with the advertisement calling the meeting, a blank proxy which might be filled up in favour of any one of *three* votes, viz. :—1, *for* the trains; 2, *against* the trains; and, 3, “ for leaving this matter in the hands of the Directors.” Contrary also to the expectation of the Committee, the Directors issued

with the proxies the following circular, in which, instead of leaving, as they ought to have done, the proprietors to form an unbiassed judgment as to what was right and expedient, they employed their influence to procure votes against the trains.

“COMPANY’S OFFICES, QUEEN STREET,
GLASGOW, 10th August 1849.

“In forwarding the proxy for the Special Meeting of the 21st inst., the Directors beg to explain that they have called it in compliance with a requisition to reconsider the question of running Sunday trains.

“They regret the agitation of this topic, their opinion as a Board remaining unchanged; and they have not found that any practical inconvenience has arisen during the period for which the traffic has been discontinued. With this expression of their feelings, they now leave the matter in the hands of the Shareholders.

“By Order of the Board,

(Signed) “PETER BLACKBURN, *Chairman.*”

The statement here made, that the Directors “had not found that any practical inconvenience had arisen during the period for which the traffic had been discontinued,” was calculated (I will not say *intended*) to make the distant Shareholders suppose that the “practical inconvenience” which the Directors had failed to find, had been found by nobody else—a supposition greatly at variance with the fact.

The issuing of this circular by the Directors will appear the more uncalled for, when it is remembered that the reasons for and against Sunday trains had previously been laid before the Proprietors at ample length, in a circular by the Committee who prepared the requisition, and two Answers to it by certain Shareholders in Edinburgh and Glasgow—to which Answers a Reply was afterwards issued by the Committee.

At the meeting on 21st August, I proposed the motion quoted in the foregoing Plea; and Colonel Dundas thereupon proposed as an amendment—not “that no passenger-trains be run on Sundays,” nor, “that this matter be left in the hands of the Directors” (to either of which motions singly, as well as to mine, the proxies were applicable)—but an amendment of the following composite character:—“That this meeting *refuse the motion*; AND, having entire confidence in the present Board of Management, *resolve to leave this matter in the hands of the Directors*”!

The meeting was attended by Peter Blackburn, Esq., as proxy for certain persons “for running passenger-trains upon Sundays;” Peter Blackburn, Esq., as proxy for others “against running passenger-trains upon Sundays;” and Peter Blackburn, Esq., as proxy for a third class of persons “for leaving the running of passenger-trains upon Sundays, in the hands of the Directors.”

At the close of the meeting, the Chairman announced the state of the vote to be—

	Votes.
“For the motion, . . .	7678
“For the amendment, . . .	7919
	<hr/>
“Majority of votes, . . .	241”

On the motion of Mr M’Clelland, it was agreed to appoint Scrut-

tineers, when Mr A. Paton and I were nominated on behalf of those in favour of Sunday trains, and Messrs W. Kidston junior and Charles Cunningham on the part of those against the trains.

At an adjourned meeting on 28th August, the Scrutineers handed in and the Chairman read the following Report:—

“ Result of Votes at Special General Meeting, held at Glasgow, 21st August 1849, on the Sunday trains question:—

AGAINST SUNDAY TRAINS.

	Stock.	Votes.
“ Proxies,	£392,958	5836
“ Left in hands of Directors,	147,226	1839
“ Parties present,	20,461	244
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	£560,645	7919

FOR SUNDAY TRAINS.

“ Proxies,	£614,257	7565
“ Parties present,	9,262	113
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	£623,519	7678
“ Majority of Votes against Trains	241	
“ Majority of Stock for Trains	£62,874	

“ We the undersigned, having been appointed by the meeting scrutineers to ascertain the state of the votes and proxies, find the same to be as above.

“ CHAS. CUNNINGHAM.
 “ ANDREW PATON.
 “ WILLIAM KIDSTON.
 “ ROBT. COX.”

“ Glasgow, August 21, 1849.

The following letter was then read:—

“ EDINBURGH, 27th August 1849.

“ J. Latham, Esq.,
 “ Secretary of the Edinburgh
 “ and Glasgow Railway.

“ DEAR SIR,—In writing you to-day with the note to be added to the scrutineers’ report, I omitted to say that the words ‘majority against trains, 241’ require to be altered to ‘majority 241,’ or ‘majority for the amendment, 241.’ The latter is the form I prefer, and I do not see that any of the scrutineers can have any objection to either.

“ Another alteration which it is desirable to make, and which I hope all the scrutineers will approve of, is the substitution for ‘Proxies left in the hands of the Directors’ of ‘Proxies for leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors.’ This is the accurate description of these proxies, and as such it ought to be adopted; but as my view of the matter appears from the note, I do not insist on this alteration if the other scrutineers object.

“ I regret giving you this further trouble; and am, dear Sir, yours truly,
 ROBT. COX.

“ I coincide in the above.

ANDREW PATON.”

The note referred to in this letter was then read to the meeting; but being to the same effect with the following protest, which was immediately afterwards laid on the table with legal formality, it need not be inserted here.

“ We, the undersigned proprietors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, hereby, for ourselves and on behalf of those who may adhere to us,

protest that the application by the Chairman to the support of the amendment moved by Colonel Dundas at the special general meeting of the proprietors, held on 21st August 1849, of two sets of proxies, one authorising the holders 'to vote against running passenger-trains upon Sundays,' and the other authorising the holders 'to vote for leaving this matter in the hands of the directors,' was incompetent, irregular, and illegal; and that the motion for running passenger trains upon Sundays was carried by a great majority of the votes legally and competently given; because the amendment being 'That this meeting refuse the motion, and, having entire confidence in the present board of management, resolves to leave this matter in the hands of the directors,' no proxy which did not authorise a vote for both clauses thereof could be competently used in its support; and the effect of otherwise using the proxies has been that while, on the one hand, the proxies to vote for leaving the matter in the hands of the directors have been employed against a specific motion to which they did not apply, on the other hand the proxies to vote against running the trains have been employed in favour of an amendment which, so far from prohibiting passenger trains upon Sundays, actually empowers the directors to run such trains at their pleasure; and because proxies to vote against running the trains could be competently used only in support of a specific motion that the trains should not run, whereas no such motion was submitted to the meeting.

" J. G. CRAIG.

" ROBT. COX.

" J. T. GIBSON-CRAIG.

" JOHN PAXTON.

" HEW CRICHTON.

" HEW H. CRICHTON.

" JOHN HUME.

" THOMAS EDINGTON.

" JAMES M'CLELLAND.*

" August 27, 1849."

I was not present at this meeting, but, according to the report of it in the newspapers, "the Chairman said he did not like the introduction of legal gentlemen at the Company's meetings; that the papers presented would be duly recorded in the Company's minutes; but that he thought the view he had taken at the meeting last week as to the application of the proxies was the common-sense one."

The manner in which this business was conducted by the Board called forth many severe comments from the newspaper press, few if any of whose conductors, except those of the reputed organs of ecclesiastical or Sabbatarian parties, found it possible to utter a word in defence of such proceedings. In the *Scotsman* of 29th August, the subject is thus clearly and conclusively handled by a Shareholder resident in Fife:—

" 25th August 1849.

"SIR,—Permit me, through the medium of your paper, to express my disapprobation of the conduct of the Directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway at the late meeting regarding Sunday trains. In common with other Shareholders, I received a proxy, which I filled up and returned. I did so in the faith, that if there were a majority

* The first of these signatures is the honoured name of Sir James Gibson-Craig, who, in spite of old age and infirm health, felt the same lively interest in this matter which he had ever displayed in the cause of freedom, and above all when any public right was defeated by mean and juggling manœuvres. I am proud to have co-operated with this veteran and well-tried champion of liberty on one of the last occasions—if not the very last—on which he took an active part in any public affair.

of votes *for* the trains, it would be decided accordingly; if a majority *against*, the trains would not run; and if there were a majority for *leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors*, they would have the sole power of running them or not as they thought proper. I will venture to affirm that not one of those Shareholders who returned a proxy had a different opinion, unless the Directors had made up their scheme beforehand, and made it known to their friends. But it seems I have been deceived, and like all those who returned as I did *for*, have been *tricked* out of my vote by a most indefensible course of procedure on the part of the Directors. I would ask any man of common sense, if those who filled up '*leaving to the Directors*' were *against* the trains running, why they did not say '*against*?' The answer is obvious, that they were either undecided, or they thought it better to leave it to the Directors than to tie up their hands either for or against. It will not do to maintain that because the Directors are at present against the trains running, '*against*' and '*leaving*' were the same. They were substantially different, and the Shareholders no doubt understood the difference. The Directors, like every other elected body, are subject to changes, and so it is to be hoped are their judgments. No one can say that the Board will be of precisely the same opinions to-morrow that they are to-day, or next year as they are this year. Hence Shareholders might very properly conceive that the better way was to leave this question to the Board, that they might be guided by after circumstances rather than be compelled to *run or not to run* Sunday trains, independent of all circumstances.

"I do not wish to use too strong language, but I conceive I am quite justified in saying that we, the '*fors*,' have been tricked out of our votes by most unworthy means on the part of *our* Directors. I wonder the meeting did not as one man repel their conduct, and the Shareholders would do well to give the most unequivocal expression of their sentiments as to the want of straightforwardness in this instance on the part of those whom they had chosen to manage their affairs. Why, by such a procedure the Directors were sure of having everything their own way, unless by an absolute majority against them. If they had changed their minds previously to the meeting, they might with as much propriety have put the first and last votes together, and have turned out the '*against*s,' even though these should have been of greater number than either of the two others. Something like those who when tossing up say, 'Heads I win, tails you lose,' they made themselves nearly as sure of gaining. Or like the white man who, when dividing the result of his day's fishing with the poor Indian, said, 'I take the shoulders and you take the tail, or you take the tail and I take the shoulders, any you like.' The '*fors*' are in a situation akin to the simple Indian, who replied, 'What you say seems fair enough; I don't know how it is, but you always get the shoulders and I always get the tail.'—I am, &c."

The following extract from the *Daily News* affords a specimen of the general tone of the press on the occasion. After commenting with due severity on the case of a railway porter, who had recently been fined at Bath for drawing a truck, laden with passengers' luggage, from the luggage to the passenger station of the Great Western Railway, the writer proceeds:—

"Frivolous and contemptible as the proceedings of Captain Gis-

borne and Mr Walters must appear to every rational being, they look venial when compared with the tricks in which their allied opponents of Sunday travelling by railway in the north indulge. The public are aware that the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company have had a Board of Sabbatarian Directors inflicted upon them, in consequence of an equivocal coalition to which some English Shareholders, of whom better things might have been expected, were parties. Intimation having been given of a motion for the resumption of Sunday trains at the last statutory meeting of this Company, the Directors took the precaution of issuing blank proxies with three alternative votes. They gave the absent Shareholders the option of voting for the motion, or against it, or for leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors. As the day of meeting approached, it was ascertained that the proxies would stand thus: for opening the line on Sundays, 7565; against opening it, 5836; for leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors, 1729. Accordingly the party of the Directors shaped their amendment thus—‘That the meeting refuse the motion; and having entire confidence in the present Board of Management, leave this matter entirely in the hands of the Directors.’ The pious Chairman declared—*ex cathedra*—that all proxies against the motion and all proxies for leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors were to count in support of this amendment, and thus the proposition in favour of which there was a clear majority was held to be negatived.

“Really, the interests of true religion imperatively demand that all who are sincerely impressed with profound and earnest religious convictions should lose no time in openly withdrawing themselves from the associated formalists who are bringing the very name of religion into discredit.

“We feel as strongly as any one can the importance of securing for every son of toil one day of repose and relaxation in seven. We can respect those earnest and elevated natures who sanctify this day for themselves by devoting it principally (we defy any mere human being to devote it exclusively) to religious contemplation and exercises. But we hold with Luther, that this mode of hallowing the seventh day, to be either meritorious or beneficial, must be spontaneous, the result of conviction and feeling, not a mere outward formal obedience to precepts enforced by penalties. We hold, further, that an exact literal compliance with the injunction to hallow the Sabbath-day by abstinence from industrial pursuits is impossible; that a part of that day must always be employed by some part of the community in the discharge of menial and other services. And we hold that the Sabbath rest of fewer people is encroached upon, and to a less extent, even in the case of parties actively employed on Sundays by railway travelling, than by the cooking of dinners, making of beds, and driving of carriages for the busy-bodies who, by such immoral trickery and subterfuges as we have detailed, seek by direct or indirect means to put a stop to Sunday railway trains.

“The most inveterate precisians will not deny that there are cases in which Sunday travelling is allowable. If one of them, for example, when summoned to attend the death-bed of a parent, a spouse, or a child, were to wait till the Sunday were over, his own sect would impute it to lack of natural affection, not to any higher motive. Now along

all the great lines of railway travelling by any other means has become impossible. There are but few who can afford the expense of a special train. The railways are morally bound to run Sunday trains, so that all who may be suddenly summoned to undertake necessary journeys on a moment's warning, may be freed from the embarrassments that would otherwise ensue from the banishment of post-chaises and horses from our roads.

"The meddling impertinence of the opponents of Sunday travelling by railway has reached its climax, and can no longer be disregarded. By their employment of spies, and their tampering with votes, they have set at defiance every precept of honour and morality, and even of common decency. By gravely proposing that a railway porter should be put in the stocks for discharging his duty to his employers in the performance of services warranted by an act of Parliament, they have shewn their readiness to coerce consciences by penalties, and to have recourse to the provisions of old and forgotten statutes to this end. They are seeking to impose the yoke of a mere formal and ceremonial religion upon the people, and they shrink from no device, however mean or oppressive, that can promote their purposes."

An article in a similar strain appeared in the *Examiner*. It concludes as follows:—

"To understand the baseness of the trick, observe that all those who sent their proxies *against* Sunday trains are made to vote for leaving the matter in the hands of the Directors. What would these worthies say should the Directors think fit to open the line on Sunday, on the plea that they have a vote recorded committing the matter to their hands? If they should do so, we cannot say that it would be very inconsistent with their past morality.

"It may be a nice question with those who are curious in the analysis of moral obliquity, whether the incident we have just related, or that by which the same object was accomplished in the Scottish Central Company, be the more admirable in its cunning unscrupulousness. Our readers may probably remember the circumstance to which we allude. A vast preponderance of proxies were in favour of opening the line, but the person who was to move the amendment on that side happening to leave the room for a few minutes, the counter-motion was put in his absence; and as no one had presence of mind enough to represent him, it was declared unanimously carried!

"Dr Candlish lately described the operations of the Sabbath Alliance as 'long-headed,' an expression generally synonymous with *cunning*. That individual objects may be accomplished through such qualities, we do not doubt; but it involves too much of the art of the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness in reality, to be the means of permanently influencing great questions in which truth, religion, and honesty are concerned. It will do no harm to the cause of toleration in Scotland to be beaten with such weapons. We only hope that no temporary irritation may tempt its advocates to have recourse to others like them. Let them never doubt that they will ultimately triumph."

It is worthy of remark, that even after all possible advantage had been gained by the partisanship and devices of the Directors, there was still left a considerable and increasing majority in favour of the trains.

Since 1847, when the question had been last divided on, the votes given absolutely *for* trains had increased from 6751 to 7565; while the votes *against* trains had fallen from 6820 to 5836. The editor of the *Scotsman*, by whom this circumstance was pointed out at the time, and to whose acuteness, energy, consistency, and courage, the cause of religious liberty is deeply indebted, remarked also that, "in 1847, there was a preponderance of the *stock* voted on of £30,390 in favour of opening; in 1849, there is a preponderance (even reckoning according to Mr Blackburn's unparalleled plan) of £62,874. We court attention to the fact that, nevertheless, the majority which was 152 in 1847, is 241 now, shewing that the Pharisees maintain the little ground they really possess only by splitting and vote-manufacturing. It is important also to note the fact that one-half of the capital of the company (excluding loans) has not voted at all. All that half may be considered favourable to opening—the Pharisees, who are thoroughly organised, knowing all their men, and looking sharply after them, while the other side, with little or no organisation, only grope in the dark. We have thus the amendment carried by less than one-fourth of the capital, at least a half of that fourth voting against their own avowed opinions, in order to please a presumptuous and clamorous clique, and the half of the remaining eighth composed of parties scattered over the whole country, who have bought one or two votes apiece for the sole purpose of making the company a field for agitating theological questions. If the *bona fide* Shareholders choose to tolerate such a state of matters, they should know that the *bona fide* Scotch public will *not*, but will continue perseveringly to resent and assail the insulting tyranny." *

On the two subsequent occasions when my motion was brought forward, the results were these:—

At the meeting on 12th March 1850, "a show of hands was taken, when 16 were held up for the motion, while the numbers against it were so numerous that they were not counted." The proxies stood as follows:—

	Stock.	Votes.
"Against Sunday trains,	£427,218	6094
"For Sunday trains,	4,575	74
	<hr/>	<hr/>
"Majority against Sunday trains,	£422,643	6020 "

At the meeting on 27th August 1850, "it was agreed to come to a vote by a show of hands; when there appeared 40 for the amendment of Mr Macfie, and 18 for the motion of Mr Cox. The amendment was therefore declared to be carried. The proxies sent in to the Directors were stated to shew the following results:—

	Stock.	Votes.
"Against Sunday trains,	£309,376	4481
"For Sunday trains,	30,237	233
	<hr/>	<hr/>
"Majority against Sunday trains,	£279,139	4248 "

The comparatively small attendance, on these two occasions, of

* *Scotsman*, 22d August 1849.

Shareholders favourable to the motion, was the natural effect of a well-founded belief that no actual trial of strength would take place ; seeing that, as usual, the Sabbatarian leaders would secure an efficient muster of their friends (who mostly reside in Glasgow and its neighbourhood), and would, moreover, by a liberal expenditure of money, add no small strength of proxies to that of voters present.

If, happily, the Directors shall reach the conviction that they are *not entitled* to withhold from the public the use of the Sunday Trains, they need not be deterred from doing justice by any compact with those Sabbatarians who, several years ago, helped them into power ; for, in the eye alike of morality and the law, every agreement to do what is unjust and illegal is, *ab initio*, null and void. Nor need they pay much regard to the resolutions of the meetings above referred to—carried as those resolutions were by a small but active section of the shareholders. The *majority* has a preferable claim to their respect ; and if, in spite of the facts above adduced, it appear to them doubtful what the wish of the majority is, a cheap and easy mode of ascertaining the truth is at hand : let them send to each shareholder a circular inclosing a *simple and unambiguous* declaration, to be signed and returned by *such as are hostile to the proposal embodied in my motion* ; and let them, in doing so, refrain from directly or indirectly employing their influence as a Board to bias any of the shareholders. Nobody who regarded the running of the Sunday Trains as a breach of religious duty would fail to sign and return the declaration forthwith ; and all others would, by omitting to do so, tacitly intimate their consent that passengers as well as letters and parcels should again be carried. If the preponderance were thus clearly ascertained to be in favour of the measure, the Board would be not only justified, but bound by a due respect for their constituents, to carry it into effect without delay. But I repeat, that if the public right asserted in the foregoing pages exist (and till the Plea be refuted I cannot but regard it as conclusive), no such appeal to the shareholders is in the slightest degree necessary ; since it is the duty of the Directors to fulfil every obligation of the Company to the public, whether nine-tenths or only a tenth or a twentieth of their constituents be adverse to their doing so. And with respect to the Sabbatarian section of *the community at large*, it is plain that although it were as preponderant, either in number or in the qualities which give weight to men's opinions and advice, as I believe it to be the reverse, its remonstrances in such a case as this are still less entitled to regard. Any complaints from that quarter against the Board for honestly performing a bargain, could bring discredit only upon those who made them.

NOTE B, page 3.

The Right to act according to one's Religious Belief.

At the meeting to which the contents of this page were originally addressed, I was accused by the Rev. Dr Lorimer of Glasgow, of maintaining “a monstrous doctrine, which would cover and protect the greatest vices and atrocities that had been committed on the face

of the earth. Would not," he asked, "the Thugs in the East Indies say with perfect sincerity that they held it as a religious duty to murder their fellow-men? Theirs was not a religion—he would call it a superstition; but on the principle advocated by the gentleman who first spoke, those persons were honest, and equally entitled to hold their opinions with any others."*

This accusation was founded on a speech in which the very words printed in the text were used:—namely, that every man is entitled "to shape his practice in conformity with his own conclusions as to the divine will; *under this sole restriction always, that he shall abstain from violating by his conduct the rights of his fellow-men;*"—"that for our religious opinions and practice, *while they violate no man's rights,* we are responsible to God alone;" and that, "*so long as the rights of society are uninvaded,* no one has a right to say to us, 'What doest thou?'" The qualification was deliberately thus reiterated, in order to prevent, if possible, misconception on the part even of the dullest hearer; and, with the same object, the first of the three clauses here printed in italics was uttered with as marked an emphasis as a pretty strong voice was capable of giving it.†

If, as is probable and may here be assumed, the reverend gentleman was not guilty of intentional misrepresentation, it must be concluded, either that, in his opinion, the murders committed by the Thugs do not "violate the rights of their fellow-men;" or that, in believing me to be the apologist of every crime committed from religious motives, he fell into a misapprehension not less "monstrous" than the doctrine which he fancied he had heard. If the former alternative be the true one, he is beyond the reach of argument; if the latter, he has furnished a proof that to be a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, and a doctor of divinity, is not necessarily to be so well imbued with the spirit of religious freedom, as to be incapable of ridiculously misunderstanding a plain statement of its tritest and most elementary principles.

So absurdly complete, indeed, was the mistake of the reverend gentleman, that, instead of having proclaimed the "monstrous doctrine" ascribed to me, *I had, on the contrary, been loudly complaining of him and his friends for acting in a manner which, as far as principle is concerned, thoroughly assimilates THEM to those very Thugs whom I am represented as virtually taking under my patronage!*‡ The fact is, that, in accusing me, he unwittingly pronounced his own condemnation; for,

* Report of Dr Lorimer's speech, in the North British Mail of 13th March 1850, p. 1, col. 5.

† That the words above quoted are exactly those which were spoken, I am able to certify with confidence; for, knowing well the necessity of extreme precision and clearness of language in such discussions, and having neither talent nor practice as a public speaker, I had taken the precaution to commit the argument to paper, and, as all who were present might see, made faithful use of the manuscript while speaking.

‡ "Many and many a time," says Richard Baxter, "my own and others' sermons have been censured, and openly defamed, for that which never was in them, upon the ignorance or heedlessness of a censorious hearer: *yea, for that which they directly spoke against;* because they were not understood. Especially he that hath a close style, free from tautology, where every word must be marked by him that will not misunderstand, shall frequently be misrepresented."—*Baxter's Works, by Orme, vol. ii., p. 561.*

just as the Thugs, on their side, regard it as a meritorious act of religion to murder and rob travellers, so do the reverend doctor and his sabbatarian friends, on their side, think it a religious duty *to rob the public of the means of travelling on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway on Sundays—to which means of travelling the persons robbed have as perfect a right as the victims of the Thugs have to their lives and property!*

That Dr Lorimer, not less than the Thugs—or than Samuel when he hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal—or the followers of Joshua when they slaughtered the Canaanites—or Calvin when he burned Servetus in Geneva for heresy—or the excellent Judge Hale when he condemned old women to death for witchcraft—is “honest and equally entitled to *hold his opinions* with any other,” I do not for a moment call in question. But when from opinion he proceeds to action—when, instead of merely expostulating with those whom he regards as sinners, he becomes a railway-shareholder and joins a band of robbers under the idea that it is his religious duty to do that which is as truly a violation of my rights as the taking of my purse would be—I am just as little inclined to tolerate *his* religious doings as I should be to submit with meekness to the predatory religious rites of the Thugs, or to wink at any of the other “vices and atrocities” which my doctrine is said to “cover and protect.”*

Dr Lorimer appears to have studied to little purpose, if at all, the literature of religious liberty, else he would have been more deeply impressed with the fact, that during the long and earnest controversy by which the right of private judgment in religious matters was at length established on an immovable basis, the accusation which he so solemnly brings against me was completely met by the champions of freedom in the 17th century; and that any revival of it now is looked upon with surprise and contempt by well-informed and thinking men. Its revival, in fact, has of late been so seldom ventured upon, that it would be difficult to point out among Protestant writers during the hundred and fifty years which have followed the

* “On no occasion,” says that very able and consistent champion of religious liberty, Bishop Watson, “ought we to act in opposition to our conscience, but it does not follow that in obeying the dictates of conscience we always act rightly; for there is such a thing as an erroneous conscience, and we may not be able to detect the error. I knew a gentleman who had been brought up at Eton and at Cambridge, who from being a Protestant became a Roman Catholic. This gentleman examined the foundation of both religions, and finally settled on that of the Church of Rome. He acted properly in following the impulse of his judgment. I think he formed an erroneous judgment, but that is only my opinion, in opposition to his opinion; and even admitting my opinion to be right, it would be uncharitable in me to condemn him; for God only knows whether, with his talents and constitutional turn of mind, he could have escaped the error into which he had fallen. With a similar degree of moderation, therefore, I think of the different sects of Christians. Every sect believes itself to be right; but it does not become any of them to say, ‘I am more righteous than my neighbour,’ or to think that the gates of Heaven are shut against all others.”—*Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, written by Himself*, vol. ii., p. 230. Lond. 1818.

The same truly Christian spirit pervades the whole of that instructive work; see particularly vol. i., pp. 107, 118, and vol. ii., pp. 16, 17, 56, 227, 287; also his *Miscellaneous Tracts on Religious, Political, and Agricultural Subjects*, Lond. 1815; and pp. 39 and 47 of the Catalogue of Books in Divinity appended to vol. vi. of his *Collection of Theological Tracts*, 2d ed., Lond. 1791.

death of Locke, a single instance of so rash an enterprise, besides that of Dr Lorimer himself.

While religious liberty was still a question even among Protestants no argument was more frequently employed by the advocates of despotism than this very one,—That the right of private judgment would, if conceded to all, sanction every species of crime, sedition, and immorality, which knaves or enthusiasts might pretend or imagine to fall within the sphere of their religious duties. How strenuously and effectively the inference was repudiated, may be learned from the controversies of the day ;* and in particular from the following passage in Locke's conclusive *Letter concerning Toleration*, a work in which the whole subject of men's religious rights is handled with consummate ability.

“ As the magistrate,” says he, “ has no power to *impose* by his laws, the use of any rites and ceremonies in any church, so neither has he any power to *forbid* the use of such rites and ceremonies as are already received, approved, and practised by any church : because if he did so, he would destroy the church itself; the end of whose institution is only to worship God with freedom, after its own manner.

“ You will say, by this rule, if some congregations should have a mind to sacrifice infants, or, as the primitive Christians were falsely accused, lustfully pollute themselves in promiscuous uncleanness, or practice any other such heinous enormities, is the magistrate obliged to tolerate them, because they are committed in a religious assembly ? I answer, No. These things are not lawful in the ordinary course of life, nor in any private house ; and therefore neither are they so in the worship of God, or in any religious meeting. But indeed if any people congregated upon account of religion, should be desirous to sacrifice a calf, I deny that that ought to be prohibited by a law. Melibœus, whose calf it is, may lawfully kill his calf at home, and burn any part of it that he thinks fit. For no injury is thereby done to any one, no prejudice to another man's goods. And for the same reason he may kill his calf also in a religious meeting. Whether the doing so be well-pleasing to God or no, it is their part to consider that do it. The

* See, for instance, Apollonii Jus Majestatis circa Sacra, tom. i., pp. 26, 56, 58, quoted in Dr M'Crie's Miscellaneous Writings, p. 478 ; Letter from Faustus Socinus to Martinus Vadovitz, 14th June 1598, in Toulmin's Memoirs of Socinus, pp. 103, 105, 111 ; Dr John Owen's Works, xv., 74, 201, 239, 241, 242 ; Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, Epistle Dedicatory, and Sect. xiii., § 2 ; Sect. xvi., § 3 ; Sect. xix., *passim* (Heber's edition of his Works, vii., 403, 411 ; viii. 118, 142, 212) ; Bishop Barlow's Case of a Toleration in Matters of Religion, pp. 21, 31 ; Barclay's Apology for the Quakers, Prop. 14 ; and Locke's Letter concerning Toleration, ed. 1765, p. 51. Among later writers, see Dr Benjamin Ibbot's Sermons on the Right and Duty of Private Judgment, in the Boyle Lectures, ii., 806 ; Dr Balguy's Third Charge (on Religious Liberty) delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Winchester, in his Nine Discourses, &c., p. 208, 2d edit., 1817 ; Dr Furneaux's Letters to Blackstone concerning his Exposition of the Act of Toleration, &c., pp. 158, 160 (London, 1770) ; Dr Parr's Works, vol. iii., pp. 710, 715 ; Bishop Heber's Life of Taylor, pp. 216, 217, 318 ; Sismondi's Review of the Progress of Religious Opinions during the Nineteenth Century, p. 32 (Lond. 1826) ; Samuel Bailey's Essay on the Formation and Publication of Opinions, 2d ed., p. 316 (Lond. 1826) ; and an admirable article on the Right of Private Judgment in the Edinburgh Review, vol. lxxvi., p. 412. The last is from the pen of Mr Henry Rogers, and is reprinted among his Essays selected from that periodical, vol. ii., p. 1.

part of the magistrate is only to take care that the commonwealth receive no prejudice, and that there be no injury done to any man, either in life or estate. And thus what may be spent on a feast, may be spent on a sacrifice. But if peradventure such were the state of things, that the interest of the commonwealth required all slaughter of beasts should be forborne for some while, in order to the encreasing of the stock of cattle, that had been destroyed by some extraordinary murrain; who sees not that the magistrate, in such a case, may forbid all his subjects to kill any calfs for any use whatsoever? Only it is to be observed, that in this case the law is not made about a religious, but a political matter: nor is the sacrifice, but the slaughter of calves, thereby prohibited.

“By this we see what difference there is between the church and the commonwealth. Whatsoever is lawful in the commonwealth, cannot be prohibited by the magistrate in the church. Whatsoever is permitted unto any of his subjects for their ordinary use, neither can nor ought to be forbidden by him to any sect of people for their religious uses. If any man may lawfully take bread or wine, either sitting or kneeling in his own house, the law ought not to abridge him of the same liberty in his religious worship; though in the church the use of bread and wine be very different, and be there applied to the mysteries of faith, and rites of divine worship. But those things that are prejudicial to the common weal of a people in their ordinary use, and are therefore forbidden by laws, those things ought not to be permitted to churches in their sacred rites. Only the magistrate ought always to be very careful that he do not misuse his authority, to the oppression of any church, under pretence of public good.”

The magistrate, then, ignoring men's *motives* altogether, attends merely to their *actions*. When these infringe the rights of any whom he is bound to protect, he steps in and punishes the aggressor; and when the injurious act happens to be part of a religious ceremony, the punishment is for the *civil injury or crime*, and not for the *theological error*. Of this he has no right to take the slightest cognizance; it is entirely beyond his jurisdiction.

Now, what is true in such cases of the magistrate as the representative of the community, is true of the individual members of the community; and what is true of sacred rites in churches, is true of sacred duties in railway meetings. As the Sabbatarians may, without hindrance from any human law, kill, by way of sacrifice, any calf belonging not to “Melibœus” but to themselves, so may they lawfully (whether wisely or unwisely is not here the question) put a stop to the running of all coaches, cabs, and other vehicles, *belonging to themselves, and all railway trains under their control (whether plying on Sunday or Saturday), by which other men HAVE NO RIGHT TO BE CARRIED*. In the foregoing Plea, it has been shewn that the public are entitled to be carried on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway on Sundays; and what I affirm is, that neither the magistrate, nor Dr Lorimer and his associates, nor the Directors, are at liberty to deprive us of the enjoyment of that right, on the ground that they are doing what is (*i. e.* what they think) acceptable to God. If the reverend gentleman deny the right, let him demonstrate the inconclusiveness of the grounds on which it is maintained.

NOTE C, page 3.

God's Truth and Man's Truth.

“Logical truth,” says Dr Campbell, “consisteth in the conformity of our conceptions to their archetypes in the nature of things.”* This is *absolute truth*, or *God's truth*; and its expression in words is *verbal truth*: “Those propositions,” says Wollaston, “are true, which express things as they are: or, truth is the conformity of those words or signs by which things are expressed, to the things themselves.”†

The other kind of truth, which in the text is distinguished from absolute and eternal truth, and to which the appellation of *man's truth* may be fitly applied, is that described by Dr Beattie where he says—“I account that to be *truth* which the constitution of our nature determines us to believe, and that to be *falsehood* which the constitution of our nature determines us to disbelieve. . . . We often believe what we afterwards find to be false: but while belief continues, we think it true: when we discover its falsity, we believe it no longer. . . . Truths are of different kinds; some are certain, others only probable; and we ought not to call that act of the mind which attends the perception of certainty, and that which attends the perception of probability by one and the same name. Some have called the former *conviction*, and the latter *assent*. All convictions are equally strong; but assent admits of innumerable degrees, from *moral certainty*, which is the highest degree, downward, through the several stages of *opinion*, to that suspense of judgment which is called *doubt*.”‡ “Of the eternal relations and fitnesses of things,” says the same writer, “we know nothing; all that we know of truth and falsehood is, that our constitution determines us in some cases to believe, in others to disbelieve; and that to us is truth which we feel that we must believe; and that to us is falsehood which we feel that we must disbelieve.”§ “We are here,” says he, “treating of the nature and immutability of truth, as perceived by human faculties. Whatever intuitive proposition, man, by the law of his nature, must believe as certain, or as probable, is, in regard to him, certain or probable truth; and must constitute a part of human knowledge, and remain unalterably the same, as long as the human constitution remains unaltered.”|| “While man continues in his present state, our own intellectual feelings are, and must be, the standard of truth to us. All evidence productive of belief, is resolvable into the evidence of consciousness; and comes at last to this point,—I believe because I believe, or because the law of my nature determines me to believe. This belief may be called implicit; but it is the only rational belief of which we are capable: and to say that our minds ought not to

* Philos. of Rhetoric, B. I., ch. 5, at the beginning.

† The Religion of Nature Delineated, Sect. I., par. 4.

‡ Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, Part I., ch. I., pp. 18, 19. Lond. 1810.

§ *Ib.*, Part II., ch. 1, § 2, p. 134.

|| *Ib.*, Part II., ch. 1, § 3, p. 148.

submit to it, is as absurd as to say that our bodies ought not to be nourished with food. Revelation itself must be attended with evidence to satisfy consciousness, or common sense; otherwise it can never be rationally believed. By the evidence of the gospel, the rational Christian is persuaded that it comes from God. He acquiesces in it as truth, not because it is recommended by others, but because it satisfies his own understanding.*

It thus appears that a doctrine which, when uttered by me, is "monstrous" and dangerous, has for three quarters of a century stood harmless and admired in the principal work written in opposition to the sceptical philosophy of Hume! "Our own intellectual feelings," says Dr Beattie, "are, and must be, the standard of truth to us." "The opinions a man adopts," say I, "are the truth to him." These two propositions are identical; and if it be true that mine asserts (as Dr Lorimer says it does) that "there is no such thing as a standard of truth," then is Dr Beattie's chargeable with the same enormity.

But every discriminating reader will see that both Dr Beattie and I assert merely the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism, that each man's own judgment is to himself, though to nobody else, the standard of truth. Whoever denies this, and affirms that there is another standard, is bound to tell what the true standard is, and to prove that it really possesses the character which is claimed for it.

Many will say that the revealed declarations of God are the standard of religious truth. Admitting this to be the fact, a standard must still be found to determine, *1st*, where the revealed declarations of God are to be found; and, *2dly*, what is the true meaning of the records containing them. Now, it is only by the exercise of the intellectual faculties in the act of private judgment that these questions can be answered; so that private judgment is in fact the su-

* Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, Part III., ch. I, p. 264.

In the following lines of Butler, the word *truth* is used in the sense of *man's truth*; in other words, belief, persuasion, or opinion:—

"Th' Egyptians worshipp'd dogs, and for
Their faith made internecine war;
Others ador'd a rat, and some
For that church suffer'd martyrdom;
The Indians fought for the *truth*
Of th' elephant and monkey's tooth:
And many, to defend that faith,
Fought it out *mordicus* to death."

Hudibras, Part I., Canto I., v. 773-780.

"Our opinions," says Dr Ibbot, "do not alter the nature of things, and make them true or false as we believe or disbelieve them. Things are true or false in themselves antecedently to, and exclusively of, our opinions about them. So that though every man's religion be true to himself, yet it does not therefore follow that it is true in itself because he believes it to be so. He may have made a wrong choice, and embraced his religion before he had duly weighed the proofs of it."—*Boyle Lectures*, ii., 818; Sermon entitled, "The Objections against Private Judgment answered."

Besides "God's truth" and "man's truth," above explained, there is "moral truth," which is the verbal expression of the latter, and is defined by Locke to be "speaking of things according to the persuasion of our own minds, though the proposition we speak agree not to the reality of things."—*Essay*, B. IV., ch. v., § 11.

preme arbiter here as in every thing else.* In regard to the question, What are the revealed declarations of God? there is a pretty general

* "For what," says the most eminent of Scottish theologians, "is every man's immediate standard of orthodoxy but his own opinions? . . . Should ye object, that the standard is not any thing so fleeting as opinion; it is the word of God, and right reason: this, if ye attend to it, will bring you back to the very same point which ye seek to avoid. The dictates both of scripture and of reason, we see but too plainly, are differently interpreted by different persons, of whose sincerity we have no ground to doubt. Now to every individual, that only, amongst all the varieties of sentiments, can be his rule, which to the best of his judgment, that is, in his opinion, is the import of either. Nor is there a possibility of avoiding this recurrence at last. But . . . such is the presumption of vain man (of which bad quality the weakest judgments have commonly the greatest share), that it is with difficulty any one person can be brought to think that any other person has, or can have, as strong conviction of a different set of opinions as he has of his."—(*Dr Campbell's Lectures on Eccl. Hist.*, Lect. 25.)

This subject is excellently illustrated by Mr Blanco White, in his *Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy*. "What," says he, "do divines understand by *Christian truth*? The answer at first appears obvious. '*Christian truth* (it will be said) is what Christ and his apostles knew and taught concerning salvation under the Gospel.' Thus far we find no difficulty: but (let me ask again) where does this exist as an object *external* to our minds? The answer appears no less obvious than the former: '*In the Bible.*'—Still I must ask, Is the MATERIAL Bible the *Christian truth* about which Christians dispute? 'No (it will be readily said): not the MATERIAL Bible, but the SENSE of the Bible.'—Now (I beg to know) is the SENSE of the Bible an object *external* to our minds? Does any *sense* of the Bible, accessible to man, exist anywhere but in the mind of each man who receives it from the words he reads? The Divine Mind certainly knows in what sense those words were used; but as we cannot compare our mental impressions with that model and original of all truth, it is clear that by the *sense* of the Bible we must mean our own sense of its meaning. When, therefore, any man declares his intention to defend *Christian truth*, he only expresses his determination to defend his *own notions*, as produced by the words of the Bible. No other *Christian truth* exists for us in our present state.

"I feel confident that what I have now stated is a *fact*, which every reflecting person may ascertain beyond doubt, by looking into his own mind: yet I know that few will attempt the mental examination necessary for the acknowledgment of this fact. A storm of feeling will rise at the view of the preceding argument; and impassioned questions, whether Christianity is a dream—whether Christ could leave us in such a state of uncertainty—whether there is no difference between truth and error, with many others more directly pointed at myself, will bring the inquiry to the end of all theological questions—abuse, hatred, and (were it not for the protection, alas! of the great and powerful multitude who, 'caring not for these things,' take, nevertheless, more interest in the public peace than Gallio) severe bodily suffering, and perhaps death.

"The mental *fact* which I have stated is, nevertheless, as unchangeable as the intellectual laws to which God has subjected mankind; as fixed as the means employed by God himself to address his revelation to us. The *Christian truth*, which man can make an object of defence, is an impression which exists in his own mind: it is *his own* Christian truth which he wilfully identifies with the Christian truth which is known to the Divine Mind. That each individual is bound to hold that Christian truth which he conscientiously believes to have found; that it is the great moral duty of every man to prepare himself conscientiously for the undisturbed reception of the *impression* which he is to revere and to follow as *Christian truth*, I cannot doubt at all. I acknowledge, also, the duty of every man to assist others (without intrusion), as much as it may be in his power, in receiving a mental impression similar to that which he venerates as Christian truth. But it is at this point that a fierce contest arises; and the reason is this: certain men wish to force all others to reverence (at least *externally*), not the mental impression, the *sense*, which each receives from the Bible—not the conviction at which each has arrived—but the im-

agreement among Protestants, that the collection of ancient books forming the Bible, is the only authentic record of God's supernatural revelations to man; but when the *true meaning* of it comes under consideration, men's private standards of truth, when freely applied, are found by experience to furnish, in many cases, the most opposite indications. One man's judgment decides that the doctrines of Calvin are revealed in the Bible; another, those of the Pope; a third, those of Arminius; a fourth, those of Socinus; a fifth, those of George Fox; and a sixth, those of Swedenborg. In regard to the scriptural doctrine of the Sabbath, one man agrees with Sir Andrew Agnew, another with Archbishop Whately. And each unavoidably regards his own opinions as the truth, and those of the other investigators, so far as different from his own, as error. In like manner, the "religious truth" of savages is very different from that of civilized men, and the "truth" of a "consecrated cobbler" from that of an able and accomplished scholar. So also, the "religious truth" of thoughtful inquirers is usually different, in many respects, at the age of sixty, from what it was at twenty.

Baxter, a man who, during a long and active life, both thought and published with more rapidity and earnestness than any other theologian of his own or perhaps any age, makes repeated mention of his experience in regard to alterations of his views. "If," says he, "you must never change your first opinions or apprehensions, how will you grow in understanding? Will you be no wiser at age than you were at childhood? . . . Our first unripe apprehensions of things will certainly be greatly changed, if we are studious, and of improved understandings. . . . For my own part, my judgment is altered from many of my youthful, confident apprehensions: and where it holdeth the same conclusion, it rejecteth abundance of the arguments, as vain, which once it rested in. And where I keep to the same conclusions and arguments, my apprehension of them is not the same, but I see more satisfying light in many things which I took but upon trust before."* Again: "The great mutability of our apprehensions doth

pression and conviction of some theological sect or church. The Christian truth of some privileged leaders (it is contended by every church respectively) should be recognised as Christian truth by all the world: in more accurate, because more scientific language, Christian parties, of the most different characters, have for eighteen centuries agreed only in this—that the *subjective* Christian truth of certain men should, by compulsion, be made the *objective* Christian truth to all the world: *i. e.* that the *sense* which the Scriptures did at some time or other convey, or still convey, to such and such men, should be acknowledged as identical with that sense which was in the mind of the writers of the Bible; the true sense which is known to the Divine Mind.

"Opposition to these various standards of Christian truth, with those who respectively adopt them, is HERESY."—Pp. 5-7.

See also p. 58 of the same work; J. Martineau's "Rationale of Religious Enquiry; or the Question stated of Reason, the Bible, and the Church," Lecture iv., p. 56 of the 3d Edition; Archbishop Whately's "Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, which may arise from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors," 2d Edition, pp. 184, 250; the Rev. Baden Powell's "Tradition Unveiled: or, an Exposition of the Pretensions and Tendency of Authoritative Teaching in the Church," p. 76; the Quarterly Review, vol. xiv., p. 238; and Selden's Table Talk, article on "Declaring the Will of God," in his Works, vol. iii., Part ii., p. 2060. The passage in Selden will be quoted afterwards.

* Christian Ethics, Part I., ch. ii.; Works, vol. ii., p. 129.

shew that they are not many things [in theology, &c.] that we are certain of. Do we not feel in ourselves how new thoughts and new reasons are ready to breed new conjectures in us, and that looketh doubtful to us, upon further thoughts, of which long before we had no doubt? Besides the multitudes that change their very religion, every studious person so oft changeth his conceptions, as may testify the shallowness of our minds."* In his autobiography, published in the *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, he has recorded, in simple and beautiful terms, his last thoughts on this subject. The passage has often been reprinted, and is characterised by an Edinburgh Reviewer as "the most impressive record in our own language, if not in any tongue, of the gradual ripening of a powerful mind under the culture of incessant study, wide experience, and anxious self-observation."† Coleridge, also, pronounces this autobiography of Baxter to be "an inestimable book."‡

If there be one point in theology which, more than any other, is in this country thought by most people to be clearly revealed in the Bible, it is the doctrine of the Trinity. Many are unable to conceive it possible, that an intelligent and candid reader of the Scriptures should fail to discover it plainly taught there; and some are even ignorant of the existence, in past or present times, of Christians who deny that it is to be found in the New Testament.§ Yet there have been scholars,—and these not a few,—who, although brought up in the belief of this doctrine, and sometimes biassed by weighty inducements to give its evidence the most favourable consideration, have been led, after mature study of the Bible and those branches of learn-

* Of Falsely-Pretended Knowledge, Part I. ch. xvi.; Works, vol. xv., p. 130.

† Edinburgh Review, vol. lxx., p. 218. See *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, Part I., pp. 124-135, Lond. 1696. The passages referred to are given by Mr Orme in his *Life of Baxter*, pp. 775-785; and by Dr Wordsworth, in his *Ecclesiastical Biography*, vol. v., p. 559. Some extracts may be seen in Chambers's *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, vol. i., pp. 454-7. See also Dr Samuel Johnson's observations on this subject in the *Rambler*, No. 196.

Swift, in his *Thoughts on Various Subjects*, exclaims: "If a man would register all his opinions upon love, politics, religion, learning, &c., beginning from his youth, and so go on to old age, what a bundle of inconsistencies and contradictions would appear at last!"

And Niebuhr, writing to a friend in 1814, observes: "It is not the Pope, but the imposition of a creed, which the true lover of freedom fears; for no one individual can undertake to hold the same creed unchanged throughout his life, and no two can believe exactly alike, unless they choke themselves with words."—(*Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr*, vol. i., p. 414. London, 1852.)

‡ Coleridge's *Table Talk*, vol. i., p. 83. "Baxter," says Doddridge in one of his letters, "is my particular favourite; and it is impossible to tell you how much I am charmed with the devotion, good sense, and pathos, which are everywhere to be found in that writer. I cannot, indeed, forbear looking upon him as one of the greatest orators that our nation ever produced, both with regard to copiousness, acuteness, and energy; and if he has described the temper of his own heart, he appears to have been so far superior to the generality of those whom we must charitably hope to be good men, that one would imagine God raised him up to disgrace and condemn his brethren, by shewing what a Christian is; and how few in the world deserve the character!"—(*Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge, D.D.*, vol. i., p. 460. London, 1829.)

§ On an occasion of the delivery, in a church in Edinburgh, of a sermon in proof of the Trinity, a young lady of my acquaintance, of such education as was usual in her rank, and who is now the wife of a Scottish clergyman, expressed her surprise that so much pains should be taken to convince people of what everybody believed already!

ing which elucidate its meaning, to renounce as human error what they had long cherished and venerated as the truth of God. It will surprise some readers to be told that Milton was one of these; but there is irrefragable proof of the fact. That this great man originally believed in the Trinity, appears from an invocation near the end of his treatise *Of Reformation in England*, published in 1641.* But when his posthumous and latest work, "*A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, compiled from the Holy Scriptures alone*," was, in the present generation, discovered and published, it became apparent that he had adopted, in his riper age, the opinion that the Father alone is the supreme and eternal God.† His doctrine in chapter v., is thus epitomized by Sumner:—"It is there asserted, that the Son existed in the beginning, and was the first of the whole creation; by whose delegated power all things were made in heaven and earth; begotten, not by natural necessity, but by the decree of the Father, within the limits of time; endued with the divine nature and substance, but distinct from and inferior to the Father; one with the Father in love and unanimity of will, and receiving everything, in his filial as well as in his mediatorial character, from the Father's gift. This summary," continues Mr Sumner, "will be sufficient to shew that the opinions of Milton were in reality nearly Arian, ascribing to the Son as high a share of divinity as was compatible with the denial of his self-existence and eternal generation, but not admitting his co-equality and co-essentiality with the Father."—(P. xxxiv.) But "with respect to the cardinal doctrine of the atonement, the opinions of Milton are expressed throughout in the strongest and most unqualified manner" in its favour.—(P. xxxvi.) He teaches also the doctrine of original sin (p. 262); but in some other particulars differs from those deemed orthodox in Scotland—as where he lays it down that "in death, the whole man (consisting of body, spirit, and soul), and each component part, suffers privation of life" (p. 280); that "there is consequently no recompense of good or bad after death, previous to the day of judgment" (p. 293); that Christ died, not for the elect only, but "for all mankind" (p. 323, *et seq.*); and that the Mosaic law, particularly the article relating to the Sabbath, neither is, nor ever was, binding upon the Gentiles (pp. 228, 600.) In his prefatory remarks to the chapter "Of the Son of God," he asserts the right of private judgment with a characteristic dignity, and cogency of reason, which no true Protestant can resist. "If indeed," says he, "I were a member of the Church of Rome, which requires implicit obedience to its creed, on all points of faith, I should have acquiesced from education or habit in its simple decree and authority, even though it denies that the doctrine of the

* *Prose Works*, vol. ii. p. 417; Mr J. A. St John's edition, in Bohn's Standard Library. The passage is as follows:—"Thou, therefore, that sittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of angels and men! next, thee I implore, omnipotent King, Redeemer of that lost remnant whose nature thou didst assume, ineffable and everlasting Love! and thou, the third subsistence of divine infinitude, illumining Spirit, the joy and solace of created things! one Tripersonal Godhead! look upon this thy poor and almost spent and expiring Church," &c. See additional evidence of Milton's early Trinitarianism in Mr Charles R. Sumner's preface to his translation of the *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. xxxiv. Lond., 1825.

† Book I., chapters v. and vi., "Of the Son of God," and "Of the Holy Spirit."

Trinity, as now received, is capable of being proved from any passage of Scripture. But since I enrol myself among the number of those who acknowledge the word of God alone as the rule of faith, and freely advance what appears to me much more clearly deducible from the Holy Scriptures than the commonly received opinion, I see no reason why any one who belongs to the same Protestant or Reformed Church, and professes to acknowledge the same rule of faith as myself, should take offence at my freedom, particularly as I impose my authority on no one, but merely propose what I think more worthy of belief than the creed in general acceptance. I only intreat that my readers will ponder and examine my statements, in a spirit which desires to discover nothing but the truth, and with a mind free from prejudice. For without intending to oppose the authority of Scripture, which I consider inviolably sacred, I only take upon myself to refute human interpretations as often as the occasion requires, conformably to my right, or rather to my duty, as a man. If indeed those with whom I have to contend were able to produce direct attestation from heaven, to the truth of the doctrine which they espouse, it would be nothing less than impiety to venture to raise, I do not say a clamour, but so much as a murmur against it. But inasmuch as they can lay claim to nothing more than human powers, assisted by that spiritual illumination which is common to all, it is not unreasonable that they should, on their part, allow the privileges of diligent research and free discussion to another inquirer, who is seeking truth through the same means, and in the same way as themselves, and whose desire of benefiting mankind is equal to their own.”*

Let us take another noted instance of the same kind. Dr Daniel Whitby, whose piety and learning Bishop Watson vouches for as “above all question,” † tells, in the preface to his Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament, that he found so many things said by Le Clerc, in his Animadversions on Hammond, in favour of the Arians, that he protracted the publication of his work *till he had prepared an antidote for them*. But, instead of an antidote, he found that which convinced himself that Arianism has a preponderating weight of Scriptural authority: and in his Last Thoughts, which were published by his express order after his death, this theologian, who had intended to refute the Arians, is, at the close of his studies undertaken for that purpose, found writing in the following terms:—“This doctrine, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are of one and the same individual and numerical essence, *seems to burlesque the Holy Scriptures, or give them an uncouth and absurd sense, from the beginning of the Gospel to the end of the Epistles.*” And he candidly acknowledges in his preface, that “when he wrote his Commentaries he went on too hastily in the common beaten road of other reputed orthodox divines; conceiving, first, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one complex notion, were one and the same God, by virtue of the same individual essence communicated from the Father—*which confused notion he is now fully convinced to be a thing impossible, and full of gross absurdities.*”

* Pp. 80, 81. The same just sentiments are expressed in his treatise Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, &c.; Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 510.

† Catalogue of Books in Divinity, p. 7, appended to vol. vi. of Bishop Watson's Collection of Theological Tracts.

This same Dr Whitby, in the preface to a Discourse concerning Election and Reprobation, &c., which he published in 1710, mentions that he was brought up a Calvinist, and that what first moved him to examine into the truth of the Calvinistic divinity was the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity, and the strange consequences of it. He adds, that he examined the writings of antiquity, and finished a treatise on Original Sin in Latin, which had been composed about twenty years, but which he had not thought it advisable to lay before the world. This anti-Calvinistic treatise, however, was published in the following year; and he has prefixed to it the declaration, for the sincerity of which he takes the Deity himself to witness, that in publishing it he was actuated by "pure zeal for God, and love of truth."*

* *Tractatus de Imputatione Divinæ Peccati Adami Posteris ejus Universis in Reatum.* Auctore Dan. Whitby, S.T.P. Ecclesiæ Sarisburiensis Praeceptore. Londini, 1711.—The following words of St Augustine appear as a motto on the title-page: "Non quisquam de vitiis naturalibus, sed de voluntariis, pœnas luit."—*August. de Civ. Dei*, l. 12, c. 2.

The doctrine of original sin and the corruption of human nature has been rejected by many other divines of the Church of England, and also by not a few pious laymen, such as Locke (*Reasonableness of Christianity*, at the beginning), and Dr John Gregory (*Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with those of the Animal World*, Sect. 1.); and by the whole body of the Unitarians, for whose opinions the works of Priestley, Lindsey, and Channing, may be referred to. Those who wish to see the doctrine of human corruption discussed with good sense, and knowledge of both Scripture and mankind, may get satisfaction in the perusal of Dr Jortin's Dissertation on the Duty of Judging Candidly and Favourably of Others and of Human Nature; being the third of his Six Dissertations upon Different Subjects, published in 1755. Taking for his motto the words of St Paul, "Charity thinketh no evil" (1 Cor. xiii. 5), he observes that "many who had no good will to revealed religion have taken a perverse delight in blackening human nature, and many weak and ignorant Christians have done and daily do the same thing; and thus with different views these sworn enemies have joined together and assisted each other in abusing and slandering mankind" (p. 129). The express purpose for which he sets about disproving the Calvinistic dogma in question, is to defend Christianity against an objection stated by Bayle in the following passage:—

"The laws of Christian charity," says that celebrated writer, "which require us rather to give a favourable turn to the actions of our neighbour than an unfavourable one, are quite contrary to reason.

"For it is as certain as anything can be, that man is infinitely more prone to evil than to good, and that there are infinitely more bad than good actions done in the world.

"It is therefore beyond degree more probable that an action is bad than that it is good, and that the secret motives which produce it are corrupted than that they are honest.

"According then to the dictates of reason, if we know that a man hath done an action, and are ignorant of his motive and intent, we should judge it to be far more probable that he acts from bad than from good causes.

"And yet the laws of charity require, that unless we have a very probable evidence of the wickedness of an action, we should rather conclude it to be good than bad.

"Thus charity directs us to do just the contrary to the dictates of reason: and indeed this is not the only sacrifice which religion requires us to make of our reason."

See his *Lettres Crit.*, xii. p. 248; in which, says Jortin, he thus "endeavours to prove, that none can receive the Christian religion, unless he will think and act contrary to reason; that is, in other words, unless he be fool or mad."

If the premises assumed by Bayle—which we must allow are identical with an opinion generally taught in Scotland as "God's truth,"—are a correct re-

That the celebrated Chillingworth, who flourished a little earlier than Milton, also held Arian opinions, appears plainly from a letter

presentation of the nature of man, then must the conclusion which he so logically deduces from it be accepted as true, and the duty of Christian charity must be regarded as one which no reasonable man can ever practise.

Others, with equally good logic, have maintained, that since the Scripture teaches that all men, and even the best of them, are thoroughly corrupt, holiness and good works cannot be so very necessary as they are said to be,—and that, in fact, the practice of them is absolutely impossible. That the Scriptures, however, give no such account of human nature, is thought by others to be easily discoverable by any judicious student of them, whose object is to find the truth, and not merely to furnish himself with the means of upholding a theological system, which his credit or interest impels him to defend. For if, say they, what is poetically stated in verse 3d of the 14th Psalm is to be as strictly understood as if it were asserted in a dry scholastic treatise, it will follow “that there is not one good man upon earth, that all men are perverted, that they are all become abominable by their sins, and that there is not one single person that is just, or that fears God. But this consequence,” they add, “raises horror; it is contrary to truth and experience, and to what the Scripture declares in a thousand places, where it speaks of good men, and distinguishes them from the wicked. Nay, this consequence may be destroyed from what we read in that very Psalm, which mentions the just who are protected by God, and the wicked who persecute them. This complaint of David must therefore be understood with some restrictions.”—(*Osterwald's Treatise concerning the Causes of the present Corruption of Christians*, Part i. Cause iv., “The abuse of Holy Scripture;” in Bishop Watson's Coll. of Theol. Tracts, vol. vi., p. 168.)

Locke expresses the opinion that “if by death, threatened to Adam, were meant the corruption of human nature in his posterity, it is strange that the New Testament should not anywhere take notice of it, and tell us that corruption seized on all because of Adam's transgression, as well as it tells us so of death. But, as I remember, every one's sin is charged upon himself only.”—(*The Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures*, 4th paragraph.) And Gilbert Wakefield roundly affirms, that “that doctrine of the depravation of the human heart, in consequence of the fall, is most unscriptural and erroneous, dishonourable to God, and an encouragement to sinners; as Dr Taylor, in his work on Original Sin, has demonstrated by evidence as clear and cogent as can be offered to the human mind.”—(*Memoirs of Gilbert Wakefield*, vol. i., p. 419.)

There is an admirable delineation of human nature as it really is, in the Sermons of Dr Alexander Gerard, who in the middle of last century filled the chair of Divinity in King's College, Aberdeen, and, with his friends Reid, Gregory, Beattie, and Campbell (who evidently concurred with him in rejecting the Calvinistic dogma), at that time threw so much lustre on the northern university. See his 9th, 10th, and 11th Sermons, on “The diversity of men's natural tempers.” “The necessity of governing the natural temper,” and “The manner of governing the natural temper,” vol. i., p. 211, *et seq.* (Lond. 1780.) Dr Gerard's analysis of the human dispositions comes very near that which Dr Gall has more recently deduced from the physiology of the brain, and which, for the last twenty-five years, has been an object of suspicion and dislike to the Scottish clergy.—(*Sur les Fonctions du Cerveau, et sur Celles de Chacune de ses Parties*. Par F. J. Gall. Paris, 1825.) Whether any philosophy of human nature, which teaches its utter vileness, is countenanced by the general tenor of Scripture, let the following extracts testify:—“Every tree,” says Jesus, “is known by its own fruit; for of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble-bush gather they grapes. A good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is evil; for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh”—(Luke vi. 44, 45). In Matthew's Gospel, he counsels his followers thus:—“Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.” And again, “I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance”—(Matt. v. 16; ix. 13). Of Nathanael he said:—“Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile”—(John i. 47). Explain-

of his to a friend, in the Life prefixed to his Works. (Tenth edition, 1742, p. 34.) He there maintains that the most eminent Christian

in the parable of the sower, he uses the following words:—"But that on the good ground are they which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience"—(Luke viii. 15). And in the parable of the lost sheep—"I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety-and-nine just persons, which need no repentance"—(Luke xv. 7). Of Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth, we are told, that "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless"—(Luke i. 6). And the Apostle says—"Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart"—(2 Tim. ii. 22). And again—"Unto the pure all things are pure"—(Titus i. 15). In the Book of Proverbs there are endless contrasts between the wicked and the righteous. Thus—"The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion"—(xxviii. 1). "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn"—(xxix. 2). And the Psalmist says—"For thou, Lord, wilt bless the righteous; with favour wilt thou compass him as with a shield"—(v. 12). "Oh, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end, but establish the just"—(vii. 9). "With the merciful thou wilt shew thyself merciful; with an upright man thou wilt shew thyself upright; with the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure; and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward."—(xviii. 25, 26.) Finally, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace"—(xxxvii. 37). See also Psalms i. 1, 2; xv.; xxxii. 11; xxxiii. 1; xxxvii. 16, 17; xcvi. 10—12; cxii.; cxxviii.

The foregoing texts relate to the *dispositions* or emotional faculties of man, and appear to recognise clearly the existence of moral sentiments in a sound natural condition. If farther proof be wanting, I think it will be found in the following remarkable words, which almost seem to be prophetically directed against the modern Calvinists: "He that justifieth the wicked, AND HE THAT CONDEMNETH THE JUST, *even they both are abomination to the Lord.*" (Prov. xvii. 15.) With respect to the *intellect* of man, any one may see that it is appealed to throughout the Bible as capable of judging correctly of evidence set before it. St Paul, for example, desires us to "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21); and in the words of my motto he says—"I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (1 Cor. x. 15).

For an ample defence of the natural soundness of human reason, see Dr Ibbot's Sermon, in the Boyle Lectures, vol. ii., p. 855, entitled—"That the Scriptures do suppose, encourage, and enjoin, the use of our reason in matters of religion;" and two other Sermons, by the same writer, pp. 840, 850, entitled—"Objections out of Scripture against Free-thinking answered." For a vigorous assertion of the existence of inborn, incorruptible integrity, unswayed by motives of self-interest, in many human beings, see Life of Niebuhr, vol. i., p. 316. Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Reid, Kames, Stewart, Brown, Mackintosh, and most other modern writers on Moral Philosophy teach the same opinion.

Those who have recourse to the doctrine of the degeneracy of the human understanding, and to the incessant wiles of the devil, in order to explain the prevalence of religious error in the world, constantly set out by assuming their own opinions to be true, their own intellectual vision to have escaped the general corruption, and their minds, by dint of some peculiar spiritual armour, to be proof against the diabolic wiles to which the great majority of mankind fall victims. Dr Ibbot pithily asks—"If reason was originally in itself, or is, in its present state of degeneracy and corruption, an incompetent judge in religious matters, how can I depend upon that reasoning which I use to prove this? My reason may betray its weakness and deceive me even here; and the arguments which, I think, I urge with so much weight, may be inconclusive, and have nothing in them."—(P. 850). Archbishop Whately, also, in treating of the dangers arising from injudicious preaching, observes, that although "each part of our nature should be duly controlled, and kept within its own proper province, and the whole 'brought into subjection to Christ,' and dedicated to Him;" yet, "there is no real Christian humility, though there be debasement,

writers of antiquity taught the inferiority of the Son to the Father ; and sums up in the following terms :—“ In a word, whosoever shall

in renouncing the exercise of human reason, to follow the dictates of human feeling. The Apostle's precept is, ‘ In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men.’” He goes on to remark, that those declaimers against the pride of human reason, who, themselves possessing cultivated intellectual powers, are understood not to be disparaging an advantage of which they are destitute, “ never do, in fact, divest *themselves* of any human advantages they may chance to possess. Whatever learning or argumentative powers any of them possess (and some of them do possess much), I have always found them ready to put forth, in any controversy they may be engaged in, without shewing much tenderness for an opponent who may be less gifted. It is only when learning and argument *make against* them, that they declaim against the pride of intellect ; and deprecate an appeal to reason when its decision is unfavourable. So that the *sacrifice* which they appear to make, is one which in reality they do not *make*, but only *require* (when it suits their purpose) from others.”—(*Essays on some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c.*, 2d ed., p. 60.)

In reference to Christian humility, the same acute prelate observes that “ men should be warned not to suppose that virtue to consist in a mere *general* confession of the weakness and sinfulness of human nature, or (which comes to the same) such a sinfulness in themselves—or, if you will, such an utter corruption and total depravity in their own nature, as they believe to be common to *every* descendant of Adam, including the most eminent apostles, and other saints.”—(*Ib.*, p. 39.) And he copies this striking passage from Archbishop Sumner's Apostolic Preaching, p. 136 : “ It is sometimes considered as a proof of the advantage to be obtained from the habit which I am here presuming to discourage, that such preaching generally proves attractive to the lower classes. This, however, may be accounted for, without furnishing any justification of the practice. For, first, the lower classes, unless they are truly religious, usually *are* gross sinners, and, therefore, are neither surprised nor shocked at being supposed so to themselves, and at the same time feel a sort of pleasure which need not be encouraged, when they hear their superiors brought down to the same level ; and, secondly, it seems to furnish them with a sort of excuse for their sins, to find that they are so universal, and so much to be expected of human nature. The considerate minister will not court such dangerous applause : there is no edification communicated by exciting feelings of disgust on one side, and of malignant exultation on the other.”

There is excellent sense in these remarks ; but if Dr Sumner had said that the lower classes are *frequently* (instead of “ *usually*”) gross sinners, his statement would probably have been more accurate than it is. I refer, of course, to the class of *artisans and labourers* ; for the lowest class of all is composed chiefly of persons who, through vice or imbecility, have sunk into the profoundest depths of social and moral degradation.

Archdeacon Daubeny, in his Book of the Church, acknowledges the difficulty of reconciling the differences of opinion which prevail on the subject of religion, with “ that uniform consistency which is one of the most striking characteristics of truth,” as well as “ with the benevolent design which the Deity must have had in view in revealing that truth to the world.” He finds, however, a solution in the following considerations : “ But when we take a view of man in his present state of degeneracy, as a being perverse in will, and corrupt in understanding, we cease to be surprised at an effect necessarily resulting from that variety of causes, to which the opinions and practices of men are at different times to be traced up. Pride, self-opinion, interest, and passion, are the most prevailing principles of the human mind. A singleness of heart, accompanied with an uncorrupt love of truth for the truth's sake, is a perfection to be coveted rather than to be looked for, from that general derangement of the human faculties which was brought about by the fall. When the same subject, therefore, is viewed through those different mediums which correspond with the different characters and dispositions of the parties concerned, it is not to be expected that an uniform conclusion should be drawn from it.”—(*Guide to the Church*. By the Rev. Charles Daubeny, late Archdeacon of Sarum. 3d

freely and impartially consider of this thing; and how on the other side the ancient Fathers' weapons against the Arians are in a manner only places of Scripture (and those now for the most part discarded as impertinent and unconcluding), and how in the argument drawn from the authority of the ancient Fathers, they are almost always defendants, and scarce ever opponents, he shall not choose but confess, or at least be very inclinable to believe, that the doctrine of Arius is either a truth, or at least no damnable heresy."

In the year 1712, Dr Samuel Clarke, one of the profoundest thinkers and most amiable men that ever graced the Church of England, published a work called "The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity," the fruit of deep study of the Scriptures and other Christian literature of the primitive times. In spite of the warnings of his friends, and even, it is said, of a message from some of the Ministers of Queen Anne, dissuading him from publishing a work likely to create angry contention, when free opinions of any kind were scarcely tolerated, he boldly ventured to controvert the popular belief in the eternal existence and undivided divinity of Christ.

"But let every man of sense," says his friend and biographer Bishop Hoadly, "be judge with how much wisdom, and in how Christian a method, he proceeded to form his own sentiments upon so important a point. He knew, and all men agreed, that it was a matter of mere revelation. He did not, therefore, retire into his closet, and set himself to invent and forge a plausible hypothesis which might sit easily upon his own mind. He had not recourse to abstract and metaphysical reasonings, to cover or patronise any system he might have

edit., p. 329. London, 1830.) This, I think, is one of the most edifying specimens of theological reasoning that could be found. Let us see what it amounts to. 1. The Deity, we are told, must have intended, for the benevolent purpose of human salvation, to reveal religious truth to the degenerate world. 2. Uniform consistency is a striking characteristic of truth. 3. But those religious doctrines which different men regard as truth, are so palpably and extensively deficient in uniformity, that error is in fact infinitely more prevalent than truth. 4. There is in the world no love of truth for truth's sake (and here the Archdeacon must be presumed to draw the picture from his own consciousness); whence it happens that men are apt to wander into the mazes of error, although *he* (we are to understand) has so well avoided the general misfortune, as to know with certainty that those who do not hold, like him, the tenets of the Church of England, have missed the benevolently-revealed truth. But the most striking idea embodied in the passage is, that while, on the one hand, the fall is considered to have occasioned the revelation of saving truth by the benevolent Deity to the world, this very fall is, on the other hand, the cause why that saving truth is so seldom recognised:—which is equivalent to the assertion that God has failed to accomplish the end he had in view!

It cannot be sinful to harbour doubt of a doctrine which logically conducts to such a conclusion; and those who do so may take courage from the reflection, that however much it may, in the abstract, be professed with the lips, and inculcated in books and from the pulpit, it is daily repudiated *in practice* by clergy and laity alike, in funeral sermons, obituary notices, certificates of character, dedications, and epitaphs,—in the talk of the market-place and the drawing-room,—and in testimonies to human virtue, given on oath by witnesses in our courts of law. Men marry, and take partners in trade, without seeming to believe that they are linking themselves to such loathsome creatures as John Calvin has delineated; and even orthodox parents have been known to proclaim the unparalleled excellencies of their children, and to resent as an affront the *special* imputation of iniquity to themselves.

embraced before. But, as a Christian, he laid open the New Testament before him. He searched out every text in which mention was made of the three persons, or of any one of them. He accurately examined the meaning of the words used about every one of them; and by the best rules of grammar and critique, and by his skill in language, he endeavoured to fix plainly what was declared about every person, and what was not. And what he thought he had discovered to be the truth, he published, under the title of ‘The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.’

“ I am far from taking upon me to determine, in so difficult a question, between him and those who made replies to him. The debate soon grew very warm; and in a little time seemed to rest principally upon him and one particular adversary, very skilful in the management of a debate, and very learned and well versed in the writings of the ancient Fathers. The controversy has been long before the world; and all who can read what has been alleged on both sides, ought to judge for themselves. But this, I hope, I may be allowed to say, that every Christian divine and layman ought to pay his thanks to Dr Clarke, for the method into which he brought this dispute; and for that collection of texts in the New Testament, by which at last it must be decided, on which side soever the truth be supposed to lie. And let me add this one word more, that since men of such thought and such learning have shewn the world, in their own example, how widely the most honest inquirers after truth may differ upon such subjects, this, methinks, should a little abate our mutual censures, and a little take off from our positiveness about the necessity of explaining, in this or that one determinate sense, the ancient passages relating to points of so sublime a nature. . . .

“ One matter of fact I will add, that from the time of his publishing this book to the day of his death, he found no reason, as far as he was able to judge, to alter the notions which he had there professed concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, towards any of those schemes which seemed to him to derogate from the honour of the Father on the one side, or from that of the Son and Spirit on the other. This I thought proper just to mention, as what all his friends know to be the truth. And, indeed, nothing to the contrary can be alleged, without contradicting many express sentences scattered through all his works which have followed, or will follow, the fore-mentioned treatise, evidently setting forth or implying the same doctrine. . . .

“ In the cause of Christianity he laboured as sincerely as in natural religion and morality; and, with the same clearness and strength, produced and illustrated all the evidences peculiar to it: not indeed considering it, as it has been taught in the schools or discourses of modern ages; but as it lies in the New Testament itself.”*

One of Clarke’s particular friends was Sir Isaac Newton, of whom

* Life prefixed to Clarke’s Sermons. See also Whiston’s Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr Clarke, where the annoyance to which he was subjected, and his conduct (not altogether defensible) under its influence, are more explicitly recorded than in Hoadly’s sketch.

That Hoadly himself, by “Christianity as it lies in the New Testament,” meant essentially the same sort of “primitive Christianity” that his friend believed in, is tolerably plain from the passages above quoted, but is put be-

also there is good reason to believe that, on the same point of doctrine, he abandoned the orthodox faith. A zealous Unitarian gentleman, Mr Hopton Haynes, who served many years as Assay-master of the Mint under the illustrious philosopher, and was on intimate terms with him, told the Rev. Richard Baron, a dissenting minister, "that Sir Isaac Newton did not believe our Lord's pre-existence, being a Socinian, as we call it, in that article; and that Sir Isaac lamented Dr Clarke's embracing Arianism, which opinion, he feared, had been, and still would be, if maintained by learned men, a great obstruction to the progress of Christianity."* This is confirmed by a passage in Whiston, who was intimate with both Newton and Clarke, and held also Unitarian opinions; where he conjectures what might be the discouragements to their "making public attempts for the restoration of primitive Christianity."† Moreover, it is not likely that, for any other cause than the holding of Unitarian opinions, Sir Isaac would have written his "Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture," an imperfect and erroneous edition of which was published in 1754, but which Bishop Horsley inserted entire in the fifth volume of Newton's Works, published in 1785. For, besides that the texts there proved to have been interpolated are among the strongest supports of the doctrine of the Trinity; near the beginning of the treatise there is an expression which has drawn from Horsley the remark, that "the insinuation contained in it, that the Trinity is not to be derived from the words prescribed for the baptismal form, is very extraordinary to come from a writer who was no Socinian." It would have been extraordinary, had the concluding bold assertion been as true as it is contrary to all the evidence.

The passages in question are, 1 John v. 7, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one;"—and 1 Tim. iii. 16, "Great is the mystery of godliness; God manifest in the flesh:" in which latter case the alteration of a very short Greek word into another closely resembling it, has brought this to be the meaning of a passage which, in the text received by "all the churches for the first four or five hundred

yond question by the terms in which he has ridiculed the persecutors of Emlyn and Whiston (and, incidentally, the Trinitarian opinions of those persecutors), in his Dedication to Pope Clement XI. See Hoadly's Works, vol. i., p. 537. Theophilus Lindsey, who, in his Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship, p. 396, treats of the opinions of Bishop Hoadly, adduces in proof of that prelate's Unitarianism, "his fine devotional compositions, published at the end of his Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For in these," says Lindsey, "we find no intimation, in the most remote degree, that Jesus Christ was to be invoked in prayer; nor example of any divine worship addressed to him, but to the Father only. Now if the Bishop had believed Christ to have been an object of worship to Christians, it is hardly to be supposed that in set forms of prayer, drawn up with great care and deliberation, he should have taken no notice of him in that character; especially if it be considered which way the popular fashionable doctrine leaned, and the prejudices of many against him on other accounts." &c. &c. As to the persecutions of Emlyn and Whiston, see pp. 325–334 of the same work by Lindsey, and Whiston's Memoirs of Himself.

* Sequel to Lindsey's Apology on Resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, p. 285; quoted in Toulmin's Memoirs of Socinus, p. 283.

† Whiston's Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr Clarke, p. 15; see also pp. 13 and 17. Dr Cook, in his General and Historical View of Christianity, vol. i., p. 415, speaks loosely of Newton's "partiality to Arianism."

years, and the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome as well as the rest," means "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh."* Both passages have been keenly defended by biblical critics; but all profound scholars, Trinitarians included, now agree that, in regard to the former at least, if not also the latter, the conclusions of Sir Isaac Newton are indisputable.† In these circumstances, can any creditable reason be given for still allowing the passage in 1 John v. 7 to mislead the ignorant, by standing in the authorised version of the Bible as a portion of Divine revelation? In the words of Newton himself, which every candid Protestant will echo,—“Whilst we exclaim against the pious frauds of the Roman Church, and make it a part of our religion to detect and renounce all things of that kind, we must acknowledge it a greater crime in us to favour such practices than in the Papists we so much blame on that account; for they act according to their religion, but we contrary to ours.”‡ He mentions, to the credit of “the more learned and quicksighted men, as Luther, Erasmus, Bullinger, Grotius, and some others,” that they “would not dissemble their knowledge;” but adds with truth, that “yet the generality are fond of the place for its making against heresy.” He defends the Arians from the ridiculous charge of having erased the words in question from the Epistle of John (p. 22). In another place he thus expresses himself: “If it be said that we are not to determine what is Scripture and what not, by our private judgments, I confess it, in places not controverted; but in disputable places I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries, and for that reason, to like best what they understand least” (p. 56). And his treatise concludes in the following words, which are worthy of so great a man: “You see what freedom I have used in this discourse, and I hope you will interpret

* Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions, &c., p. 58 of the separate edition, published at London in 1841.

† The passage in 1 John is abandoned as spurious by Michaelis (*Introd. to the New Testament*, translated by Bishop Marsh, 2d ed., vol. iv., p. 412); Dr Adam Clarke (*View of the Succession of Sacred Literature*, vol. i., p. 71); and Porson, Marsh, and Griesbach, who is the highest authority of all (See Orme's *Bibliotheca Biblica*, articles GRIESBACH, MARSH, PORSON, TRAVIS, &c.). Moreover, we learn from Whiston's *Memoirs of the Life of Dr Samuel Clarke*, p. 100, that both he and Clarke, as well as the celebrated scholar Dr Bentley, and even the great champion of the Trinity, Dr Waterland, were satisfied of the spuriousness of the text in question. “Nor,” says Whiston, “does the Doctor (Waterland) I think ever quote that text as genuine in any of his writings; which in so zealous and warm a Trinitarian deserves to be taken great notice of, as a singular instance of honesty and impartiality.”—Nevertheless, in 1821, the then Bishop of St David's was bold enough to publish a “Vindication of 1 John v. 7,” which elicited a severe reply in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. xxvi., p. 324. “The Bishop, then,” says the critic, “on his own avowal, has been able to dismiss every doubt respecting the genuineness of a verse which is found only in a single Greek manuscript, and that of recent date; which is not quoted by a single Greek father, nor, in express terms, by any Latin father before the sixth century; which is wanting in the more ancient manuscripts of the Vulgate, and, even in those in which it is found, appears in such a variety of shapes as clearly to shew that those transcribers who thought proper to insert the verse had no certain reading before them. We have the most sincere respect for the Bishop of St David's, but we cannot peruse the declaration without astonishment.”—(P. 339.)

‡ Historical Account, &c., p. 2.

it candidly. For if the ancient churches, in debating and deciding the greatest mysteries of religion, knew nothing of these two texts, I understand not why we should be so fond of them now the debates are over. And whilst it is the character of an honest man to be pleased, and of a man of interest to be troubled, at the detection of frauds, and of both to run most into those passions when the detection is made plainest, I hope this letter will, to one of your integrity, prove so much the more acceptable, as it makes a further discovery than you have hitherto met with in commentators."

It is by no means wonderful that Sir Isaac refrained from publishing explicitly his Unitarian opinions; for, says Whiston (whose statement is confirmed by the recent discoveries of Newton's biographers), "he was of the most fearful, cautious, and suspicious temper that I ever knew" (*Whiston's Memoirs of his own Life*, p. 294); and his extreme dislike of controversy has always been notorious. But how very necessary it was for all to be circumspect, may be seen from the Act 8th & 9th Will. III., c. 32, "for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness;" in which it is enacted "That if any person having been educated in, or at any time having made profession of, the Christian religion within this realm, shall, by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the persons of the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain that there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine authority, and shall . . . be thereof lawfully convicted by the oath of two or more credible witnesses; such person for the first offence shall be adjudged incapable and disabled in law, to have and enjoy any office or employment ecclesiastical, civil, or military;" for the second offence, shall be disabled to sue, or hold the office of guardian or executor, and be incapable of any legacy, &c., or to bear civil or military office or ecclesiastical benefice, "and shall also suffer imprisonment for the space of three years, without bail or mainprize, from the time of such conviction."*

Is not this a beautiful specimen of the laws of a Protestant country? And could we have blamed Newton for his reserve if he had lived in the present day, when, if there be not less of the spirit of persecution, there is happily less power to gratify it than there was in the reign of Queen Anne. For "mark the injustice constantly perpetrated by those who have the public feeling on their side! They make the honest expression of opinion penal, and then condemn men for disingenuousness. They invite to free discussion, but determine beforehand that only one conclusion can be sound and moral; where they should encounter principles, they impute motives. They fill the arena of public debate with every instrument of torture and annoyance for the feeling heart, the sensitive imagination, and the scrupulous intellect,—and then are angry that men do not rush headlong into the martyrdom that has been prepared for them."†

* The Long Parliament had previously (in 1648), by the influence of the Presbyterians, passed a similar act, with the higher penalty of *death*. It is quoted by Theophilus Lindsey, in his *Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship*, p. 304, where both of these statutes are commented on.

† *A Retrospect of the Religious Life of England: or, the Church, Puritanism, and Free Inquiry*. By John James Tayler, B.A. London, 1845, p. 425.

This is an impartial work, by the study of which no intelligent and candid

Whiston used to urge Dr Clarke to act sincerely, openly, and boldly, in the declaration of his true opinions; but "his general answer was by this question, 'Who are those that act better than I do?' Very few of which," says Whiston, "I could ever name to him, though I did not think that a sufficient excuse."—(*Memoirs of Clarke*, p. 64). Clarke, however, might have quoted the words of Solomon in palliation of his conduct: "A fool uttereth all his mind; but a wise man keepeth it in till afterwards" (Prov. xxix. 11). And even those of Paul might have been adduced for the same purpose: "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able" (1 Cor. iii. 2). And again: "Strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil" (Heb. v. 14).

The learned Dr Lardner, whose defence of the Credibility of the Gospel History is universally known, became a believer in the simple humanity of Christ; and towards the close of life the opinions of Dr Isaac Watts also appear to have become completely Unitarian.* The Rev. Robert Robinson, likewise, who in 1776 published a Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, which gained him much applause, became, after he had studied Mr Lindsey's Examination of it, a convert to the opinion he had opposed.† And Belsham relates of himself, that in January 1779, being at that time the orthodox minister of a congregation in the country, he was taken by a friend to attend the evening service in Mr Lindsey's chapel in Essex Street, London. "The subject of the discourse," says he, "was a good conscience; and the seriousness and gravity with which it was treated confirmed him in the opinion, which he had already formed from the perusal of some of Dr Priestley's writings, that it was *possible* for a Socinian to be a good man. At the same time he felt a very sincere concern that persons so highly respectable as Mr Lindsey and Dr Priestley should entertain opinions so grossly erroneous as he then conceived, and so disparaging to the doctrines of the Gospel. This he ignorantly imputed to the little attention which they paid to the subject of theology. Little did he then suspect that further and more diligent and impartial inquiry would induce him to embrace a system from which his mind at that time shrunk with horror. And had it been foretold to him that in the course of years, and the revolution of events, he should himself become the disciple, the friend, the successor, and the biographer of the person who was then speaking; that it should fall to his lot from that very pulpit to pronounce, before a crowded assembly of weeping mourners, the funeral oration of Theophilus Lindsey, he would have regarded it as an event almost without the wide circle of possibilities, and as incredible as the incidents of an Arabian tale."‡

reader can fail to have his mind delivered from much of any petty sectarian feeling which education may have imparted to it.

* See Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*, 2d ed., p. 162.

† *Ibid.*, ch. vii.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 107. In an age when Unitarians abounded among the English clergy, Theophilus Lindsey was one of the few who sacrificed worldly interest to the approval of a tender conscience. Another was Gilbert Wakefield, whose *Memoirs* are highly instructive on this subject; as are also Whiston's *Memoirs of himself and of Dr Samuel Clarke*, Disney's *Life of Dr John Jebb*

Another illustrious instance of change of opinion is that of the profoundly learned Archbishop Usher. In early life he was a rigid Calvinist, but in his later years "did declare his utter dislike of the doctrine of absolute reprobation, and held the universality of Christ's death, and that not only in respect of sufficiency, but also in regard of efficacy, so that all men were thereby salvable; and the reason why all were not thereby saved was because they did not accept of the salvation offered; and the grace of conversion was not irresistible, but men might, and often did, reject the same: and in these points he did not approve of the doctrine of Geneva, but was wholly of Bishop Overall's opinions."*

The famous John Hales of Eton, one of the most learned and most estimable men of his time, was likewise originally a Calvinist, and took his opinions with him to the Synod of Dort, which he was commissioned by the English ambassador at the Hague to attend. But it has been left on record by his intimate friend Mr Farindon, that "at the well pressing 3 St John 16, by Episcopius, 'there I bid John Calvin good night,' as he has often told me."† The Synod, however,

of Cambridge, and Field's Life of Dr Parr. Belsham mentions the Rev. William Robertson, an Irish clergyman, who, having adopted Unitarian opinions, followed the same honourable course: when he waited on his patron Dr Robinson, then bishop of Ferns, and who subsequently became archbishop of Armagh, he was told, "You are a madman; you do not know the world" (p. 123.)

Dr Richard Price, in a letter to Lindsey in reference to the opinion that Christ is almost equal to supreme God, says, "*It is a sentiment at which I shudder, and which probably no Arian now holds.*"—(*Belsham, op. cit.*, p. 155.) Compare with this the opinion of Dr Owen, that the Unitarians are men who, "*through the incurable blindness of their minds, fall into error of judgment, and misinterpretation of the word*" (*Works*, vol. xv., p. 241); or with the following characteristic denunciation by Dr South: "The Socinians are impious blasphemers, whose infamous pedigree runs back from wretch to wretch, in a direct line, to the devil himself; and who are fitter to be crushed by the civil magistrate, as destructive to government and society, than to be confuted as merely heretics in religion." Dr William Dunlop, in his able vindication of Creeds and Confessions of Faith, (prefixed to a Collection of the Standards of the Church of Scotland, published in 1719,) in speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity, affirms, that "*it diffuses itself through the whole of our religion, and is the life and soul of it, without which it could have no subsistence;*" and that he who denies it "*contradicts the whole train of the Gospel, in plain as well as incomparably momentous questions.*"—(P. lxxv.) In Coleridge's opinion, "the pet texts of the Socinian are quite enough for his confutation with acute thinkers" (*Table Talk*, vol. i. p. 47); and every body knows that according to the Athanasian Creed, which is "God's truth" among the orthodox in England, all disbelievers of the Trinitarian doctrine which is there most elaborately expounded, "without doubt shall perish everlastingly."

Can it be of essential importance to dull and illiterate men to decide which of these opposite parties is in the right?

* Letter from Dr Walton to Dr Pierce, quoted, with other evidence, in Dr Elrington's Life of Usher, p. 292. Dublin, 1847.

† Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of the Ever-memorable Mr John Hales. [By M. Des Maizeaux.] London, 1719, p. 69. The writings of Hales prove that he was far in advance of his age, in his apprehension of the principles of religious liberty. Some admirable passages on that subject are quoted in Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature, vol. i., p. 287, where an instructive biographical sketch also may be found. The letters written by him when attending the Synod of Dort, are characterised by Lord Clarendon, as "the best memorial of the ignorance, and passion, and animosity, and injustice of that convention."—(*Clarendon's Life of Himself*, vol. i., p. 27.)

decided *in favour* of John Calvin; and thanks, as we have seen, used to be, and perhaps are still, yearly offered up to God Almighty for the decision.

Baxter, speaking of the modified opinions of his latter days, intimates that in his case a similar change had occurred, and says, "I can never believe that a man may not be saved by that religion which doth but bring him to the true love of God, and to a heavenly mind and life; nor that God will ever cast a soul into hell that truly loveth him." This passage refers to the Papists, but it appears to be a statement of a general principle which he had adopted. He says also, "At first I thought that Mr Perkins well proved that a Papist cannot go beyond a reprobate: but now I doubt not but that God hath many sanctified ones among them, who have received the true doctrine of Christianity so practically, that their contradictory errors prevail not against them, to hinder their love of God and their salvation; but that their errors are like a conquerable dose of poison, which nature doth overcome."*

The same historian says, that "nothing troubled him more than the brawls which were grown from religion; and he therefore exceedingly detested the tyranny of the Church of Rome, more for their imposing uncharitably upon the consciences of other men, than for the errors in their own opinions; and would often say, that he would renounce the religion of the Church of England to-morrow, if it obliged him to believe that any other Christians should be damned; and that nobody would conclude another man to be damned, who did not wish him so. No man more strict and severe to himself; to other men so charitable as to their opinions, that he thought that other men were more in fault for their carriage towards them, than the men themselves were who erred; and he thought that pride and passion, more than conscience, were the cause of all separation from each others' communion." Hales, in his Tract concerning Schism, defines it to be "an unnecessary separation of Christians from that part of the visible Church of which they were once members."—(*Works*, vol. i., p. 116; ed. 1765.) "But you will ask," says he, "who shall be the judge what is *necessary*?" Indeed that is a question which hath been often made, but I think scarcely ever truly answered: not because it is a point of great depth or difficulty truly to assail it, but because the true solution carries fire in the tail of it; for it bringeth with it a piece of doctrine which is seldom pleasing to superiors. To you for the present this shall suffice: If so be you be *animo defecato*, if you have cleared yourself from froth and grounds; if neither sloth, nor fears, nor ambition, nor any tempting spirits of that nature abuse you (for these, and such as these, are the true impediments why both that and other questions of the like danger are not truly answered)—if all this be, and yet you see not how to frame your resolution and settle for yourself that doubt—I will say no more of you than was said of Papias, St John's own scholar, you are 'of small judgment,' your abilities are not so good as I presumed."—(*Ib.*, p. 118.)

Protestants who talk of the sin of schism, would do well to consider that every argument which they direct against conscientious dissenters from their own Church, strikes with equal force against the lawfulness of Luther's secession from the Church of Rome. It was a saying of Charles or James II., "When you of the Church of England contend with the Catholics, you use the arguments of the Puritans; when you contend with the Puritans, you immediately adopt all the weapons of the Catholics."

* *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, Part I., p. 131. Hear also Bishop Watson, in his Letter from a Christian Whig: "Are the gates of heaven open only to us, the Athanasians and the Calvinists of the age? Is yours the only intelligible interpretation of Scripture; yours the only saving faith? Away with such learned arrogance, such uncharitable judgment! They are a disgrace to humanity, and a dishonour to any religion. The question will not be, at the last day, Are you of the Church of Jerusalem or of Antioch, of Rome or England? Are you a Doctor of the Sorbonne or of Oxford, a friend of the Re-

A still further instance of abandonment, by a theological disputant, of what lately seemed to him "God's truth," for its opposite, is contained in the following striking passage in the works of Dr Owen :— "I myself," says he, "once knew a scholar invited to a dispute with another man, about something in controversy in religion ; in his own, and in the judgment of all the bystanders, the opposing person was utterly confuted ; and yet the scholar within a few months was taught of God, and clearly convinced that it was an error which he had maintained, and the truth which he opposed ; and then, and not till then, did he cease to wonder, that the other person was not convinced by his strong arguments, as before he had thought."*

My concluding example shall be that of Chillingworth, the most acute, the most candid, and the most renowned of all the champions of Protestantism. Alluding to himself, he addresses his Popish adversary as follows :—"I know a man that, of a moderate Protestant, turned a Papist, and, the day that he did so (as all things that are done are perfected some day or other), was convicted in conscience that his yesterday's opinion was an error, and yet thinks he was no schismatic for doing so, and desires to be informed by you, whether or no he was mistaken ? The same man afterwards, upon better consideration, became a doubting Papist, and of a doubting Papist a confirmed Protestant. And yet this man thinks himself no more to blame for all these changes, than a traveller, who, using all diligence to find the right way to some remote city where he had never been (as the party I speak of had never been in heaven), did yet mistake it, and after find his error, and amend it. Nay, he stands upon his justification so far as to maintain, that his alterations, not only to you, but also from you by God's mercy, were the most satisfactory actions to himself that ever he did, and the greatest victories that ever he obtained over himself, and his affections to those things which in this world are most precious ; as wherein, for God's sake, and (as he was verily persuaded) out of love to the truth, he went, upon a certain expectation of those inconveniences, which to ingenuous natures are of all most terrible. So that, though there were much weakness in some of these alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedness. Neither does he yield his weakness altogether without apology, seeing his deductions were rational, and out of some principles commonly received by Protestants as well as Papists, and which, by his education, had got possession of his understanding."†

monstrants or the Synod of Dort ? Not, What articles, confessions, formularies, have you subscribed ? But, What hungry have you fed ? What naked have you clothed ? What sick have you visited ? What souls have you saved ? Not, What barren metaphysical creeds have you repeated ? But, What fruits of your faith have you brought forth ?"—(*Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii., pp. 20, 21.)

* Of Toleration, and the Duty of the Magistrate about Religion ; Owen's Works, vol. xv., p. 244.

† The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation, ch. v., § 103. See also the case of conversion to Romanism mentioned by Bishop Watson, *ante*, p. 28.

"Any candid man acquainted with religious controversy," says Sidney Smith, "will, I think, admit that he has frequently, in the course of his studies, been astonished by the force of arguments with which that cause has been defended which he at first thought to be incapable of any defence at all. Some accusations he has found to be utterly groundless ; in others the facts and arguments have been mis-stated ; in other instances the accusation has been

What a lesson of modesty and mutual forbearance do facts like these convey to us all ! And how strongly should they dispose us to join with Pope in the prayer—

“ Let not this weak, unknowing hand
Presume thy bolts to throw,
And deal damnation round the land
On each I judge thy foe.

If I am right, thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay ;
If I am wrong, O teach my heart
To find that better way.”

retorted : in many cases the tenets have been defended by strong arguments and honest appeal to Scripture, in many with consummate acuteness and deep learning. So that religious studies often teach to opponents a greater respect for each other's talents, motives, and acquirements ; exhibit the real difficulties of the subject ; lessen the surprise and anger which are apt to be excited by opposition ; and by these means promote that forgiving one another, and forbearing one another, which are so powerfully recommended by the words of my text.”—(*A Sermon on those Rules of Christian Charity, by which our Opinions of other Sects should be formed ;* preached at Bristol on 5th November 1828 : Sidney Smith's Works, ed. 1850, p. 593.)

A liberal theological education has thus the same tendency as mental cultivation in general : “ *emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.*”

“ But,” as Abraham Tucker says, “ there is a particular fear that fetters the mind grievously when entering upon topics of religion ; some are so afraid of departing from the faith, that they will not depart from error or prejudice, whenever imposed upon them as an article of faith. This shuts out all means of information or amendment ; with such a bar against them neither the Jew nor the Gentile could ever have been converted, the Papists reformed, nor the enthusiast restored to his senses. We do not deny that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, but will never bring it to perfection ; our reverence and awe we ought never to lay aside, no not for a moment, for in him we live, move, and have our being ; on his power we depend both in body and soul, and in our obedience to his declared will consists our happiness. But he requires not of us a slavish fear, for his service is perfect freedom in all senses, as well when we serve him with his talent of understanding, as with the active powers he has given us ; nor shall we run less hazard of offending him by wrapping it up in a napkin than by any involuntary mistakes it may lead us into.

“ This servile fear often dashes men upon the very rocks of offence they were apprehensive of ; for it makes them think hardly of God as of a rigorous taskmaster ; it represents him as giving arbitrary commands, on supposition that such may magnify his authority ; it pins them down to the letter, without regarding the intention ; attaches them to forms and ceremonies, not daring to penetrate into the substance ; it draws them to imagine their help necessary to defend his glory and resist his enemies ; it drives them into censoriousness, derision, animosity, and other kinds of persecution, under pain of forfeiting their allegiance, until the zeal of the Lord's house hath eaten them up ; it overwhelms them with scruples, misgivings, terrors, and desperations ; lays them open to credulity in dreams, omens, judgments, and supernatural events ; and debars them the use of their understanding, as a presumption and profaneness.”—(*Tucker's Light of Nature Pursued*, ch. viii., on “ Freedom of Thought,” vol. ii., p. 122, ed. 1834.)

“ The vulgar,” observes the same excellent writer, “ are commonly very positive, thinking themselves possessed of absolute certainty in almost everything they know : this happens from their weighing their evidences singly, which will naturally produce that effect ; for we can judge of weights only by their opposition, because any one thrown in alone drives down the scale forcibly. But the contemplative use themselves to compare the judgments, as well of their senses as of their understanding, which they frequently find contradictory ; therefore they abound in doubts that never enter the head of a common man, which

Sir Thomas Browne appears to have read aright the lesson of his own experience. "I could never," says he, "divide myself from any

has occasioned doubting to be reckoned the avenue to philosophy: but if it be the avenue, it is no more, nor can one arrive at the thing itself until one has passed it, and he that sticks in the passage had better not have attempted it. The use of doubting is to prevent hasty decisions, and lead to something more sure and certain than we could have attained without it. . . . There is a moderation in all things: a man may as well doubt too much as too little—nor let us run away with a notion that a propensity to doubting shews a sagacity of parts, for it may as well proceed from the contrary quality. . . . [But] when we reflect on our utter incapacity of attaining to absolute certainty, this is enough, though not to make us doubt of the clear judgments of our understanding, yet to make us acknowledge a possibility of their being erroneous; and this, if not overlooked, must prevent every man from being so wedded to an opinion, as to turn a deaf ear upon all evidence that can be offered against it. Wherefore I must look upon those bigots in religion or reason, for there are of both sorts, as very little skilled in human nature, who lay so great a stress upon one kind of evidence as to think no other worth regarding in competition with it."—(*Op. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 121, 122, ch. xi., on "Judgment.")

There is a passage in Selden which places this subject in an equally clear light. "The old sceptics," says he, "that never would profess that they had found a truth, shewed yet the best way to search for any, when they doubted as well of what those of the dogmatical sects too credulously received for infallible principles, as they did of the newest conclusions. They were, indeed, questionless, too nice, and deceived themselves with the nimbleness of their own sophisms, that permitted no kind of established truth. *But, plainly, he that avoids their disputing levity, yet, being able, takes to himself their liberty of inquiry, is in the only way that in all kinds of studies leads and lies open even to the sanctuary of truth*; while others, that are servile to common opinion and vulgar suppositions, can rarely hope to be admitted nearer than into the base court of her temple, which too speciously often counterfeits her inmost sanctuary."—(*Selden's History of Tithes*, preface.)

"The most undecided men on doubtful points," says Bishop Watson, "are those often who have bestowed most time in the investigation of them, whether the points respect divinity, jurisprudence, or policy. He who examines only one side of a question, and gives his judgment, gives it improperly, though he may be on the right side. But he who examines both sides, and after examination gives his assent to neither, may surely be pardoned this suspension of judgment; for it is safer to continue in doubt than to decide amiss. To such men may well be applied what that most learned man Peter Daniel Huet says of himself, in his Philosophical Treatise concerning the Weakness of Human Understanding: 'If any man ask me what I am, since I will be neither academic, nor sceptic, nor eclectic, nor of any other sect; I answer that I am of my own opinion, that is to say *free*, neither submitting my mind to any authority, nor approving of any thing but what seems to me to come nearest the truth; and if any man should either ironically or flatteringly, call us *διαγνωμονας*, that is, men who stick only to their own sentiments, we shall never go about to hinder it.'"—(*Watson's Anecdotes of his Own Life*, vol. i., p. 227.)

Even the Romanist Pascal has expressed similar opinions; and the passage here subjoined ought to call a blush into the cheeks of many who profane the title of Protestant:—

"It is fit," he observes, "we should know how to doubt where we ought, to rest assured where we ought, to submit where we ought. *He who fails in any one of these respects, is unacquainted with the power of reason.* Yet there are many which offend against these three rules; either by warranting everything for demonstration, because they are unskilled in the nature of demonstrative evidence; or by doubting of everything, because they know not where they ought to submit; or by submitting to everything, because they know not where to use their judgment.

"If we bring down all things to reason, our religion will have nothing in it

man upon the difference of an opinion, or be angry with his judgment for not agreeing with me in that from which within a few days I should dissent myself.”*

From these instructive examples of devout and learned men, who, after holding certain doctrines as “God’s truth,” at length took leave to differ from their former selves and to regard it as *human error*, let us now turn to an equally instructive class of cases which obtrude themselves upon the observation of every inquiring man.

If you compare the religious tenets of different *nations*, the strange contrasts which will be discovered between what passes for God’s truth in one country and in others, will furnish matter for the gravest reflection. For instance—

“In England,” says Bishop Hoadly, “it stands thus. The Synod of Dort (for whose unerring decisions, public thanks to Almighty God are, every three years, offered up, with the greatest solemnity, by the magistrates in Holland) is of no weight; it determined many doctrines wrong. The Assembly of Scotland hath nothing of a true authority; and is very much out in its scheme of doctrines, worship, and government. But the Church of England is vested with all authority, and justly challengeth all obedience.

“If one crosses a river in the north, there it stands thus. The Church of England is not enough reformed; its doctrines, worship, and government, have too much of Antichristian Rome in them. But the Kirk of Scotland hath a divine right, from its only Head, Jesus Christ, to meet and to enact what to it shall seem fit for the good of his Church.”†

In England, with respect to another most important matter, it stands thus—Jesus Christ died for all, and every man who chooses to avail himself of the means whereby the benefit of the propitiatory sacrifice may be enjoyed, will certainly be saved from everlasting punishment.

But on the north side of the river it stands thus—“God having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected *some* to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver *them* out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring *them* into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer.”‡

mysterious or supernatural. If we stifle the principles of reason, our religion will be absurd and ridiculous.

“Reason, says St Austin, would never be for submitting, if it did not judge that on some occasions submission was its duty. It is but just, therefore, that it should recede where it sees an obligation of receding; and that it should assert its privileges, where, upon good grounds, it supposeth itself not engaged to waive them.”—(*Pascal’s Thoughts on Religion*, chap. v.)

Within reason’s province, then, and with men capable of thinking, the maxim of Bacon holds true, “He who begins in doubt ends in certainty; but he who begins in certainty ends in doubt.”

* *Religio Medici*, p. 10, ed. 1838.

† Dedication to Pope Clement XI., prefixed to Sir Richard Steele’s *Account of the State of the Roman Catholic Religion throughout the World*; in Hoadly’s *Works*, vol. i., p. 534. A portion of this unrivalled satire on Protestant Infallibility may be seen in Chambers’s *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, vol. i., p. 666.

‡ Shorter Catechism of the Church of Scotland, Question 20. The answer to Question 68 in the Larger Catechism is still more explicit: “All the elect, *and they only*, are effectually called.”

Whatever may be the right interpretation of the 17th Article of the Church

In the region last mentioned, it is proclaimed as "God's truth," that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, which ought

of England as to election (for, as may be seen in Bishop Burnet's Exposition of it, opposite views are entertained on this point), it is certain that the most eminent English divines are hostile to the Calvinistic view. See, for instance, Dr Isaac Barrow's sermon, entitled "The Doctrine of Universal Redemption asserted and explained;" the evidence already given on page 48 as to Archbishop Usher; and Bishop Watson's sermon on John iii. 16, preached before the King on 11th April 1802 (*Miscel. Tracts*, vol. i., p. 370; also his *Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. i., p. 427, and vol. ii., pp. 313, 418.)

Paley says: "Great and inestimably beneficial effects may accrue from the mission of Christ, and especially from his death, which do not belong to Christianity as a *revelation*; that is, they might have existed, and they might have been accomplished, though we had never in this life been made acquainted with them. These effects may be very extensive; they may be interesting even to other orders of intelligent beings. I think it is a general opinion, and one to which I have long come, that the beneficial effects of Christ's death extend to the whole human species. It was the redemption of *the world*. 'He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the whole world,' 1 John ii. 2."—(*Evidences of Christianity*, Part II. ch. ii., note.)

The same view is emphatically asserted by Archdeacon Daubeny in his Discourse "On the Plea advanced by Separatists from the Church, that the Gospel is not preached in it." (See his *Guide to the Church*, 3d edit. 1830, p. 63). He observes:—"Had it been said that the Gospel of J. Calvin was not preached there, we should readily have pleaded guilty to the charge; but that the *Gospel of Jesus Christ* is preached there, we certainly maintain, upon the authority of those Scriptures from which it has been received." He characterises the Calvinistic view as "a doctrine which carries its own condemnation on the face of it;" and remarks that "a doctrine, then, which tends to weaken the obligation to repentance and newness of life, which supports the sinner with a false hope, or lulls him into a fatal security, which proves destructive of one great end of Christ's death unto sin, namely, the reformation of the sinner, thereby counteracting one great object of the Gospel revelation, cannot be a doctrine that cometh from God."—(P. 66.) He quotes Erasmus on the demoralizing effect of belief in the Calvinistic dogma, and gives the following confirmatory instance from his own experience. "One of my parishioners who took his divinity, as perhaps many others may do, from some old puritanical writers of the last (17th) century, rather than from the Bible, maintained, I am sorry to think, the above doctrine in its fullest extent. He has been heard to say, that should he kill a man to-day, he should certainly go to heaven to-morrow. His salvation, therefore, being, according to his own notion, perfectly secured, religious ordinances, as means of grace, to him were useless. He acted, therefore, but in consistence with his doctrine, when, instead of frequenting a place of public worship on Sundays, he was generally occupied in attending his farm. But on this head we shall only say with South, that 'what is nonsense upon a principle of reason, will never be sense upon a principle of religion.'"—(P. 72.)

By John Wesley the doctrine of election is denounced in the following hearty manner:—"The sum of all is this: One in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected, nineteen in twenty are reprobated! The elect shall be saved, *do what they will*; the reprobate shall be damned, *do what they can*. This is the doctrine of Calvinism, for which Diabolism would be a better name; and in the worst and bloodiest idolatry that ever defiled the earth, there is nothing so horrid, so monstrous, so impious as this."—(*Southey's Life of Wesley*, 3d edit., vol. i., p. 321.)

After this, the ridiculous light in which Burns has represented the Calvinistic dogma, by merely stating it plainly, without the least exaggeration, in the opening stanza of "Holy Willie's Prayer," will not, I think, be regarded as a proof of impiety by any who concur with Lord Bacon in the sentiments expressed in his Essay of Superstition:—"It were better," says he, "to have no

to be observed in obedience to the Fourth Commandment, and "is to be sanctified by a holy resting all that day, even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days; and spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy."*

If you cross the German Ocean, however, there it stands thus—The first day of the week is the Lord's Day, a joyful festival, which has been observed since the early ages of the Church, in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. A portion of it is fitly and beneficially devoted to adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to the Almighty Father from whom all bounties flow, and to the acquiring of religious and moral instruction; the remaining hours of it may be spent in such refreshing, improving, and innocent pursuits or recreations, as each man finds most suitable to his own nature and circumstances. And the doctrine of the English Puritans, in opposition to this, is *figmentum Anglicanum*.†

opinion of God at all, than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely: and certainly superstition is the reproach of the Deity. Plutarch saith well to that purpose: 'Surely,' saith he, 'I had rather a great deal men should say there was no such a man at all as Plutarch, than that they should say there was one Plutarch, that would eat his children as soon as they were born;' as the poets speak of Saturn.'

* Shorter Catechism, Question 60.

† Dr Owen, in his treatise on the Sabbath, complains that the Puritanical tenets concerning it are so styled by sundry divines in the United Provinces. See his *Life* by Orme, p. 269. A friend of mine who received a part of his education at Utrecht, has furnished me with the following particulars:—"Our general way of spending the Sunday was to go to church in the forenoon, come home to an early dinner, and then start for a long rural walk, generally resting for two hours in some house of refreshment where tea and tobacco could be obtained. The Dutch theatres are closed on Sundays, but in the evening tea gardens and zoological gardens, where music is performed, are largely frequented by the people." Yet the Dutch, for aught that appears, are as moral a people as the self-complacent Scotch. The mere fact that, among ourselves, the members of the Society of Friends (who do not regard Sunday as more holy than any other day) are a class pre-eminent for sobriety and moral behaviour, might suggest to any thinking man that to repudiate Sabbatarianism and to lapse into vice are two things between which there is really not the slightest relation of cause and effect. For my part, I have never observed that Sabbatarians are distinguished beyond their opponents for virtuous behaviour.

A solemn warning against Sabbath-breaking is frequently drawn from the statements of condemned criminals, that their career to destruction had its root in that sin. Supposing the opinions of such persons about the original source of their misdeeds to be worthy of respectful consideration, and their declarations to the prison-chaplains to be sincere expressions of conviction, and not merely symptoms of a wish to please "the old gentleman," by answering his questions as he evidently desires and expects them to be answered—there is still, I humbly think, a misleading tendency, on the part of those who point the Sabbatarian moral, to confound two things which are entirely different. *To idle and drink in the worst company on Sunday* is no doubt Sabbath-breaking, if such a sin there be; but besides being a "desecration of the holy day," it is (as such conduct would be on *any* day) that course for "corrupting good manners," which "evil communications," especially along with idleness and drunkenness, have ever been found to be: and the corrupting influence of these alone, I contend, is quite sufficient to produce the lamented results in natures so unfavourably constituted as a taste for low company implies that they are. We see abundance of Sabbath-breaking which leads to neither the prison nor the gal-

Again : That the "truths" of one generation often become "errors" and bywords in the estimation of the next, is a remark frequently made by

lows ; but if a man habitually keep company, on Sunday or Saturday, with immoral and degraded associates, you may safely predict his end, without at all inquiring into his manner of keeping *holy* the Sabbath.

Dr Lorimer, of whose logical penetration the reader has already seen a sample, ascribes the disregard of the Fourth Commandment in Holland to the fact that "one-third of the population is now Roman Catholic ;" for, says he, "Popery and Neology combined cannot but war most adversely with the old Presbyterian Sabbath of Holland." (*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath? A Word of Warning from the Word of Prophecy, and the History of the Christian Church.* By the Rev. J. G. Lorimer, Glasgow. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1847. P. 21.) Should a copy of the treatise in which these words occur fall into the hands of an educated Dutchman, he would smile at the idea that the Protestant countrymen of Grotius and Erasmus are less concerned for their salvation, less capable of understanding the Bible, and more apt to be led astray by their Roman Catholic neighbours, than the Rev. Dr Lorimer, by whom their alleged backsliding is attributed to Popish contagion. If his theory be true, Glasgow has every year more and more cause to tremble for her Sabbatarian purity ! The Doctor, however, incidentally gives us a glimpse of another cause for the phenomenon, not quite identical with the one assigned by himself, but perhaps not on that account the less efficacious in its action. It is this—"that the controversy on the Sabbath in Holland, in the early part of the seventeenth century, was at once the signal and the instrument of spreading relaxed views."—(P. 43.) That is to say : when the question was fairly discussed, the intelligent Dutchmen found reason to believe that the Sabbath of the Puritans has no solid foundation in Scripture. Yet so unconscious is he of the suicidal character of the fact, that he actually heralds his proclamation of it with a flourish of trumpets :—"It is high time," says he, "it were generally understood that . . . the controversy on the Sabbath in Holland was at once the signal," &c. Here, I think, we may say with Shakspeare's Henry the Fifth,

" Now your own reasons turn into your bosoms,
As dogs upon their masters, worrying you."

K. Henry V., Act II., Sc. 2.

For how should a fair and *really* free controversy terminate in the ascendancy of error ? "Who knows not," as Milton grandly asks, "that Truth is strong, next to the Almighty ?"—that "though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously . . . to misdoubt her strength ? Let her and Falsehood grapple ; who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter ? . . . Well knows he who uses to consider, that our faith and knowledge thrives by exercise, as well as our limbs and complexion. Truth is compared in Scripture to a streaming fountain ; if her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition."—(*Areopagitica* ; Prose Works, vol. ii., pp. 96, 85.) It is therefore allowable to conjecture that, in the course of the controversy referred to, the thoughtful Hollanders discovered the following passage in the 14th chapter of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans :—"One man esteemeth one day above another ; another esteemeth EVERY day alike : let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord ; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." (Verses 5, 6.) As far as Dr Lorimer's treatise on what he calls the Protestant and Popish Sabbaths permits us to know, he has not yet discovered the existence, in the Bible, of this the most explicit, and perhaps the only absolute, declaration which it contains on the subject of the controversy ; and I am compelled to add, that in nine-tenths of the Sabbatarian treatises and sermons which I have read (and they are not few), its existence is similarly ignored. Either the writers thought the passage of no importance, or they did not : if they did, their notion is strange and unaccountable ; if they did not, then by passing over it in silence, while huddling together from the Old Testament and the New, but principally from the Old, a number of pas-

those acquainted with the history of human knowledge, and sometimes with the greatest self-complacency by men who, through their own

sages which, when tested by those rational principles of interpretation which are constantly applied in every department of literature but the theological, and are *professed* even by theologians who forget them in practice, evidently have no bearing whatever on the question at issue—by following, I say, this remarkable course, they plainly confess that the apostolic declaration is conclusive against them.

The absence of these words of St Paul from the texts quoted in the Scottish Confession and Catechisms, is not to be wondered at; for, as we shall afterwards see, it was not till these famous productions were completed by the Divines at Westminster, that the scriptural texts which were thought to establish the doctrines there stated were added in the margin, by command of the Parliament under whose authority the Assembly was acting. Of course, nothing of a hostile tendency could in such circumstances be included among the “proofs;” nor indeed could inconvenient texts, in any circumstances, have found admission into such manifestoes as these.

Even the able Dr Wardlaw, in his Discourses on the Sabbath, makes no attempt whatever to remove this stumbling-block in the way of the perplexed Sabbatarian. He extracts from Belsham’s Review of Wilberforce, p. 139, a passage in which the words, “every day alike,” are quoted and given effect to; but instead of attempting to *prove* that an erroneous interpretation is there put upon them, what does he do? He tries to divert attention from the difficulty, and to weaken the force of Belsham’s observations, by the mean device of rousing the orthodox prejudices of his readers against the writer as a Socinian! “We need not,” says he, “be greatly astonished, that one who could not find in the Scriptures the divinity and atonement of Christ, the depravity of human nature, and the existence and influences of the Holy Spirit, should have been little at a loss to exclude from them the duty of sanctifying the Lord’s day; and that, even as to the public worship of that day, he should have made light of the admitted example of the apostolic churches, commending it indeed as a ‘laudable and useful custom,’ and condescending to ‘approve of its continuance,’ but not at all allowing in it any obligation of divine authority.—(*Discourses on the Sabbath*, by Ralph Wardlaw, D.D., p. 100. Glasgow, 1832.) This is all that Dr Wardlaw can say to neutralize the words of the Apostle; and it is a plain confession of inability to propound a syllable to the purpose. He might as well have referred to the colour of Mr Belsham’s hair, or the roundness of his person, as presumptive evidence against his opinions about Sunday; nay, he might by this kind of logic assail with equal success the philosophies of Newton and Locke, who were as much Socinians as Mr Belsham was.

Dr Chalmers, a still more famous *Glasgow minister* than Dr Wardlaw, treats of the Sabbath in three of his Congregational Sermons, vol. ii., p. 252, *et seq.* Here not a word of “every day alike” is to be found! “But,” it may be suggested, “he wrote also Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. What says he *there*?” The difficulty could not fail to meet him in his progress, and surely he must have removed it when it came so directly in his way? Not he, indeed! Look at Lecture 95, vol. iv., p. 329, and you will see that the bearing of the passage upon the Lord’s day is completely ignored.

Some years ago, there was published in Scotland a Cyclopædia conducted by biblical scholars of far higher rank than any who had previously contributed to such a work. It contains an article on the Sabbath, in which the passage under consideration is quoted and discussed. An abridged edition was by and by prepared and published for popular use; and, that the passage was omitted in *that* edition, is only what was to be expected from the fact that the work of abridgment was performed *by another Glasgow minister!*

About the same time, a Biblical Cyclopædia was published by a *fifth Glasgow minister*, Dr John Eadie. There is, of course, an article on the Sabbath; and that article contains a classified list of references to Scripture texts bearing upon the subject. But, according to custom, the passage in Rom. xiv. is *not referred to*, either there or in any other part of the article; nor is mention made of certain other texts, which will be noticed below. This omission, *in a formal*

conduct and opinions, are exposing *themselves* to the sneers and wonder of their successors. The time is not very distant when Romanism over-

array of references, of the most important text of all, is quite indefensible; even though the writer has provided himself with a reply to the charge of *positive* misrepresentation, by introducing his list as one containing references only to texts which "are AMONG the *leading authorities* of the Bible respecting the Sabbath and its proper observance."

There is a line in Young's Night Thoughts, which says—

"Truth never was indebted to a lie;"

and I cannot help thinking that the striking disingenuousness of this special pleading is not a whit better calculated than "a lie" to serve her cause.*

The course of Bishop Horsley is equally significant: he grapples with, and explains in his own way, a passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, which has been supposed, he says, "to prove that the observance of a Sabbath in the Christian Church is no point of duty, but a matter of mere compliance with an ancient custom. In the second chapter of that Epistle, St Paul, speaking of the handwriting of ordinances which is blotted out, having been nailed to the Redeemer's cross, adds, in the 16th verse, 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.' From this text," says the Bishop, "no less a man than the venerable Calvin drew the conclusion, in which he has been rashly followed by other considerable men, that the sanctification of the seventh day is no indispensable duty in the Christian Church,—that it is one of those carnal ordinances of the Jewish religion which our Lord hath blotted out. The truth however is, that . . . the Sabbath-days of which St Paul in this passage speaks, were not the Sundays of the Christians, but the Saturdays and the other Sabbaths of the Jewish calendar." (Sermon XXIII.) I am constrained to observe, however, that the venerable Calvin is here most unfairly dealt with; for he expressly says that his opinion is founded, not merely on the text commented on by Bishop Horsley, but also on *certain other texts*, which the Bishop *suppresses altogether*, for no other apparent reason than that if he had candidly quoted them, they would have damaged his case so completely as to render it self-refuting and ridiculous. By turning to Book II., ch. viii., § 33, of Calvin's Institutes, it will be seen that, after stating, as his reason for adopting the observance of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day, that it is "a necessary remedy for preserving order in the Church," he proceeds as follows:—"Paul informs us that Christians are not to be judged in respect of its observance, because it is a shadow of something to come (Col. ii. 16); and accordingly, he expresses a fear lest his labour among the Galatians should prove in vain, *because they still observed days* (Gal. iv. 10, 11). AND HE TELLS THE ROMANS THAT IT IS SUPERSTITIOUS TO MAKE ONE DAY DIFFER FROM ANOTHER (Rom. xiv. 5)." (Vol. i., p. 464, Beveridge's transl. Edin., 1845). We shall have occasion to say more about Calvin's opinions in a subsequent page.

In the sermon above quoted, Bishop Horsley gives a brief, just, and forcible description of the spirit of Christianity; which, says he, "is rational, *manly*, and *ingenuous*; in all cases delighting in the substantial works of judgment, justice, and mercy, more than in any external forms." Christianity, then, condemns those who violate compacts about Sunday-trains, and descend to juggling tricks in the management of the business of railway meetings, or to the forgery of hundreds of signatures to memorials and petitions in favour of Sabbatarian measures (See Notes A. and N. in this Appendix), for the purpose

* In a book published about thirty-five years ago, entitled "A Treatise on the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Sabbath, with a view to enforce, from Scripture authority, a more careful observance of the Lord's Day, by Thomas Wemyss," there is a table of references to all the passages of Scripture in which the word "Sabbath" occurs. This has the look of a key to *all* the texts bearing on the subject; but as the word "Sabbath" happens not to be used in Rom. xiv., that most important passage is very conveniently left out of view, as it is likewise in all other parts of the work! Why did not the author furnish a *complete* list of the pertinent texts? Because, like the most of his orthodox brethren, he was afraid of letting the words of St Paul be seen. At least this is the only reason that I can think of; but if anybody can suggest a better, I shall be truly glad to hear it.

spread the whole of western Europe, and when to call its truth in question was a far more flagrant sin than even the strictest adherence to it

of glorifying God by a scrupulous regard to external forms. But I have quoted this passage chiefly for the purpose of remarking, that if Bishop Horsley's treatment of Calvin be *not* "manly and ingenuous," the calling him "venerable" is an "external form" which fails to bring his own conduct into harmony with the spirit of Christianity.

To the Rev. Dr Andrew Thomson, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, is due the credit of displaying greater courage than either Bishop Horsley or the five Glasgow ministers: he does not shrink from quoting the passages in the two Epistles, and putting forth a reply to the argument which has been founded on them. "As for the two passages from the apostolic Epistles (Rom. xiv. 5; Col. ii. 16, 17), which have been paraded with so much confidence, it is quite evident," says he, "that they refer to the attempt of Judaizers to make the observance of the seventh day, as well as of the first, binding upon the Christian Churches. The Apostle interferes to protect their Christian liberty. They might observe the seventh day if they chose, but no man was to compel them to do so, or to condemn them if they did not. To suppose that these verses were intended by the Apostle to declare that all days under the Christian dispensation were alike, is to suppose him to write one thing and to practise another."—(*The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*. By Ministers of different Denominations. P. 85. Edin. 1850).

With great deference I submit, that, in using the plain words "every day," the Apostle doubtless *meant* what he said; that he spoke of the seven days of the week, and not of six of them only. Besides, even supposing that he himself "practised" according to the Sabbatarian notion of his duty in regard to the observance of days (a point on which the scanty evidence we have in the New Testament is *hostile* to the assumption of Dr Thomson that he kept the first day holy), still his words to the Romans, if they have any meaning whatever, assuredly mean this—that all who thought it right to practise differently from him in that respect, were as fully entitled to act on *their own* opinion that "every day" was "alike," as he was to act on the opposite principle that "one day" is to be "esteemed above another." Dr Thomson's way of handling the question, and the conclusion which he draws, that "the apostles, by their example, sanctioned the change of the day, and the permanence of the institute" (p. 84), remind me forcibly of a piece of advice given by Bentham in his *Rationale of Evidence*. "In the minds of some men," he observes, "(not to say the bulk of men), if you set about proving the truth of a proposition, you rather weaken than strengthen their persuasion of it. Assume the truth of it, and build upon it as if indisputable, you do more towards riveting them to it than you could do by direct assertion, supported by any the clearest and the strongest proofs. By assuming it as true, you hold up to their eyes the view of that universal assent, or assent equivalent to universal (dissenters being left out of the account), which, from your assumption, they take for granted has been given to it: You represent all men, or (what comes to the same thing) all men whose opinions are worth regarding, as joining in the opinion; and by this means, besides the argument you present to the intellectual part of their frame, you present to its neighbour the volitional part another sort of argument, constituted by the fear of incurring the indignation or contempt of all reasonable men, by presuming to disbelieve or doubt what all such reasonable men are assured of."—(*Bentham's Works*, vol. vii., p. 451.)

The only glimpse we have of Paul's practice in regard to the sanctification of the first day of the week is obtained in Acts, xx. 7-11. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, *ready to depart on the morrow*, and continued his speech until midnight." Now, as the Jews reckoned their day from sunset to sunset, and were accustomed to "break bread" in the evening, it seems that Paul, after sunset on what *we* should call Saturday evening, attended the meeting of disciples, preached until midnight, restored Eutychus to life, supped, continued his preaching, and "when he had talked a long while, even till break of day, departed." That is to say, as I interpret the passage (for we can hardly sup-

is now regarded among Protestants. Another noted instance relates to the motion of the earth upon its axis—to teach which was, three

pose that he began this long preaching *before sunset*), *he resumed his travels on Sunday morning*. But whether he did or not, we have no proof that he thought it an act of profanity to do so; and nothing can be plainer than the admission, in his Epistle to the Jewish converts at Rome, of their liberty to keep days holy or not, according to their own views of the Divine law in regard to that practice.

The late Dr Richard Winter Hamilton of Leeds, in a rhapsody which he published in 1848 under the title of *Horæ et Vindictæ Sabbaticæ*, also takes notice, at p. 90, of the passage about which we are speaking. "We are aware," says he, "that Scripture has been quoted to render the question of its (the Sabbath's) observance indifferent; to expose it rather in the light of a burden than of a blessing. It would be strange, could this be established, laxity is abhorrent to the spirit of Revelation. The statement, upon which this doctrine of indifference is founded, proceeds from Paul (Rom. xiv. 5): 'One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day.' Our translators have added, 'alike,' which has no pretext of place in the original Greek. This must refer to the Jewish feasts. He who had been educated beneath their associations would feel much scrupulousness in renouncing them. If he 'regarded it unto the Lord,' he was not to be 'judged' by them who regarded it not unto the Lord." Dr Hamilton should have added the more pertinent declaration, that "he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it;" for which reason *he* is not to be "judged" by those who do regard it to the Lord. But moreover, the reader will observe here the same begging of the question—the same unwarrantable assumption that "*every day*" means *every day but Sunday*. Several other points deserve to be noticed: 1. The question in connection with this passage is not as to the duty of resting on the Lord's Day, but whether the day is *holy*, and thus susceptible of "*profanation*?" 2. To the best of my knowledge, nobody has ever inferred from the words of St Paul, that rest on the Lord's Day is a burden rather than a blessing. 3. Laxity with respect to things not enjoined by Revelation or natural religion cannot be abhorrent to the spirit of Revelation; and if (as many think) the esteeming of one day above another is neither a natural nor a revealed duty of Christians, then laxity in venerating the first day of the week cannot be worse than the prevailing and reputable laxity in esteeming the second or the seventh above the others. Lastly, although it is quite true that the word "alike," added by our translators, has no counterpart in the original Greek, Dr Hamilton has not said, because he dared not say, that its insertion was not indispensable to give the true sense of the passage. He tries to destroy the force of the Apostle's words by *insinuating* a mis-translation, where, had he been conscious that one existed, he would not have failed to *assert* the fact in the broadest terms. This device is only a degree less discreditable than that by which he elsewhere tries to weaken the force of Paley's *candid* chapter on the Sabbath. "It was," says he, with an air of virtuous sorrow—"It was in melancholy consistency, that he *who loosened the foundations and principles of all morality* should thus assail the authority of the Sabbath"!—(P. 13.) If Dr Hamilton had been conscious of his ability to meet Paley's argument by *argument*, would he have descended to so undignified a course as this? And if the charge thus brought against that eminent advocate of the Divine origin of Christianity be true, with what degree of satisfaction can his "Evidences" be henceforth studied, or placed by parents in the hands of their children? To me it appears that any disposition to lax morality in Paley was more likely to manifest itself in stretching the Sabbatarian texts *beyond* their legitimate meaning—this course having the tendency, which its opposite had not, to facilitate his wished-for advancement in the Church. That he *has stretched them but a little* in the popular direction, while so many of his fellow-divines, especially among the dissenters, have stretched them to an extravagant length, is, everything considered, a good deal to the Archdeacon's credit.

Lastly, it is worthy of remark, that Mr Alexander Oliver, in his recently-published Defence of the Universality and Perpetuity of the Sabbath, contents himself with a mere general allusion to the passage in Romans xiv., without either quoting it or mentioning its place in Scripture. After arguing that the

centuries ago, equivalent to denial not merely of Divine revelation, but of the evidence of our very senses. For what could be more evi-

words in 1 Col. ii. 16, refer to the Jewish Sabbath only (which may or may not be the case), he thus proceeds (p. 45):—"The same observations apply to *the other texts which have been adduced by opponents*; the idea, therefore, cannot be entertained for a moment, that the Apostle intended 'to declare that all days under the Christian dispensation were alike:' for this would be to 'suppose him to write one thing and to practise another.' (*The Sabbath*. By Rev. Andrew Thomson, D.D.)" Here Mr Oliver is evidently glad to devolve upon the broad shoulders of Dr Thomson the burden of proving that "every day" is *not* "every day," and to escape as nimbly as possible to a more tractable subject.

It is not without reason that I am disposed to attribute the abandonment of "the old Presbyterian Sabbath of Holland," to enlarged knowledge of Scripture among the Dutch; for both my own experience and what I have observed in the case of some other serious inquirers after religious truth, have convinced me that such an event may naturally ensue from a diligent study of the Bible. I was bred a strict Sabbatarian in principle and practice; but at an early age began, after the example of the Bereans, and in obedience to advice frequently heard from the pulpit, to "search the Scriptures," with the view of seeing "whether those things were so." At the same time, thinking it the part of a rational inquirer to look into *more than one side* of every question that deserved to be seriously considered, I acted accordingly, notwithstanding the bad odour in which such a course is usually held by those who fancy they are the warmest friends of religious *truth*. Though full of prejudice in favour of my hereditary notions, I soon attained the conviction, which has become stronger and stronger the more I have since pursued my studies, that the Sabbatarian doctrines which I had imbibed in the nursery were far from having that sufficient warrant in Scripture which they had been represented to possess. The effect of this discovery was most useful: If my spiritual guides could err in what seemed so plain a matter, might they not have misled me in others as important, and perhaps of greater difficulty? The reply was obvious; and thenceforward I endeavoured to play the only part which a Protestant can consistently perform—that of an independent thinker, glad to receive light from any available source, but ever striving to "prove all things" as well as he is able, in the hope of "holding fast" *only* "that which is good." This course I have found to be as satisfactory in its results as it is sound in principle; and if in some particulars I have arrived at different conclusions from those generally believed in Scotland to be correct, the love of singularity has certainly had no share in producing this result, nor have I ever been disposed to obtrude my opinions upon others, unless on some such compulsion as is supplied in the present instance by the aggressive conduct of the Sabbatarians, and the unjust demand of the "orthodox" clergy and their adherents, that the theological doctrines on which the stamp of "*God's truth*" is set by them, shall be taught in national schools at the expense of those who repudiate portions thereof as pernicious *human error*. On those points where I have the happiness to agree with the generality of my countrymen, I of course enjoy the advantage of being more able to render to myself "a reason for the hope that is in me," than would otherwise have been possible; and am thus in some measure safe from being "carried about with every wind of doctrine." Whoever will follow such a course as is here described, will soon find reason to concur with Pascal in the opinion, that "many things which are true have been contradicted, while many which are false pass without contradiction;" and that "to be contradicted is no more a mark of falsehood, than not to be contradicted is a mark of truth."—(*Thoughts on Religion*, ch. 31.) Bishop Watson at the conclusion of his Apology for Christianity, tells Gibbon,—“We are far from wishing you to trust to the word of the clergy for the truth of your religion; we beg of you to examine it to the bottom; to try it, to prove it, and not to hold it fast unless you find it good.” And he elsewhere says,—“I have no regard for latitudinarian principles, nor for any principles but the principles of truth, and truth every man must endeavour to investigate for himself; and, ordinarily speaking, he will

dent to human sight than the diurnal motion of the heavenly bodies ? and what could be clearer than these words of Scripture—"He hath established the earth upon its foundations : it shall not be moved, for ever and ever.—For upon the seas he hath founded it, and upon the streams he hath fixed it.—O, give thanks unto Him—who hath spread out the earth upon the waters !—The mount Zion" [and therefore, they inferred, the whole earth, of which any hill or mountain is only a part]—"shall not be moved, for ever and ever.—Generation goeth, and generation cometh ; but the earth for ever standeth. —The sun——rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. From the end of the heavens is his going forth, and his circuit to their uttermost parts.—Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens.—Who stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, who layeth rafters in the waters, his upper chambers."* "Upon the interpretation which men of the highest ability attached to these declarations of Scripture," says Dr John Pye Smith (who might have quoted also the first chapter of Genesis, and the tenth of Joshua, to the same effect), "they rested the most positive confidence that the sun flies round the earth every twenty-four hours, and that the earth rests immovably in the centre of the universe. 'This,' said one of the most eminent men of the Reformed Church, 'we affirm, with all divines, natural philosophers and astronomers, Jews and Mohammedans, Greeks and Latins ; excepting one or two of the ancients, and the modern followers of Copernicus.'† It is in no small degree

be most successful in his endeavours, who examines with candour and care what can be urged on each side of a greatly controverted question."—(*Miscell. Tracts*, vol. i., p. 323.) In accordance with these sentiments, I say with honest Matthew Green—

" Thus in opinions I commence
Freeholder in the proper sense,
And neither suit nor service do,
Nor homage to pretenders show,
Who boast themselves by spurious roll
Lords of the manor of the soul ;
Preferring sense, from chin that's bare,
To nonsense thron'd in whisker'd hair."

The Spleen ; Aikin's Select Brit. Poets, iv., 330.

To me, therefore, who know so well these incidents of my own mental history, and have observed the like phenomena in others, nothing can seem more probable than that, as soon as the attention of intelligent Dutchmen was closely directed by clerical discussion to the bearings of Scripture on the Sabbath question, the controversy should be "at once the signal and the instrument of spreading relaxed views." But, that what Dr Lorimer calls "the old Presbyterian Sabbath of Holland" was ever as strictly and ultrajudaically observed, as the Sabbath introduced in England by the Puritans about the end of the sixteenth century, and which the following generation of Puritans embalmed in the Westminster Confession, is a notion not to be received upon his sole authority, and which is hardly consistent with the fact mentioned by Dr Owen, that the phrase "*figmentum Anglicanum*" was applied to the Puritanic doctrine by Dutch divines.

For proof of the "*ultrajudaical*" character here ascribed to the orthodox Scottish mode of Sabbath-observance, see an inquiry into its Scriptural grounds, in a subsequent part of this work, Note R.

* Psalm civ. 5 ; xxiv. 2 ; cxxxvi. 6. Eccles. i. 4. Psalm xix. 6 ; cxlviii. 4 ; civ. 3.

† Gisb. Voetii *Disput. Theol.* vol. i., p. 637. Utrecht, 1648."

curious, but it conveys also a serious lesson to us, to observe what was a very great stretch of candour and charity, one hundred and fifty years ago. ‘That the sun moves and that the earth is at rest,’ wrote another of that class of learned men, ‘is testified in Scripture :—that the earth also cannot be moved, being as it were founded and fixed upon bases, pedestals, and pillars. Some philosophers, indeed, both ancient and modern, and Copernicus, the most distinguished among them, have maintained the contrary. Gemma Frisius has taken pains to explain this opinion of Copernicus in the most favourable manner that he could ; and some celebrated philosophers have endeavoured to reconcile it to the Bible, by considerations drawn from the ambiguity and various use of language. Others have recourse to the condescension of the style of Scripture, which, upon matters that do not affect faith and religion, is wont to lisp and prattle (συμψελλίζειν,) like a father with his babes. But our pious reverence for the Scripture, the word of truth, will not allow us to depart from the strict propriety of the words ; as, by so doing, we should be setting to infidels an example of wresting the Scriptures ; unless we were convinced by sure and irrefragable arguments, as perhaps there may be a few so convinced,—but they are ambitious persons, though professing themselves to be devoted to sacred studies.’ ”*

The concluding unfair insinuation by this rough-named Protestant divine, of the predominance of unworthy motives in those who had adopted the Copernican system, is precisely in the spirit which, in our own day, frequently characterises the language employed by men “devoted to sacred studies,” against those who, as geologists and physiologists, are guilty of reading the Book of Nature with more searching eyes than theirs, and who thus devolve upon them the unwelcome task of remodelling such parts of their venerated systems as are discovered to be “man’s truth” alone, instead of being that “Divine truth” which they have been pompously asserted to be. For, as a writer in *The Independent Whig* has observed, “with the bigot, every truth that exposes his devout dreams is blasphemy ;” to illustrate which, he tells of a Scotch Presbyterian whom he had very lately heard of, “who found a multitude of texts against the astronomical system, and told his hearers a world of angry things which God Almighty said against it : He asserted that the earth stood still, and the sun travelled round it, ‘in spite of all the mathematical demonstrations that could come from hell ;’ and, with a ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ added terrible threatenings against the philosophers and freethinkers of the

* Joh. Henr. Heideggeri *Medulla Theol. Christ.* p. 136 ; Zurich, 1696.”

The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science. By John Pye Smith, D.D. 4th ed., p. 186. Lond. 1848.—In Luther’s *Colloquia Mensalia*, or *Table-Talk*, ch. lxx., the following passage occurs :—“ I am now advertised (said Luther) that a new astronomer is risen, who presumeth to prove that the earth moveth and goeth about—not the firmament, the sun, moon, nor the stars ; like as when one sitteth in a coach or in a ship, and is moved, thinketh he sitteth still and resteth, but the earth and the trees go, run, and move themselves. Therefore, thus it goeth, when we wean ourselves to *our own foolish fancies and conceits*. This fool will turn the whole art of astronomy upside down ; BUT THE SCRIPTURE SHEWETH AND TEACHETH HIM ANOTHER LESSON, where Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth.”—(P. 503 of Capt. Henry Bell’s Translation. London, 1652.)

age, whom he christened blasphemers, and doomed to Divine wrath, without any hesitation.”*

The truth of this report might reasonably be doubted if we did not remember that, so recently as 1722, an old woman was burnt in Scotland for witchcraft; and that, *two years after the publication of the volume just quoted*, the repeal of the statutes against witches was formally bewailed by the Associate Presbytery of the Seceders, who, in their annual confession of national sins, printed at Edinburgh in 1743, enumerated this measure as a grievous transgression, “CONTRARY TO THE EXPRESS LAWS OF GOD.”† In the history of witchcraft, indeed, beyond perhaps that of any other religious error, we may find a solemn warning against the danger of mistaking “man’s truth” for God’s. In the end of the sixteenth century, it was a flagrant proof of “heresy” and “infidelity” to deny that witches existed; and the few who doubted were glad to hold their peace. “The fearful abounding at this time in this country,” writes King James VI. in 1597, “of these detestable slaves of the devil, the witches or enchanters, hath moved me (beloved reader) to despatch in post this following treatise of mine, not in any wise (as I protest) to serve for a show of my learning and ingine, but only, moved of conscience, to press thereby, so far as I can, to resolve the doubting hearts of many, *both that such assaults of Sathan ARE MOST CERTAINLY PRACTISED*, and that the instruments thereof merits most severely to be punished: against the *damnable opinions* of two principally in our age, whereof the one called Scot, an Englishman, is not ashamed in public print to deny that there can be such a thing as witchcraft, and so maintains the old error of the Sadducees in denying of spirits. The other, called Wierus, a German physician, sets out a public apology for all these crafts-folks, whereby, procuring for their impunity, he plainly bewrays himself to have been one of that profession.”‡

In reference to this famous production, the late Mr D’Israeli, in his Inquiry into the Literary and Political Character of King James I., writes as follows:—“Not long before James composed his treatise on ‘*Dæmonologie*,’ the learned Wierus had published an elaborate work on the subject. ‘*De præstigiis Dæmonum et incantationibus et veneficiis*,’ &c. 1568. He advanced one step in philosophy by discovering that many of the supposed cases of incantation originated in the imagination of these sorcerers—but he advanced no farther, for he acknowledges the real diabolical presence. The physician who pretended to cure the disease, was himself irrecoverably infected. Yet even this single step of Wierus was strenuously resisted by the learned Bodin, who, in his amusing volume of ‘*Demonomanie des Sorciers*,’ 1593, refutes Wierus. These are the leading authors of the times; who were followed by a crowd. Thus James I. neither wanted authorities to quote, nor great minds to sanction his ‘*Dæmonologie*,’ first

* The Independent Whig: or, A Defence of Primitive Christianity and of our Ecclesiastical Establishment against the Exorbitant Claims and Encroachments of Fanatical and Disaffected Clergymen. [By Gordon and Trenchard.] 2d. ed., vol. iii. p. 4. London, 1741.

† See an elaborate and most instructive article on Witchcraft in the Foreign Quarterly Review, vol. vi., p. 46; June 1830. Sir Walter Scott’s Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft is a still more accessible book.

‡ King James’s *Dæmonologie*, Preface.

published in 1597. To the honour of England, a single individual, Reginald Scot, with a genius far advanced beyond his age, denied the very existence of those witches and demons in the curious volume of his 'Discovery of Witchcraft,' 1581. His books were burned! and the author was himself not quite out of danger; and Voetius, says Bayle, complains that when the work was translated into Dutch, it raised up a number of libertines who laughed at all the operations and the apparitions of devils. Casanbon and Glanvil, who wrote so much later, treat Scot with profound contempt, assuring us his reasonings are childish, and his philosophy absurd! Such was the reward of a man of genius combating with popular prejudices! Even so late as 1678, these popular superstitions were confirmed by the narrations and the philosophy of Glanvil, Dr More, &c. The subject enters into the Commentaries on the Laws of England. An edict of Louis XIV. and a statute by George II. made an end of the whole *Diablerie*. Had James I. adopted the system of Reginald Scot, the king had probably been branded as an atheist king!—"But one fact in favour of our royal author is testified by the honest Fuller and the cynical Osborne. On the king's arrival in England, having discovered the numerous impostures and illusions which he had often referred to as authorities, he grew suspicious of the whole system of 'Dæmonologie,' and at length recanted it entirely;" [*i. e.* the things which had been "*most certainly*" true, or were accounted "God's truth," became, if not "*most certainly false*, at least unworthy of belief.] "With the same conscientious zeal James had written the book, the king condemned it; and the sovereign separated himself from the author, in the cause of truth; but the clergy and the parliament persisted in making the imaginary crime felony by the statute, and it is only a recent act of parliament which has forbidden the appearance of the possessed and the spæ-wife. But this apology for having written these treatises need not rest on this fact, however honourably it appeals to our candour. Let us place it on higher ground, and tell those who asperse this monarch for his credulity and intellectual weakness, that they themselves, had they lived in the reign of James I., had probably written on the same topics, and felt as uneasy at the rumour of a witch being a resident in their neighbourhood!"*

* *Miscellanies of Literature*, by I. D'Israeli, Esq., p. 332. London, 1840. In the same work, p. 333, there is a curious chapter on "The Popular Superstitions of the Age," from which may be learnt certain other wonderful "truths" which were then universally believed.

I have searched Fuller's Church History for the passage alluded to by Mr D'Israeli, and found it under the year 1618, in Cent. XVII., B. x., § 57. He mentions some cases of pretended demoniacal possession, the catalogue of which, says he, with his usual pleasantry, "consists most of the weaker sex, either because Satan would plant his battery where easiest to make a breach, or because he found such most advantaged for dissembling, and his cloven foot best concealed under long coats. Indeed," says he, "some feminine weaknesses made them more strong to delude, the ruins of the disease of the Mother being the best foundation to build such impostory thereon." But "King James, remembering what Solomon saith, 'It is the honour of a king to search out a matter' (Prov. xxv. 2). was no less dexterous than desirous to make discovery of these deceits. Various were his ways in detecting them, aweing some into confession with his presence, persuading others by promise of pardon and fair usage. He ordered it so, that a proper courtier made love to one of these bewitched maids, and quickly Cupid his arrows drove out the pretended darts of the Devil.

In the *Spectator* of July 14, 1711 (No. 117), Addison writes of witchcraft in the following cautious way:—

“There are some opinions in which a man should stand neuter,

Another there was, the tides of whose possession did so ebb and flow, that punctually they observed one hour till the king came to visit her. The maid, loath to be so unmannerly as to make His Majesty attend her time, antedated her fits many hours, and instantly ran through the whole zodiac of tricks which she used to play. A third, strangely affected when the first verse of St John's Gospel was read unto her in our translation, was tame and quiet whilst the same was pronounced in Greek, her English devil belike understanding no other language. The frequency of such forged possessions wrought such an alteration upon the judgment of King James, that he, receding from what he had written in his *Demonologie*, grew first diffident of, and then flatly to deny the workings of witches and devils, as but falsehoods and delusions.”

The predilection of Satan for the tender sex, as subjects for temptation to such trickery, is somewhat better accounted for by modern physicians than by this quaint historian. The plain truth is, that *hysteria*—a disease of which a strong inclination to deception is known to be a frequent symptom—*occurs almost exclusively in females*. See a Treatise on the Nervous Diseases of Women, by Thomas Laycock, M.D., sometime Resident Medical Officer of the York County Hospital, p. 353 (London, 1840); Essays on Partial Derangement of the Mind in supposed Connexion with Religion, by the late John Cheyne, M.D., Physician-General to His Majesty's Forces in Ireland, p. 171 (Dublin, 1843): an article on “Woman in her Psychological Relations,” in the Journal of Psychological Medicine, No. XIII., Jan. 1851, p. 32; and one on “The True Scientific Spirit in which the Claims of Phrenology and Mesmerism ought to be studied,” in the Phrenological Journal, vol. xx., p. 119.—Young women, moreover, are naturally more apt than the other sex to resort to such trickery, in order to make themselves objects of interest, wonder, and notoriety in the neighbourhood.

There can be no doubt that many of the supposed witches were insane, and really believed in their diabolic possession. Writers on mental derangement even recognise in that notion the symptom of a specific form of the disease. Esquirol, for instance, in his work *Des Maladies Mentales*, vol. i., p. 482, has a chapter on “*Démonomanie*;” and a curious case of “Supposed Demoniacal Possession,” related with perfect seriousness by the patient himself, is published in the Journal of Psychological Medicine, No. VII., p. 462, and No. X., p. 262; July 1849 and April 1850. See other instances in the Phrenological Journal, vol. xvi., p. 71. Dr Thomas Stone thinks that in many of the so-called cases of witchcraft in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the occurrence of those nervous phenomena called mesmeric, may have given rise to the imputation of that damnable sin. See his paper on “Witchcraft and Mesmerism,” in the London Polytechnic Magazine, No. II., Feb. 1844.

In ancient times, all diseases attended by mental derangement were ascribed to the possession of demons, as the Rev. Hugh Farmer has shewn in his Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament. This learned and candid writer maintains that, in regard to madmen and epileptics, as in many other cases, Christ and his apostles adapted their language to the notions of their hearers, “and that when we read in the New Testament that they *cast out demons*, this must mean that they *cured demoniacs*; and it can mean no more.”—(P. 213, 2d edit., London, 1805.) This view had previously been advocated by Joseph Mede, Dr Sykes, Dr Lardner, Dr Mead, and Bishop Warburton; the last of whom, in his Sermons, vol. i., p. 204, passes a severe censure on the doctrine of possessions, calling it “*the superstitious impiety of demoniacal possessions*;” though in his third volume of Sermons, p. 213, he subsequently defended this very “*impiety*” as God's truth! Mr Farmer (who was one of the ablest defenders of miracles against Hume) wrote also *An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of our Lord's Temptation in the Wilderness*, which appeared in 1761. His view is, that the Gospel narrative of that event is the representation of a divine vision, the several scenes of which offered to our Lord symbolical predictions of the difficulties and offices of his future ministry.

without engaging his assent to one side or the other. Such a hovering faith as this, which refuses to settle upon any determination, is absolutely necessary in a mind that is careful to avoid errors and pre-

This work, and the Essay on Demoniacs, led to much learned controversy, of which an account may be found in Aikin's General Biography, vol. iv., p. 28. Be his conclusions right or wrong, we may with justice apply to him the words of Paley, addressed, in the dedication of his Moral Philosophy, to Dr Edward Law, Bishop of Carlisle: "Whatever difference, or whatever opposition, some who peruse your writings may perceive between your conclusions and their own, the good and wise of all persuasions will revere that industry, which has for its object the illustration or defence of our common Christianity. Your researches have never lost sight of one purpose, namely to recover the simplicity of the Gospel from beneath that load of unauthorised additions, which the ignorance of some ages, and the learning of others, the superstition of weak, and the craft of designing men, have (unhappily for its interest) heaped upon it. And this purpose, I am convinced, was dictated by the purest motive; by a firm, and I think a just opinion, that whatever renders religion more rational, renders it more credible; that he who, by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records, dismisses from the system one article which contradicts the apprehension, the experience, or the reasoning of mankind, does more towards recommending the belief, and, with the belief, the influence of Christianity, to the understandings and consciences of serious inquirers, and through them to universal reception and authority, than can be effected by a thousand contenders for creeds and ordinances of human establishment."

Both sides of the controversy about the Demoniacs of the New Testament, are stated with great clearness by the Rev. J. F. Denham, in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, vol. i., p. 548. He concludes by declaring the question to be still undecided.

Baxter, in his Christian Ethics, gravely reports the "credible" case of a neighbour to whom the devil appeared (Works, vol. iii., p. 279); and like Dr Henry More, Sir Thomas Browne, Sir Matthew Hale, and most, if not all, of the Scottish clergy in the eighteenth century, he was a firm believer in the existence of witches. "Though some," says he, "are very incredulous about witches, yet to a full inquiry the evidence is past question, that multitudes of such there be."—(*Reasons of the Christian Religion*; Works, vol. xxi., p. 87.) "And though some are as incredulous of apparitions, yet evidence hath confuted all incredulity"—(*Ib.*, 88.) He even adduces witchcraft as a proof of the immateriality of the soul and the being of the devil (xviii. 284; xx. 255; xxii. 327; and his treatise entitled "The certainty of the World of Spirits fully evinced by unquestionable Histories of Apparitions and Witchcrafts, Operations, Voices," &c., published in 1691, and noticed in his Life by Orme, p. 437; but not included in Orme's collection of his writings, which contains only his "Practical Works," though, for brevity's sake, I have all along referred to it as his "Works.")

In the *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, Part ii., p. 432, the following remarks occur: "It is worthy the mentioning how God's strange judgments about this time (1663), were turned by the devil to his own advantage. Most certainly abundance of real prodigies and marvellous works of God were done, which surely he did not cause in vain! But the over-fervent spirits of some fanatics (Fifth-Monarchy-men), caused them presently to take them up boldly with the commentary of their own applications, and too hastily venting matters of common report before they were tried, they published at several times three volumes of the history of these prodigies, in which there were divers lesser matters magnified, and some things which proved false. And though upon strictest examination both I and all men are convinced that very many of the things were true (as the drying up of the river Derwent, in Derbyshire, upon no known cause, in winter, the earth opening and swallowing a woman near Ashborne in the same county, upon her own imprecation, the appearance of an army to many near Montgomery, and abundance more); yet were falsehoods thrust in through their heady temerity and credulity, whereby it came to pass, that these wonders were so far from

possessions. When the arguments press equally on both sides in matters that are indifferent to us, the safest method is to give up ourselves to neither.

“It is with this temper of mind that I consider the subject of witchcraft. When I hear the relations that are made from all parts of the world, not only from Norway and Lapland, from the East and West Indies, but from every particular nation in Europe, I cannot forbear thinking that there is such an intercourse and commerce with evil spirits, as that which we express by the name of witchcraft. But when I consider that the ignorant and credulous parts of the world abound most in these relations, and that the persons moving men to repentance, or the fear of God’s judgments, that they greatly hardened them, and made them say, ‘These fanatics are the odious lying deceivers of the world, that, to cheat the people into a seditious humour, care not to belie even God himself.’ And what the fanatics had been guilty of, was imputed to the ejected ministers and their followers, by those who thought it their interest to do so. So that the poor obdurate enemies of godliness did not only lose the benefits of God’s strange and dreadful warnings, but were much hardened by them.”

Explanations of these wonders may easily be suggested. The drying up of the river Derwent was doubtless such a phenomenon as that sudden and remarkable lowering of the waters of the Teviot, Clyde, and Nith, on the 27th November 1838, which Mr David Milne has recorded in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, vol. xli., p. 200, and ascribes to the united action of frost and wind during the previous night. The swallowing up of the imprecating woman near Ashborne, may have been a case of falling into one of those narrow clefts which abound among the limestone rocks of Derbyshire, and into which *any* woman, but most of all an *imprecating* (and therefore agitated, if not insane) one, might easily fall or leap. Every Derbyshire tourist knows Eldon Hole, one of the “wonders of the Peak,” between Castleton and Buxton: it is now fenced by a wall, for the protection of man and beast; and strangers in passing (*haud inexpertus loquor*), are wont to throw stones into it, and listen to the noise as it dies away in the distant depths.—Of the appearance of the army to many near Montgomery, I have no better explanation to propose than that contained in the remark of Sir Walter Scott, that there is in crowds a “disposition to see as much of the supernatural as is seen by others around, or in other words to trust to the eyes of others rather than to our own.”—(*Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*, p. 12.) Or, to speak more precisely, there is a disposition in persons under a strong emotion of wonder, to see subjectively (*i. e.* as apparitions and dreams are seen) things suggested to them by others. Sir Walter gives several instances in illustration, particularly one which occurred near Lanark in 1686, where many saw “showers of bonnets, hats, guns, and swords, which covered the trees and the ground: companies of men in arms marching in order upon the water side; companies meeting companies, going all through other, and then all falling to the ground and disappearing, other companies immediately appeared, marching the same way.” This account is quoted from Walker’s *Lives*, vol. i., p. xxxvi. Edin. 1827. Two-thirds of the persons present saw these appearances; the remaining third looked for them in vain.

See remarks on the credulous disposition of Baxter, in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxx., p. 213.

Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Religio Medici* (p. 73 of Mr J. A. St John’s edition of 1838), records his belief “that the souls of the faithful, as they leave earth, take possession of heaven; that those apparitions and ghosts of departed persons are not the wandering souls of men, but the unquiet walks of devils, prompting and suggesting us unto mischief, blood, and villany, instilling and stealing into our hearts, that the blessed spirits are not at rest in their graves, but wander solicitous of the affairs of the world; but that those phantasms appear often, and do frequent cemeteries, chunnel-houses, and churches, it is because those are the dormitories of the dead, where the devil, like an insolent champion, beholds with pride the spoils and trophies of his victory over Adam.”

among us, who are supposed to engage in such an infernal commerce, are people of a weak understanding and crazed imagination, and at the same time reflect upon the many impostures and delusions of this nature that have been detected in all ages, I endeavour to suspend my belief till I hear more certain accounts than any which have yet come to my knowledge. In short, when I consider the question, whether there are such persons in the world as those we call witches, my mind is divided between two opposite opinions, or rather, to speak my thoughts freely, I believe in general that there is, and has been, such a thing as witchcraft, but at the same time can give no credit to any particular instance of it."

If, by any rare chance, the 117th No. of the *Spectator* fell into the hands of some Parson Trulliber of Queen Anne's reign, what a theme for declamation against "science falsely so called" it must have furnished him with! In what a holy rapture would he denounce the impiety and "insidiousness" of this polite attempt to cheat "God's people" out of their saving faith!

Under the influence, however, of the writings of Bacon, Newton, Boyle, Sydenham, and Locke, and by dint of the incessant labours of the Royal Society (which was established in 1662), the physical and moral sciences continued to expand with unprecedented activity; driving witches and ghosts, nay, the horned devil himself, out of sight, and making it safe and reputable for even the pious Dr Beattie to publish, eighty years ago, a poem in which these beautiful stanzas are found:—

And Reason, now, through Number, Time, and Space
Darts the keen lustre of her serious eye,
And learns, from facts compared, the laws to trace,
Whose long progression leads to Deity.
Can mortal strength presume to soar so high?
Can mortal sight, so oft bedimmed with tears,
Such glory bear?—for, lo! the shadows fly
From Nature's face; Confusion disappears,
And order charms the eyes, and harmony the ears.

In the deep windings of the grove, no more
The hag obscene, and grisly phantom dwell;
Nor in the fall of mountain-stream, or roar
Of winds, is heard the angry spirit's yell;
No wizard mutters the tremendous spell,
Nor sinks convulsive in prophetic swoon;
Nor bids the noise of drums and trumpets swell,
To ease of fancied pangs the labouring moon,
Or chase the shade that blots the blazing orb of noon.*

* The Minstrel, B. ii., stanzas 46, 47.—Goldsmith, in the eighth number of a publication called *The Bee*, (Nov. 24, 1759), observes:—"We have a *wondering* quality within us, which finds huge gratification when we see strange feats done, and cannot at the same time see the doer or the cause. Such actions are sure to be attributed to some witch or demon; for if we come to find they are slyly performed by artists of our own species, and by causes purely natural, our delight dies with our amazement. It is therefore one of the most unthankful offices in the world, to go about to expose the mistaken notions of witchcraft and spirits; it is robbing mankind of a valuable imagination, and of the privilege of being deceived. Those who at any time undertook the task, have always met with rough treatment and ill language for their pains, and seldom escaped the imputation of atheism, because they would not allow the devil to be too powerful for the Almighty. For my part, I am so much a heretic as to believe, that God Almighty, and not the devil, governs the world."

It was not without a painful struggle that our great-grandmothers abandoned

We now come to the consideration of a subject, which, while it strikingly illustrates the general subject of this Note, has also a special

the notion that thunder is the immediate voice of the Omnipotent, and the thunderbolt the messenger of his wrath. But Franklin succeeded here, as in another momentous enterprise in which he played a part: "*Eripuit celo fulmen, sceptrumque tyranno.*"

In the generation immediately preceding that in which Beattie's *Minstrel* appeared, two illustrious philosophical poets had already familiarised the minds of educated Englishmen with the idea that the universe is governed on a plan; in other words, that the Divine Providence is not *particular* but *general*—not exercised in the manner of special interference, but acting according to laws, or unchanging rules, prescribed by Himself at the beginning. Cowper, in the *Second Book of the Task*, gave fresh popularity to the ancient notion, in cultivated society; and there can be no doubt that he has materially helped to keep it alive among religious people, in spite of the progress of science, every new discovery in which disproves it more and more. The strong English sense, manly style, fervent piety, deep pathos, playful humour, and genuine poetic feeling which Cowper's works display, will keep them in general favour as long as our language endures; and hence it is very desirable that his readers should learn to distinguish, better than they often do, the healthy emanations of his genius from those fanatical and melancholy theological views which, originating in nervous disease, were fostered and confirmed by the evil though well-meant influence of that famous converted sinner and stern Calvinist, the Rev. John Newton of Olney, who so long wielded over him a despotic power which occasionally made the gentle spirit of its victim wince. How injudicious, and utterly at variance with the rules of physiology, was the spiritual regimen under which Cowper was placed by Newton, is shewn by Southey in the seventh chapter of his *Life of the poet*, as well as at greater length by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. xxx. p. 188, and in a volume which he published anonymously in 1830, under the title of "*Essays on the Lives of Cowper, Newton, and Heber: or an Examination of the Evidence of the Course of Nature being interrupted by the Divine Government.*" The essay on Cowper in that volume is a reprint of the article in the *Quarterly Review*; in which journal (vol. xxxi. p. 26) that on Newton had also appeared. In the fourth essay, which is "*On Human Corruption and Divine Grace,*" the author exposes, with a masterly hand, what I agree with him in regarding as prevailing errors on these subjects. In tone and general tendency it resembles the dissertation of Dr Jortin, quoted on page 38. He is hostile to the notion that Divine grace is *supernaturally* (*i. e.*, otherwise than as the effect of natural causes) imparted to men, exposes the prevailing erroneous modes of interpreting certain passages of Scripture, urges the necessity of attention to the natural and regular antecedents of spiritual improvement, and mentions the train of reasoning by which he was led to the views he has expressed. "When I reflected," says he, "that comets and eclipses, the very phenomena which were once the representatives of all that was supernatural in cause and in effect, have been subjected to the *strictest* rules of calculation; and when I recollected to what an extent the certainties of science have been ascertained, it appeared highly probable that farther discoveries will continue to diminish that *terra incognita* on which the belief of an interruptive Providence rests one portion of its base; the other portion, as it will presently be shewn, being founded on misconceptions of Scripture. And when I further proceeded to apply some of the most established and indisputable rules of moral science to the very phenomena in the lives of Cowper, Newton, Guion, and many others, which have been adduced in confirmation of this belief in the agency of an interruptive Providence, I found strong evidence that the appointed order of cause and effect had *not* been interrupted, since these very phenomena appeared eminently reconcileable to ascertained principles in human nature."—(P. 218.) He concludes as follows:—"If I have said anything which may turn attention from unfounded fears, and idle hopes, and unreal duties, to the real difficulties, the real helps, and the real duties of life, I fear not the anger of those who may take an unreasonable offence; but I hope for the praise of those who desire to

bearing on that doctrine about the Sabbath, by which the suppressers of Sunday-trains are wont to defend their conduct.

behold sound science and scriptural religion united; and I feel that consciousness of having done my duty in advocating what is true and expedient, which is ever an honest man's best reward."—(P. 296.) Such praise as I can bestow, is to this truth-loving and sensible writer most cordially given. Who he is or was, does not clearly appear. I long attributed the volume to Southey; but it is not mentioned in his *Life*, nor do the articles on Cowper and Newton appear in the list there given of his contributions to the *Quarterly Review*. It may, however, be his notwithstanding.

The unprecedented degree of attention now bestowed, by physiologists and pathologists, in investigating the functions and diseases of the nervous system, and the reciprocal influences between it and other portions of the body in health and disease, has thrown a flood of light upon this previously obscure class of phenomena, which it is fast removing from the region of supernaturalism into that of law and order. The late Dr John Cheyne of Dublin, who to earnest piety added the highest medical sagacity and attainments, confesses that he "has never seen a case of disordered mind, even when attended with the most subtle malignity, which could not more easily be explained upon natural principles than on the assumption of demonism."—(*Essays on Partial Derangement of the Mind in supposed connexion with Religion*, p. 68; Dublin, 1843.) He points out that not only religious melancholy, but bad temper, a scared conscience, and that cooling of devotional feeling (or "love to God") which is apt to disturb the equanimity of religious people who experience such coldness (as all more or less do, in proportion to the height of that previous devotional excitement to which it is a reaction), are but different phases or symptoms of disorder of the brain. Thus, in considering the question, How a sound and unsound state of the natural conscience shall be distinguished? he says,—“If we discover that the conscience is disturbed at times, and that at other times, without any mental change having occurred to relieve it, ease is restored; and more especially, if it should appear that disease of the digestive system, or fever, or nervous irritability concurs with the disquietude, we may infer that the conscience is unsound in consequence of some disease of the body which is exercising an evil influence over the mind.”—(P. 181.) The sagacity and wide experience of Baxter made him far better acquainted than many of the clergy are even in these enlightened times, with the influence of bodily states upon religious feeling and fitness for religious duty. “Some persons,” says he, “cannot bear much contemplation, especially melancholy and weak-headed people. And such must serve God so much the more in other duties which they are able for; and must not tire out and distract themselves, with striving to do that which they are not able to undergo.”—(*Works*, vol. iii., p. 216.) “It is so easy and ordinary a thing for some weak-headed persons to cast themselves into melancholy, by overstraining their thoughts and affections, and the case of such is so exceeding lamentable, that I think it requisite to give such some particular directions by themselves. And the rather because I see some persons that are unacquainted with the nature of this and other diseases, exceedingly abuse the name of God, and bring the profession of religion into scorn, by imputing all the effects and speeches of such melancholy persons to some great and notable operations of the Spirit of God, and thence draw observations of the methods and workings of God upon the soul, and of the nature of the legal workings of the spirit of bondage. . . . It is as natural for a melancholy person to be hurried and molested with doubts and fears, and despairing thoughts, and blasphemous temptations, as it is for a man to talk idly in a fever when his understanding faileth; or to think of and desire drink when his fever kindleth vehement thirst.”—(*Ib.*, pp. 218, 234.) How far these remarks apply to cases like John Bunyan's, I leave to the judgment of intelligent readers. Baxter was much consulted on behalf of melancholy people; and has left two pieces, entitled “God's Goodness Vindicated,” and “The Cure of Melancholy and Overmuch Sorrow, by Faith and Physic,” specially on the mode of treating them.—(Vol. viii., p. 511, and vol. xvii., p. 236.) They abound in good sense, as the following specimens will shew:—“You must change their air and company some-

Down to the present century, it was almost universally believed by Christians, that the material universe was created, and fashioned into

times. that strange objects may change their imagination. Above all, if they have strength, you must not suffer them to be idle, to lie in bed longer than they sleep in the day; nor to sit musing, but must get them upon the work of a lawful calling, and drive them on to so much diligence, that body and mind may be closely employed. This will be more than all other ordinary means. In most, meet physic also will do very much, which must be ordered by an experienced physician that is with them, or well knoweth them.”—(Vol. viii. p. 512.) Dr Conolly himself could not give better advice than this; but with some of our modern devotees it will pass for nothing better than “rank materialism.” To those who think it incumbent on them to wean their thoughts from worldly pursuits, as unworthy of a Christian’s care, the following passage may suggest a more reasonable view of the subject:—“And if the devil turn religious as an angel of light, and tell you that engaging in some constant business of a lawful calling is but turning away your thoughts from God, and that worldly thoughts and business are unholy, and fit for worldly men; tell him that Adam was in innocency to dress and keep his garden, and Noah that had all the world was to be husbandman, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, kept sheep and cattle, and Paul was a tent-maker, and Christ himself is justly supposed to have worked at his supposed father’s trade, as he went on fishing with his disciples. And Paul saith, idleness is disorderly walking, and he that will not work, let him not eat. God made soul and body, and hath commanded work to both.”—(Vol. xvii., p. 273.) Here again, he recommends the use of physic, and tells of a lady so deep in melancholy, that for a long time she could neither speak nor take medicine, nor endure her husband to go out of the room (with which restraint and grief he died), and who was cured by physic put down her throat with a pipe by force. Some of Baxter’s recommendations are not such as an enlightened physician would *now* sanction; but in knowledge of the nature and remedies of morbid melancholy he was certainly far before his age, and even yet may stand a most favourable comparison with some of our spiritual professors.

The “buffetings of Satan,” to which Wesley in his Journal ascribes those uncontrollable fits of laughter, accompanied by oaths and blaspheming, which sometimes came on during the religious services of his followers, are quietly thrust aside by Dr Laycock, to make room for a mere “*form of hysterics*,” to which, says he, “we have precisely analogous phenomena in cases of insanity, in which modesty is changed into obscenity, devotional habits into scornful contempt for religious things, and the feelings in general are perverted. Indeed young ladies in a hysteric paroxysm will sometimes utter expressions which one would think it impossible they could know.”—(Dr Laycock *On the Nervous Diseases of Women*, p. 175.) But it is not only in such extraordinary cases as these that we may obtain from physiology and pathology most valuable knowledge for our guidance: even “irritability of temper in the nervous and delicate,” says Dr Laycock, “should always be treated *as a disease*; that is, by medicine, regimen, air, and exercise, soothing kindness, and gentle authority. A well-regulated mind is never thus wilfully off its balance. Everybody of common sense knows that a bad temper brings misery so great to no one as to its possessor; but everybody does not consider that irritability of temper is as much a disease as insanity.”—(*Ib.*, p. 352.) In a series of papers on the laws of action of Destructiveness and Benevolence, contributed about fifteen years ago to the *Phrenological Journal* (vol. ix., pp. 402, 498; vol. x. p. 1), I endeavoured to elucidate by a multitude of illustrations a principle of human nature, which, if real (as I have not since found any reason to doubt), will at once be recognised to be of high importance as a practical guide to conduct. The principle is simply this: That malevolent feeling is naturally excited by all kinds of *uneasiness*, whether bodily or mental; and benevolent feeling, again, by all *agreeable* sensations or affections. In treating of this law of our constitution, I pointed out, 1st, that, supposing equal endowments of the disposition which may be thus roused (but which is a self-acting tendency too), the intensity of the malevolent or benevolent feeling is proportionate to the intensity of the uneasiness

its present condition, by the Deity, in the space of six days, and that on the seventh he rested from his work ; these facts being, in their

or pleasure felt by the other faculties so influencing it ; 2dly, that hence, people whose nervous systems are acutely sensitive to causes of pleasure and pain, are, *cæteris paribus*, most prone to malevolent and benevolent emotions ; 3dly, that the *circumstances* which tend most to excite ill-will or benevolence, vary according to the faculties which naturally predominate in different persons, and which are therefore most susceptible of uneasiness ; and, 4thly, that the greater the number of faculties disagreeably affected at once, with the more violence will malevolent or benevolent emotions be experienced—a violence all the greater if the special faculties from which these emotions spring, be naturally strong, and if the brain be of a temperament which disposes it to ready and violent action. If such, then, be in the main the true philosophy of good and bad temper, it is clear that, although, at the best, there will ever be ample room for the exercise of voluntary self-restraint, yet a knowledge of the laws here indicated cannot but materially increase our power to improve the tempers of ourselves and others, by employing right means for attaining the wished-for end ; and that this knowledge, moreover, will dispose us far more than we should be without it, to exercise a Christian forbearance towards those who, from bad health or other sources of unhappiness, may unfortunately be exposed to influences of which bad temper is *the natural and sometimes inevitable result*.

There is great truth in the remark of Dr John Gregory, that “it has been the misfortune of most of those who have studied the philosophy of the human mind, that they have been little acquainted with the structure of the human body and the laws of the animal economy ; and yet the mind and body are so intimately connected, and have such a mutual influence on one another, that the constitution of either, examined apart, can never be thoroughly understood.” And he observes, that “though it be a matter of great difficulty to investigate and ascertain the laws of the mental constitution, yet there is no reason to doubt, however fluctuating it may seem, of its being governed by laws as fixed and invariable as those of the material system.”—(*Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with those of the Animal World*, third ed., p. 5.)

This, at all events, is abundantly plain, that until due attention be paid to the physiological conditions of human improvement and happiness—conditions, be it observed, which the Deity himself has prescribed,—it is in vain to hope for much benefit from purely theological labours in the philanthropic field. But so many treatises on this enormously important subject are now in general circulation, that within the next fifty years the people of Great Britain may be expected to recognise practically that the improvement of man, like that of plants and the lower animals, can never be otherwise effected than by applying the *natural* means by which, under the Divine arrangements, it must, if at all, be brought about. Among the treatises alluded to may be mentioned, Dr Benjamin Rush’s *Inquiry into the Influence of Physical Causes upon the Moral Faculty*, in the second volume of his *Medical Inquiries and Observations* ;—the publications of Dr Southwood Smith, Dr Andrew Combe, and others, on *Physiology and its applications to Health and Human Improvement* ;—George Combe on the *Constitution of Man, considered in relation to External Objects* ; On the *Relation between Religion and Science* ; and *Life and Correspondence of Andrew Combe, M.D.* ;—Dr Caldwell’s *Thoughts on Physical Education, and the True Mode of Improving the Condition of Man* ;—Dr Sweetser’s *Mental Hygiene* ; or an *Examination of the Intellect and Passions, designed to illustrate their Influence on Health, &c.* ;—Dr Brigham on the *Influence of Mental Exercise and Mental Excitement on Health* ;—Mr Newham on the *Reciprocal Influence of Body and Mind* ;—Dr Moore on the *Use of the Body in Relation to the Mind* ;—the *Phrenological Journal* ;—the *Journal of Psychological Medicine* ;—a lively article on “*Physical Puritanism*” in the *Westminster Review* for April 1852 ;—and numerous works on *Insanity*, by Esquirol, Spurzheim, Prichard, Conolly, Browne, and others.

Of late years no small stir has been excited by the author of *Vestiges of*

apprehension, distinctly affirmed in the first chapter of Genesis and in the Fourth Commandment. But the discovery has lately been

the Natural History of Creation; whose suggestion (on the ground of analogy, and of certain facts, or supposed facts, in natural history), that the Creator, when introducing new species of plants and animals into the world, probably acted according to general rules laid down by Himself at the first, and resembling those which He constantly observes in creating the individuals of existing species,—has been denounced as dangerous to religion, even, in some instances, by men of science themselves. The alarm, I confidently predict, will die away with still greater speed than that of our great-grandmothers at Dr Franklin's electrical discoveries; and whether it shall ever be demonstrated or not that new species have always been introduced without a miracle, the cause of true religion will be as safe as it is actually found to be, after astronomers, geologists, and meteorologists have done their worst against "truths" long regarded as *God's*, but which have at length been discovered to be merely *man's*.

The theory advocated in the *Vestiges* seems to have come upon most people by surprise, as an alarming and unheard-of novelty. It had, however, been long thought probable by men of science; not only because more accordant with what we know of the Divine method of working, in those departments of nature which fall within human observation, but as setting the power and wisdom of the Deity in a nobler point of view than does the notion of miraculous or interruptive acts of creation whenever any new plant or animal, however insignificant, was introduced into the arena which had become suitable for its reception. Thus Sir John Herschel, in a letter to Mr (now Sir Charles) Lyell, written in 1836, and published by Mr Babbage in his *Ninth Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 203, writes as follows, in relation to what he calls "that mystery of mysteries, the replacement of extinct species by others:"—"Many will doubtless think your speculations too bold, but it is as well to face the difficulty at once. For my own part, I cannot but think it an inadequate conception of the Creator, to assume it as granted that his combinations are exhausted upon any one of the theatres of their former exercise, though in this, as in all his other works, we are led, by all analogy, to suppose that he operates through a series of intermediate causes, and that in consequence the origination of fresh species, could it ever come under our cognizance, would be found to be a natural in contradistinction to a miraculous process,—although we perceive no indications of any process actually in progress which is likely to issue in such a result." In his Address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1845, the same pre-eminent natural philosopher elucidated the subject as follows:—"A *law* may be a *rule* of action, but it is not *action*. The great First Agent may lay down a rule of action for himself, and that rule may become known to man by observation of its uniformity; but constituted as our minds are, and having that conscious knowledge of causation which is forced upon us by the reality of the distinction between *intending* a thing and *doing* it, we can never substitute the *Rule* for the *Act*. Either directly, or through delegated agency, whatever takes place is not merely *willed* but *done*, and what is done we then only declare to be explained, when we can trace a process, and shew that it consists of steps analogous to those we observe in occurrences which have passed often enough before our own eyes to have become familiar, and to be termed *natural*." Dr John Pye Smith, too, regards it as "the most reasonable supposition, that God originally gave being to the primordial elements of things, the very small number of simple bodies, endowing each with its own wondrous properties: then, that the action of those properties, in the ways which his wisdom ordained, and which we call laws, produced, and is still producing, all the forms and changes of organic and inorganic natures; and that the series is by Him destined to proceed, in combinations and multiplications ever new, without limit of space or end of duration, to the unutterable admiration and joy of all holy creatures, and to the eternal display of His glory who fixed the wondrous frame."—(*Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some Parts of Geological Science*, 4th ed., p. 196.) And the able reviewer of the *Vestiges* in Blackwood's Magazine, approving of the *inquiry* which it endeavours to advance,

made, that such a belief is utterly at variance with demonstrable facts; and all fit judges, whether lay or clerical, who have studied the

though little satisfied with the author's scientific details, commences his observations as follows: "We should take but a limited view of science, if we supposed that the laws of nature of which it is cognizant, have for their object the continuance only and preservation of the several parts of the universe: they provide also for change, improvement, development, progression. By these laws, not only are the same phenomena, the same things, perpetually reproduced, but new phenomena, new arrangements, new objects, are being successively developed. In short, we are able to perceive, to a certain extent, that not only the world is preserved and renewed, but grows and is created according to great general laws, which are indeed no other than the great ideas of the Divine Mind. . . . It is quite a legitimate object of science, therefore, to view the laws of the physical world—whether they regard its mechanic movement, its chemistry, or its zoology—in their creative as well as reproductive functions; and it is the purpose of a work lately published, entitled 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation,' and which has drawn to itself considerable attention, to collect and arrange whatever hints or fragments of knowledge science affords, enabling us to bring the successive phenomena of creation under the formula of general laws. In this purpose it is impossible to find a shadow of blame, and the work will probably answer one good end, that of directing the studies of scientific men into paths but little or timidly explored. . . . There are still, indeed, some men of narrow prejudices, who look upon every fresh attempt to reduce the phenomena of nature to general laws, and to limit those occasions on which it is necessary to conceive of a direct and separate interposition of divine power, as a fresh encroachment on the prerogatives of the Deity, or a concealed attack upon his very existence. And yet these very same men are daily appealing to such laws of the creation as have already been established, for their great proofs of the existence and the wisdom of God! Their imagination has remained utterly untutored by the little knowledge which they have rather learned to repeat than to apprehend. Whatever words they may utter, of subtle and high-sounding import, concerning the purely spiritual nature of the Divine Being, it is, in fact, a *Jupiter Tonans* clad in human lineaments, and invested with human passions, that their heart is yearning after. Such objectors as these can only be beaten back, and chained down, by what some one has called the brute force of public opinion. Some little time ago men of this class deemed it irreligious to speak of the *laws* of the human mind; it savoured of necessity, of fatalism; they now applaud a Dr Chalmers when he writes his Bridgewater Treatise, to illustrate the attributes of God in the laws of the mental as well as the physical world."—(*Blackwood's Mag.*, vol. lvii., p. 448–450; April 1845.)

Dr King repeats the observation of Dr Chalmers, that the fact of the introduction of new species confutes, more clearly than could be done before it was known, "the notion so long in favour with atheists, that events have been going on just as we see them, through a past eternity."—(*Geology in Relation to Religion*, p. 117.) As the proposition stands, its truth is undeniable; but in the refutation of *atheism itself*, geology, I think, displays no facts more conclusive than the phenomena which we daily witness. The plastic power of the Divine Artificer is everywhere in action, above, below, around, and within us; and even in the single instance of the conversion of the unorganised matter of an egg into the complicated organism of a chicken,—or in the springing up of a lily or a weed,—we find as conclusive evidence of the working of a present, provident, and powerful, though unseen, Designer and Artificer, as if fifty thousand new species of animals or plants were brought into existence before our eyes. Cowper has finely expressed this sublime truth in the Sixth Book of the Task:—

"What prodigies can power divine perform
More grand than it produces year by year,
And all in sight of inattentive man?
Familiar with the effect, we slight the cause,
And in the constancy of nature's course,
And regular return of genial months,

question under the lights of modern science, have been compelled to confess, though sometimes with great reluctance, that the tenet can no longer be maintained.* The doctrine in question has, therefore,

And renovation of a faded world,
 See nought to wonder at. Should God again,
 As once in Gibeon, interrupt the race
 Of the undeviating and punctual sun,
 How would the world admire! but speaks it less
 An agency divine to make him know
 His moment when to sink and when to rise,
 Age after age, than to arrest his course?
 All we behold is miracle; but, seen
 So duly, all is miracle in vain. . . .
 From dearth to plenty, and from death to life,
 Is Nature's progress when she lectures man
 In heavenly truth: evincing, as she makes
 The grand transition, that there lives and works
 A soul in all things, and that soul is God.
 The beauties of the wilderness are his,
 That make so gay the solitary place
 Where no eye sees them. And the fairer forms,
 That cultivation glories in, are his.
 He sets the bright procession on its way,
 And marshals all the order of the year;
 He marks the bounds which Winter may not pass,
 And blunts his pointed fury; in its case,
 Russet and rude, folds up the tender germ,
 Uninjured, with inimitable art;
 And ere one flowery season fades and dies,
 Designs the blooming wonders of the next."

The presence of God appears even, as Sir Isaac Newton and other profound thinkers have believed, in every motion from gravity or other inanimate sources,—every such force being identified with continued volition of the Deity. Thus Dr Samuel Clarke observes—"All those effects which we commonly say are the effects of the natural powers of matter and laws of motion, of gravitation, attraction, and the like, are indeed (if we will speak strictly and properly), the effects of God acting upon matter continually and every moment," &c. (*Works*, ii., 698, folio); to which opinion Dugald Stewart and others adhere.—See *Encyc. Brit.* i., 145-7; xiv., 661-2; xvii., 797.

* On this subject, see the following works:—

1. *Natural Theology*. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. 1835. B. ii., ch. ii. & iii.
2. *Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology*. By the Rev. William Buckland, D.D. (Bridgewater Treatise.) London, 1836. Vol. i. ch. ii.
3. *The Ninth Bridgewater Treatise*. By Charles Babbage, Esq. London, 1837. Chapters iv. and v., "On the Account of the Creation, in the first chapter of Genesis."
4. *The Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth; or, the Study of the Inductive Philosophy considered as subservient to Theology*. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., of Oriel College, Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London, 1838.
5. *Tradition Unveiled*. By the Same. P. 64. Also, *Supplement to Tradition Unveiled*, p. 28.
6. *A Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, edited by John Kitto, D.D., vol. i., pp. 481-6; article CREATION. Edinburgh, 1845.
7. *The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science*. By John Pye Smith, D.D., Divinity Tutor in the Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton. 4th ed. Lond., 1848.
8. *The Religion of Geology and its connected Sciences*. By Edward Hitch-

now descended irretrievably from the rank of a reputed "God's truth," to that of an exploded "man's truth;" and, of course, whatever consequences were deduced from the Hebrew cosmogony when supposed to be true, must now, *as* such consequences, be abandoned—so that whatever duty of sabbath-observance, for example, is incumbent upon men, must henceforth be defended upon other grounds than those which the Jewish narrative of the creation has hitherto supplied.

By competent judges, every one of the ingenious attempts which have been made to reconcile the Jewish narrative with astronomy and geology, is pronounced to be a deplorable failure. And it would have been strange had the fact been otherwise, in a case where the recognised principles of biblical interpretation have been so completely set at nought, and where the scientific knowledge of the reconcilers has usually been so inadequate to the task.

Professor Hitchcock, one of the most respectable and well-informed of the writers alluded to, expresses the opinion, that "Revelation is illustrated, not opposed, by geology. Who thinks at this day, of any discrepancy between astronomy and revelation? And yet, two hundred years ago, the evidence of such discrepancy was far more striking than any which can now be offered to shew geology at variance with the Scriptures. . . . Rightly understood, and fairly interpreted, there is not a single scientific truth that does not harmoniously accord with revealed as well as natural religion; and yet by superficial minds, almost every one of these principles has, at one time or another, been regarded as in collision with religion, and especially with revelation. One after another have these apparent discrepancies melted away before the clearer light of farther examination. And yet, up to the present day, not a few, closing their eyes against the lessons of experience, still fancy that the responses of science are not in unison with those from revelation."*

This is a fair sample of the assertions usually made on the subject; but if the first chapter of Genesis be, as orthodox believers regard it, a *history*, to be interpreted as other ancient histories are, I am at a loss to understand wherein the "superficial minds" have erred, either now or in the times of Copernicus and Galileo, in doing that for which Professor Hitchcock contemns them. For if the Hebrew narrative of the cosmogony be not a mere apologue, as some of the Jewish writers and primitive Fathers understood it (but as the Churches of England and Scotland do *not* understand it), it plainly teaches what Theodore Parker says it does—namely, "that God created the sun, moon, stars, and earth, and gave the latter its plants, animals, and men, in six days: while science proves that many thousands, if not millions, of years must have passed between the creation of the first plants, and man, the crown of creation; that the surface of the earth gradually received its present form; one race of plants after the other sprang

cock, D.D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Lond., 1851.

9. *The Principles of Geology explained, and viewed in their Relations to Revealed and Natural Religion.* By the Rev. David King, LL.D., Glasgow. 2d ed. Edin. 1850.

10. Article on Religion and Geology, in the *Prospective Review*, Nov. 1851.

* *Religion of Geology, &c.*, pp. 440, 457.

up; animals succeeded animals, the simpler first, then the more complex; and at last came man. This chapter tells of an ocean of water above our heads, separated from us by a solid expanse, in which the greater and lesser lights are fixed; that there was evening and morning before there was a sun to cause the difference between day and night; that the sun and stars were created after the earth, for the earth's convenience; and that God ceased his action, and rested on the seventh day. Here the Bible is at variance with science, which is nature stated in exact language. Few men will say directly what the schoolmen said to Galileo, 'If Nature is opposed to the Bible, then Nature is mistaken, for the Bible is certainly right;' but the popular view of the Bible logically makes that assertion. Truth and the Book of Genesis cannot be reconciled, except on the hypothesis that the Bible means anything it can be made to mean,*—but then it means nothing.†

* "See Augustine, Confess. Lib. xii. ch. 18. *et al.*"

† A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion. By Theodore Parker, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, Mass. p. 246. London, 1846. Compare with this the passages in which the subject is handled by the Rev. Dr Candlish, in his Contributions towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis (Edin. 1843). The following is a specimen:—"On the fourth day, the heavenly bodies, in their relation to this earth, are formed and adjusted. The light, hitherto supplied by the immediate presence of the WORD, which had gone forth on the first day,—the very glory of the Lord, which long afterwards shone in the wilderness, in the temple, and on the Mount of Transfiguration, and which may yet again illumine the world,—the light, thus originally provided, without created instrumentality, by the LIVING WORD himself, now that the chaotic mists are cleared away from the earth's surface, is to be henceforward dispensed through the natural agency of second causes. A subordinate fountain and storehouse of light is found for the earth. The light is now concentrated in the sun, as its source, and in the moon and stars, which reflect the sun's beams; and these luminaries, by their fixed order, are made to rule and regulate all movements here below."—(P. 29.) Such is the explanation afforded by one of the most intellectual and popular of Scottish preachers! During the first three days "the living Word" supplies light to the earth, while the sun and stars are yet uncreated; He divides, on the first day, the light from the darkness, and calls the light Day, and the darkness Night; withdraws the light at the "evening" of each of three days; restores it in the "mornings" of the second and third; and at length, on the fourth day, creates the sun "to rule the day" and the moon "to rule the night"—at the same time making "the stars also." Will any mortal undertake to reconcile this theory with astronomical science? Yet it is quite as plausible an explanation as any that has been fashioned on the principle that the narrative is *historical* and *true*.

Dr Candlish, however, it is fair to acknowledge, but follows the example of Dr Chalmers (*Nat. Theol.*, B. ii., ch. ii.), and even of that eminent geologist Dr Buckland, by whom, strangely enough, the Jewish narrative of the creation is maintained to be conformable to the discoveries of his favourite science. This may be seen by looking into his *Bridgewater Treatise*, chap. ii., on the Consistency of Geological Discoveries with Sacred History—"a melancholy specimen," says Mr W. R. Greg, "of the low arts to which the ablest intellects find it necessary to condescend, when they insist upon reconciling admitted truths with obvious and flagrant error. . . Dr B. imagines that the first verse relates to the original creation of all things, and that between that verse and the second elapsed an interval of countless ages, during which all geological changes preceding the human æra must be supposed to have taken place; in confirmation of which he mentions that some old copies of the Bible have a break or gap at the end of the second verse, and that Luther marked verse 3 as verse 1." And all this he does, continues Mr Greg, "in spite of the facts, which he knows and fully admits, that

The Rev. Baden Powell—a man eminent alike in theology and science—is entitled to much honour for the bold and uncompromising

the idea of ‘waters above the firmament’ could only have arisen from a total misconception, and is to us a meaningless delusion;—that day and night, depending on the relation between earth and sun, could not have preceded the creation of the latter;—that as the fossil animals existing ages before Man—(and, as he imagines, ages before the commencement of the ‘first day’ of creation)—*had eyes*, light must have existed in their time—long, therefore, before Moses tells us it was created, and still longer before its source (our sun) was called into being;—and, finally, that many tribes of these fossil animals which he refers to the vast supposititious interval between the first and second verses of Genesis, are *identical with the species contemporaneous with Man*, and not created therefore till the 21st or 24th verse.”—(*The Creed of Christendom*, &c., pp. 47, 48, 49.)

There is one phenomenon, which, as strikingly and conclusively as any that geology has disclosed, proves that long before the six days of the Hebrew narrative, the sun existed as the illuminating and heat-giving centre of our planetary system. Every one is familiar with the alternate concentric layers of harder and softer wood, which are found in the trunks of fir and other trees growing in temperate climates. The dense hard layers are the produce of winter, the softer of summer; and the thickness of the former is in proportion to the severity of the season. In climates where the winter is mild, no such rings occur. Now, *fossil trees exhibiting concentric rings have been found in the lias and oolitic rocks*, which were formed many ages before the creation of man. (Witham on the Internal Structure of Fossil Vegetables, pp. 57, *et seq.*, and Plates IX. and XIV.; Edin. 1833. See also Maclaren’s Sketch of the Geology of Fife and the Lothians, pp. 120-3, Edin. 1839; and a Note in Babbage’s Ninth Bridge-water Treatise, p. 226, “On the age of Strata, as inferred from the rings of trees embedded in them.”) The unavoidable inference is, that changes of seasons then existed; that the earth travelled annually, in those remote times, as at present, *round the sun*; and that her axis was then inclined, as it still is, to the plane of the ecliptic. It is unnecessary to remark how utterly irreconcilable these facts are with the HISTORICAL truth of a narrative which affirms the sun to have been created only forty-eight hours before the human race.

Bishop Horsley maintains most stoutly that the days of creation in Genesis must be understood in the *literal* and common meaning of the word *day*, “as denoting that portion of time which is measured and consumed by the earth’s revolution on her axis.” (*Serm.* xxiii.) And he elsewhere intimates his opinion (which seems to be the one now generally adopted), that “if it could be clearly proved (which I take it hath never yet been done), against any one of the inspired writers, that he entertained opinions in any physical subject which the accurate researches of later times have refuted,—that the earth, for instance, is at rest in the centre of the planetary system”—“or that he had used expressions in which such notions were implied,”—there would be no obligation on us to embrace his erroneous physics, although, nevertheless, we should not be “at liberty, on account of his want of information on these subjects, to reject or call in question any part of his *religious doctrine*;” seeing that “*in whatever relates to religion, either in theory or practice*, the knowledge of the sacred writers was infallible, as far as it extended; or their inspiration had been a mere pretence; and in the whole extent of that subject faith must be renounced, or reason must submit implicitly to their oracular decisions.” (*Serm.* xxxix.) As the question about the origin of the Sabbath was clearly regarded by Bishop Horsley as one “relating to religion,” it may be thought, that had he lived till the discoveries of geology were made, he must have proclaimed, in accordance with the passage just quoted, that the inspiration usually ascribed to the scriptural writers did not in reality belong to them. But inasmuch as, although, in his quality of editor of Sir Isaac Newton’s works, he was intimately acquainted with modern astronomy, he still was able to express the opinion that the author of the first chapter of Genesis had not been “clearly proved” to entertain opinions on any physical subject which the accurate researches of later times have refuted, or to have used expressions in which such notions were

manner in which, so long ago as 1838, he proclaimed the truth on this important subject. His very valuable work on the Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth ought to be read by all who wish to see the full strength of the position he has taken up; but the following extracts will sufficiently exhibit the nature of his reasoning and conclusions:—

“It would, indeed,” says he, “appear extraordinary, that the notion of looking for modern science in the ancient Scriptures should be found satisfactory to any person of ordinary sense, were it not that we discover many causes which tend, in this case, to blind the clearest perceptions. The subject, when simply and calmly considered, is plain, and hardly open to misapprehension; but men cannot be brought to consider it simply and calmly. Yet what mode of proceeding can be more irrational? passages are quoted from writings produced ages before any of the facts of geology were understood; and now that they are known, the critic sets about to make those passages speak the language of modern science!

“These writings constitute the delivery of a religious system to the Israelites; and now men try to make them supply astronomical and geological instruction to Christians!

“In all this the *object* is so palpably mistaken, that were the suggestions of the critic ever so happy, and the expositions themselves ever so luminous and natural, we could not attach any serious weight to them. But when we come to observe, in the majority of such cases, how entirely gratuitous are the theories, and how miserably strained the verbal interpretations, which are necessary in order to effect the accordance, the whole attempt must appear yet more manifestly futile. For let us only dwell for a moment on the nature of these interpretations.

“When a commentator of the present day sets about to put a particular interpretation on a passage in an ancient author, he may, upon an examination of the critical sense of the words, and the construction of the sentence, make out a meaning which to *him* is plausible, and in itself consistent. But there is another question entirely distinct from this, too often quite overlooked, but essentially important to a true interpretation: viz., whether it is *probable*, from concurrent circumstances, that this was the sense, in point of fact, *actually intended by the author*. It is one thing to make out such a sense as, to our apprehension, *the words may bear*, quite another to infer that this was the sense *really in the mind of the writer*.

“Now, in the geological interpretation of Scripture, this consideration seems strangely overlooked. Allowing for a moment that the *verbal* construction, or the proposed sense, is one which the passage

implied, it seems very unlikely that the discoveries of geologists would, in this respect, have been considered, or at least *acknowledged*, to be more conclusive. For whatever force the facts of geology have now, the facts of astronomy had before; and he who could believe that three “literal” days and nights, “measured by the earth’s revolution on her axis,” could, consistently with the results of “the accurate researches of later times,” occur before the creation of the sun, might well perform the *not more difficult* task of believing that summer and winter succeeded each other as at present, notwithstanding the nonexistence of that central luminary, by the earth’s varying positions towards which the seasons are known to be caused.

may be made to bear, where is the probability that it was the *intended* signification?

“Supposing it granted that by some critical process these descriptions may be brought to take a verbal sense, accordant with the facts elicited by geology, still the question is, Can we soberly bring ourselves to conceive that this was the sense actually *designed and contemplated* as that in which the words were to be understood! and if it was NOT, what is the coincidence worth?

“If but a moment’s consideration be bestowed on the circumstances of the case, can it be seriously imagined that the delivery of the Judaical law was really *intended* to embrace the doctrines of geology, and this too under the guise of expressions which, in their obvious sense, are directly contradictory to those doctrines? Is it on any ground conceivable that such a purpose could have been in view in the delivery of any Divine revelation? and much less in that vouchsafed to the Israelites. And if it were, could any method be devised more adverse to its accomplishment? For we are thus driven to suppose a design of revealing certain truths by effectually concealing them; since we know that, in point of fact, the hidden sense was not disclosed: and from the time of Moses downwards, no one has ever imagined the secret meaning of the description till the present day, and when disclosed it affords no instruction, since it cannot be so much as understood till the facts have been learnt from geological study, and when they have been, it is superfluous.”—(Pp. 247–9).

Proceeding to consider the representation of the creation in Genesis, he observes:—

“With a total disregard to all such considerations as those last adduced, we find a certain school of interpreters of Scripture continually labouring to make out some sense of the terms in which the creation is described in the first chapter of Genesis, to make it square with truths which could not have been in contemplation in the delivery of the narrative; and exhausting every resource of critical skill to force the language of the representation into accordance with facts now attested by the organic remains of former orders of existence, which could not have been intended to be represented.

“Formerly the geological interpreters were engaged in taxing to the utmost the powers of philology, to convert the six days into periods of millions of years; notwithstanding that they are described precisely as alternations of day and night; and that this is absolutely implied is the very purpose of the whole description, since the six days must manifestly be taken in the same sense as the seventh. On the other hand, they had to exert not less ingenuity to make the order of geological epochs accord with these periods. This scheme, however, was at length found to answer the views of neither party. The theological critic could not admit such strained and dangerous interpretation, and the advance of geological research soon shewed every one that there were, in fact, no such marked epochs in the successive formations, or in the introduction of the races of organised beings.

“At the present day another view has received the sanction of some eminent names, and has obtained considerable currency. It has been conceived that the narrative in Genesis is intended to describe separately, in few words (in the first verse), the original creation of all

things ; after this, the indefinitely long history during which all the changes indicated by geology took place, is passed over in silence ; a new period then commences, which may be understood according to the literal order of the narrative, provided some latitude be allowed in the interpretation of the terms. A state, if not of darkness and chaos, yet at least temporary disorder and obscurity, was produced ; and the work of the existing creation, or at least reproduction and arrangement, then commenced, and was continued as described in the following part of the chapter, and perfected in six natural days.

“ Now, without entering upon the grounds of such an interpretation, I will merely observe (looking only to the verbal construction), how very wide a latitude in the meaning of words must be allowed before we can affix such a sense as this to a representation so precise and circumstantial ; and every reader of the slightest taste and discernment will surely at once exclaim against it as totally at variance with the obvious tenor of the whole style of description, and destructive to the matchless sublimity of the terms in which it is conveyed. Those to whom such a version can appear satisfactory, who can believe that this is what Moses really *intended* to say,—must entertain notions of the use and application of language of a kind which I cannot appreciate. It seems to me only necessary to turn for a moment from the paraphrase to the plain text, from the critical refinements to the simple language of this magnificent composition ; from the philosophical theory to the obvious tenor and train of this most sublime imagery, to be fully satisfied as to the meaning intended to be conveyed : a meaning totally distinct from anything philosophical, or bearing the most remote reference to any anticipations of geological discoveries.

“ Another view of the matter has been proposed by an eminent philosopher, which amounts to an admission that it is impossible at the present day to fix *any* certain meaning on compositions of such antiquity, and so entirely destitute of all elucidation from contemporary writings, as the Mosaic records.* Such an idea, of course, has called forth no small censure. But surely even this is scarcely more destructive to all definite interpretation than versions like those we have just mentioned ;—such an idea, honestly avowed, is surely preferable to the indirect introduction of principles which, fairly carried out, may enable us to fix upon any given passage any required sense.

“ I am assuming that the inquirer and interpreter are both sincere seekers of truth. If indeed the object be, instead of discovering truth, to say something plausible to satisfy prejudice, and avoid giving offence to popular belief, there is no limit to the inventions which men will not readily swallow down, if only made palatable to their prepossessions.”—(Pp. 250–3).

He continues :—

“ Let the appeal be made to any reader of ordinary sense, not prepossessed in favour of a theory, and it seems to me impossible that he can understand the description (whether in the shorter form of the Decalogue, or the more expanded of Genesis), considered simply as to its terms, otherwise than as presenting a magnificent picture of Al-

* “ See Babbage’s *Ninth Bridgewater Treatise*, chap. 4 and 5.”

mighty power, and embodying the representation of one, original, entire, simple, universal, act of Divine interposition, at once, and for the first time, framing and calling into being and operation, out of previous universal darkness and confusion, the heavenly bodies, as well as the earth, and all the races of organised beings upon it, in the actual progressive stages assigned to the six days specially described as literally such. Even if we allow the separation of the first verse as a distinct account of an earlier creation (which, to my apprehension, seems a very forced dissociation of the members of a sentence), still, in the second verse, the entire tenor of this unrivalled imagery seems incapable of conveying any other impression than that of the total absence of all organised existence, and the prevalence of universal confusion and total darkness, until the work of the first day commenced.

“ Now when we refer to geology (as indeed has already been rendered sufficiently manifest), the sure monuments which we derive from the study of organic remains, disclose to us evidences of a series of gradual changes and repeated creative processes, going on without any one sudden universal intervention or creation of the existing world out of the ruins of a former. Geology shews that in none of its epochs, least of all in the later, has any universal elemental change occurred, or any trace been left of even a temporary chaos, followed by a simultaneous universal restitution of things.

“ Comparing then these indisputable conclusions with the representations in the Hebrew Scriptures, to whatever extent critical skill may stretch the meaning, there is an *insuperable discrepancy* in the most material points of the description. We, in truth, gain nothing whatever by critical refinements so long as the passage be admitted to describe a sudden universal interposition of Divine power for the formation out of previous confusion of a world peopled with organised life in its existing forms, at a period corresponding to the origin of the human race according to the received chronology.

“ The contradiction is scarcely less palpable in these more refined and far-fetched versions than in the vulgar sense.

“ Surely, then, instead of attempting to tamper with all rules of common sense in the interpretation, it would be far better at once honestly to allow that we cannot reconcile the description to the facts, nor find the original of the picture in nature. Surely, looking as well at the plain and obvious sense in which any unprejudiced reader would of necessity view the Scriptural representations, as at the forced and unsatisfactory nature of the interpretations, as also at the manifest unreasonableness of the very principle on which any such interpretation can be rendered desirable,—on every consideration, we shall see the better and wiser course of openly acknowledging the contradiction, and allowing the impossibility of making out an accordance between the literal six days’ work of creation, and the visible evidences and existing monuments of it,—between the letter of the representation (either as given in the delivery of the Decalogue to the Israelites, or as subsequently expounded by Moses in the Book of Genesis), and the perceptible and observable order of the works of the same Divine Being from whom the Judaical dispensation emanated.

“ I have been particular in stating plainly and unreservedly the exact nature and extent of the contradiction between the language of

the Word of God delivered to the Hebrews, and that of the monuments which we now extract from his works. It seems to me peculiarly needful so to set it forth, and not to shrink from the open and honest avowal of it ;—especially while we recollect that the physical evidence which thus palpably contradicts the letter of the Scriptural representation, is the very same which establishes the truth of the Divine perfections, and proves the fact of creation, however different in its mode of accomplishment from what our preconceived opinions would suggest, and however little we may be able to trace the precise means employed in carrying it on.

“ Now, so far as regards the first chapter of Genesis, we may remark, that even those divines who adopt the most approved views of the nature of inspiration, may, and do allow, that an inspired teacher might, in irrelevant points, be left to his own unassisted convictions, and, on such matters would be no more enlightened than his contemporaries. Many eminent divines have even admitted that current opinions and prejudices, though erroneous, might yet be adopted and turned into a vehicle of moral and religious instruction to those to whom they were habitual, without derogation to the inspired authority of the teacher.

“ On such a ground, we might certainly be permitted to regard the first chapter of Genesis as embodying what were the commonly received ideas among the Jews, borrowed perhaps from some poetical cosmogony, and which Moses was inspired to adapt and apply to the ends of religious instruction :—to the assertion of the majesty, power, and unity of the Creator, and the prohibition of the worship of false gods ; especially of those animals and other material objects which were peculiarly pointed out as being merely the creatures of the true God ; and this doubtless in a more particular enumeration, because they were especially the objects of that idolatrous worship into which the Israelites were so prone to relapse. The entire description being thus divested of the attributes of a real history, the concluding portion of it, the account of the solemnization of the seventh day as the Sabbath, is of course equally divested of an historical character, and thus cannot be understood as referring to any primæval institution, and can therefore only be regarded as having been designed for the more powerful enforcement of that institution on the Jews. And this indeed would be no more than accords with the opinion of many of the most approved commentators, who, on quite independent critical and theological grounds, have regarded the passage (Genesis ii. 3) conveying that institution as correctly to be understood in a *proleptical* or anticipatory sense.”—(Pp. 253-258).

“ But the great difficulty in the present case arises from the circumstance of the same main statement occurring in a more brief and pointed form in the delivery of the Decalogue. Here it is manifest the same considerations will no longer avail. For admissions which might be allowed with respect to a human teacher divinely inspired, would not apply in the instance of a direct declaration by the Divine voice and actual inscription by the Divine act.

“ It is needless to enlarge on the difficulties with which the subject is surrounded. It involves a question of the most serious moment from its extensive application in theology, which is forced upon us by the consideration of the present subject, and has also claimed much

attention as bearing widely upon the character of other Divine communications recorded in the Bible. It amounts to this,—whether, and to what extent, we can consistently believe the Deity to have adopted the course of accommodating the representations in which he thought fit to clothe his communications to the existing prejudices and belief, even when erroneous, of the parties addressed ?

“ Without pretending here to discuss the general question, I would merely ask, what is the *least* objectionable course to pursue ?

“ In every rock we trace infallible monuments of the progress of creation ; we truly read the records in ‘ tables of stone inscribed with the finger of God.’ When we compare those with documents of a different kind, we are compelled to acknowledge the visible inscriptions and the written representation to be at direct variance, so long as the *historical* character of that representation be insisted on. The only alternative is to admit that it *was not intended for an HISTORICAL narrative* ; and if the representation cannot have been designed for *literal history*, it only remains to regard it as having been intended for the better enforcement of its objects in the language of *figure* and *poetry* :—and to allow, that the manner in which the Deity was pleased to reveal himself to the Jews as accomplishing the work of creation, was (like so many other points of their dispensation) veiled in the guise of apologue and parable ; and that only a more striking representation of the greatness and majesty of the Divine power and creative wisdom was intended by embodying the expression of them in the language of *dramatic action*.”—(Pp. 259–260).

Mr Powell goes on to consider “ the importance of the question,” and its “ relation to Christianity ;” but enough has already been extracted for the purpose in view, and it is hoped that some readers who are now for the first time introduced to his writings will procure and study, both the treatise quoted here, and his subsequent works named in a previous page.* I add only his remark, that this collision between science and Scripture—“ a collision which no philology can prevent, no generalities disguise—can become *an objection* only from the prevalence of that system which mixes up Christianity with older dispensations.”—(Pp. 308).

Shortly after the publication of Mr Powell’s volume, his example of *speaking out* honestly on this important subject, was followed by the Rev. W. Vernon Harcourt, who, in the year 1839, filled the office of president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In the address which he delivered to that learned body, then assembled at Birmingham, his adherence to the conclusions above expressed was clearly and emphatically stated. “ No one, I think,” said he, “ can doubt that those who condemned the Copernican system were justified in conceiving that *the Scriptures speak of the earth as fixed, and the sun as the moving body*. Every one will allow also, that this language is ill adapted to the scientific truths of astronomy. We see the folly of any attempt, on this point, to interpret the laws of nature by the expressions of Scripture : and what is the ground of our judgment ? We are not all competent to judge between the theory of Copernicus and those which preceded it ; but we determine against the seeming

* See also the article CREATION, in Kitto’s Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit., vol. i., p. 481 ; and the Prospective Review, Nov. 1851, p. 458.

evidence of our senses, and against the letter of Scripture, because we know that competent persons have examined and decided the physical question. Now, gentlemen, *in geology we are arrived at the self-same point*; that is to say, a vast body of the best-informed naturalists have examined, by all the various lights of science, and by undeniable methods of investigation, the structure of the earth; and however they may differ on less certain points, they all agree in this—that the earth exhibits a succession of stratification, and a series of imbedded fossils, which cannot be supposed to have been so stratified, and so imbedded, in six days, in a year, or in two thousand years, without supposing also such numerous, such confused, and promiscuous violations of the laws and analogies of the universe, as would confound, not the science of geology alone, but all the principles of natural theology. Here, then, is another point of discordance,” [the other, previously mentioned, relates to the chronology of the Pentateuch]; “and *in both these cases the discordance lies between the language of Scripture and the truths of science.*”

He quotes the sublime poetical language of the Book of Job concerning the creation, and easily shews how impossible it is to put a literal interpretation upon it.

“Who, then,” he proceeds, “would expect to find in Genesis the chronology or sequence of creation? who can think that he upholds the authority of Scripture by literal constructions of *such a history*, by concluding from them that the earth was clothed with trees and flowers before the sun was created, or that the great work was measured by six rotations of the earth upon her axis? It scarcely needed the evidence of physical or geological science to teach us that such a mode of interpreting the Sacred Writings is utterly unsound: when the same author speaks of man as created *in the image of God*, every one perceives that this is one of the boldest figures which language can produce; and in what but a figurative light can we view *the days of creation*? What can we find in such a description but this truth—that *the six grand classes of natural phenomena were, all and each, distinct acts of Divine power, and proceeded from the fiat of a single Creator*?”

“Here, gentlemen, is a second instance of those great points of accordance, where all the conclusions of human science coincide with revealed religion, and none more remarkably than that which has been so falsely termed *irreligious geology*; for as astronomy shews the unity of the Creator through the immensity of space, so does geology, along the track of unnumbered ages, and through the successive births of beings, still finding, in all, the uniform design of the same Almighty power, and the varied fruits of the same unexhausted goodness.”*

During the last twelve years, no man arguing, at a scientific meeting, on the assumption of the literal truth of the first chapter of Genesis, has been otherwise regarded by his hearers than with pity or contempt.

Let the reader attentively peruse the following extracts, being the beginning and end of that narrative in Genesis which its reconcilers with science represent as relating, not to *seven days altogether*, but to *an indefinitely long period preceding the creation of light, and seven*

* Report of the Ninth Meeting of the British Association, pp. 18, 20. The *italics* in the foregoing extracts from Messrs Powell and Harcourt are in the originals.

days succeeding that period :—“ In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void ; and darkness was upon the face of the deep : and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light ; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good : and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night : and the evening and the morning were the first day. And God said, &c., &c. And God saw every-thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made : and he rested on the seventh day from ALL his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it ; *because that in it he had rested from ALL his work, which God CREATED and MADE.*”—Gen. i. 1-5, 31 ; ii. 1-3.

I agree with Mr Baden Powell in thinking that nobody without a purpose to serve, or destitute of common sense, would ever find here any longer period than the seven days ; and that even those who say they find also the indefinite space of time at the beginning, are in possession of a discovery which, after all, is of no further use to them than as giving them *something to say* (however worthless) on behalf of the orthodoxy they are bound to uphold. That men of sense and honour should be reduced to this humiliating position, is calculated to excite compassion ; and ought to strengthen, among the educated laity, the desire, which is and cannot but be earnestly felt by the best of the clergy themselves, that the trammels which at present hinder them from adapting their teaching to the actual state of human knowledge, and which deter many an able man from entering the ministry, may as speedily as possible be loosened or removed. By this class of the clergy, a hearty though silent response will be given to the concluding paragraph of the quotation from another writer, which I proceed to introduce :—

“ The credibility of every historical writing,” says Mr Kenrick, in the Preface to his *Essay on Primæval History*, “ must stand on its own ground ; and not only in the same volume, but in the same work, materials of very different authority may be included. The various portions of a national history, some founded on documentary and contemporaneous evidence, some derived from poetical sources, some from tradition, some treating of a period anterior to the invention of writing, some to the very existence of the nation, and even of the human race, cannot possess a uniform and equal degree of certainty. We cannot have the same evidence of the events of the reigns of David and Solomon, and those of the period comprehended in the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis ; nor can we be surprised, if, in the necessary absence of documents respecting primæval times, a narrative should have formed itself, reflecting the opinions, partly true and partly erroneous, of the people among whom it had its birth. Had the Hebrew literature not borne this character, the phenomenon would have been unparalleled in history ; it would have wanted a most decisive stamp of high antiquity had it exhibited, in its earliest pages, a scientific, not a popular philosophy. That the Jewish people should have been so far superior in religious belief, to the nations by

whom they were surrounded, and so much inferior in culture and the arts of life, appears to me inexplicable, except on the supposition, that their creed had some higher origin than their own speculations and inferences. It is the natural consequence of this divine instruction, that their early traditions should be, as we find them, more pure and rational than those of their neighbours; but it does not necessarily follow, that their primæval chronology must be exact, or their history everywhere free from exaggeration and misconception.

“These opinions may be startling to many persons, by seeming to derogate from an authority, concerning which ‘*sanctius ac reverentius visum credere quam scire.*’ Yet I believe it will be found, that neither our religious feelings nor our religious belief are necessarily and permanently affected by the exercise of a freer and more discriminating criticism upon the Jewish records. Creation will still appear to us an example and proof of omnipotence, though in the limitation of its manifold and progressive operations to a period of six days, we trace the influence of the Jewish institution of the Sabbath. Neither the impulse nor the duty of conjugal affection will suffer the slightest diminution, though we should regard the narrative of the creation of the woman rather as a simple and natural expression of the relation and mutual feeling of the sexes, than as an historical fact. Conscience and observation, no less than Scripture, teach us the weakness and defects of our moral nature; these will remain precisely the same, and furnish the same motive to humility and watchfulness, and the same necessity for Divine aid, whatever may have been the first occasion on which man’s evil passions broke out into transgression of the will of God.

“On the other hand, I am persuaded that there are many persons of truly religious mind, to whom it will be a relief from painful perplexity and doubt, to find that the authority of revelation is not involved in the correctness of the opinions which prevailed among the Hebrew people, respecting cosmogony and primæval history. They delight to trace the guiding hand of Providence in the separation of this people from amidst the idolatrous nations, in order to preserve the worship of a Spiritual Deity, and in all the vicissitudes of their history till its consummation. They admire the wisdom and humanity of the Mosaic institutions, and acknowledge this dispensation as the basis of the Christian; they feel the sublimity and purity of the devotional, moral, and prophetic writings of Scripture; but they can neither close their eyes to the discoveries of science and history, nor satisfy their understandings with the expedients which have been devised for reconciling them with the language of the Hebrew records. I know that this is the state of many minds; the secret, unavowed, perhaps scarcely self-acknowledged convictions of many others are doubtless in unison with it. And such views would be more general, were it not for a groundless apprehension, that there is no medium between implicit, indiscriminating belief and entire unbelief. It has been my object to shew that between these extremes there is a ground, firm and wide enough to build an ample and enduring structure of religious faith.” *

* An Essay on Primæval History. By John Kenrick, M.A. London, 1846. Pp. xviii-xxii.

Seeing that the astronomical part of the Hebrew cosmogony has long been rejected by educated men; that the narrative of Eve's temptation by a speaking and walking serpent has never been literally understood by anybody; and that even in former times some interpreters, acquainted with oriental literary fashions, and sensible of the irrationality of interpreting some parts of a narrative literally and others figuratively, where no plain distinction could be pointed out between them*—on what sound principle can we refuse to adopt,

* See Dr Conyers Middleton's Essay on the Allegorical and Literal Interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man, and several controversial pieces on this and other subjects, in his Miscellaneous Works, vol. ii., pp. 123, 189, 208, 272, 286. Lond., 1752.

“What,” inquires this learned writer, “are we to do? Why, we are to consider it neither as fact nor fable, neither literal nor allegorical, but both together; to interpret one sentence literally, the next allegorically, the third again literally, and so on to the end of the chapter; which, like the very serpent it treats of, is all over spotted and speckled, here with *letter*, there with *mystery*, and sometimes with a dash of both. For instance: ‘God made man,’ we accept *literally*; but ‘after his own image’ in a *figurative* or *metaphorical* sense: that ‘God made woman’ we believe *literally*; but out of the ‘rib of man’ most interpret *allegorically*: ‘God planted a garden or paradise;’ here commentators are endlessly divided between *letter* and *allegory*; some will have it to be in heaven, some on earth, others in a middle region between both. Again, ‘the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field,’ we understand *literally*; but this subtle creature no sooner accosts Eve, than he becomes an *allegorical* beast; the ‘old Serpent;’ the ‘old Deceiver, Satan.’ Lastly, as to the punishment denounced on the offenders, ‘I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel;’ ’tis all *allegory*, all a great *mystery*. Now, is it not more rational to follow one uniform, consistent way of interpretation, than to jump at every step so arbitrarily from *letter* to *allegory*: and if the letter be found in fact contradictory to reason and the notions we have of God, what is there left us but to recur to allegory? for which we have the authority of most of the primitive Fathers, and the best Jewish writers: and the allegorical way of expounding was so far from giving scandal in former ages of the Church, that, on the contrary, to slight it was looked upon as heretical and full of dangerous consequences.”—(Pp. 189, 190.) In support of these assertions, he quotes from Clement of Alexandria, *Stromat.* l. 5, pp. 658, 670, 673, 679; l. 2, p. 429, &c.; ed. Oxon.;—Eusebius, *Præpar. Evangel.* l. 2, 7; l. 8, x. xi.; l. 11, 5;—Origen, *Cont. Cels.*, pp. 186, 187, 189; *Philocal.* c. i. pp. 12, 13;—Cyril, *Julian. Oper. et Cyrill. contr.* vol. ii., p. 50; ed. Lips.;—Philo, *Sixt. Senens. Biblioth.* l. 5, p. 338;—*De Opific. Mundi secund. Moys.*, Op. T. 1, p. 35, &c.; ed. Lond.;—Josephus, *Antiq. Jud. Proëm. et c. i.*, p. 5; ed. Haverc;—and St Austin, *De Genes. ad literam*, l. 1, c. 1; l. 8, c. 1, 2; l. 13, c. 36, 37; who, however, it is observed, unwarrantably and arbitrarily mingles historical with allegorical interpretation, as most of the moderns do. Philo regards the serpent as the emblem of pleasure, and gives his reasons. Dr Middleton adds: “From these authorities and reflections, I have ever been inclined to consider the particular story of the fall of man as a moral fable or allegory; such as we frequently meet with in other parts both of the Old and New Testament, in which certain religious duties and doctrines, with the genuine nature and effects of them, are represented as it were to our senses, by a fiction of persons and facts which had no real existence. And I am the more readily induced to espouse this sense of it, from a persuasion, that it is not only the most probable and rational, but the most useful also to the defence of our religion, by clearing it of those difficulties which are apt to shock and make us stumble, as it were, at the very threshold. For whether we interpret the story literally or allegorically, I take it to be exactly the same with regard to its effects and influence on Christianity; which requires nothing more from it than what is taught by both the kinds of interpretation—that *this world had a beginning and creation*

if not precisely the view of Professor Powell, at least some theory essentially in accordance with it? Either the first chapter of Genesis

from God; and that its principal inhabitant man was originally formed to a state of happiness and perfection, which he lost and forfeited by following his lusts and passions, in opposition to the will of his Creator. For there could not be any religion at all, without the belief of such a Creator; nor any need of a revealed religion, but upon the supposition of man's fall. These two points, then, as the ancients observed, are all that Moses proposed to deliver to us; and they are delivered with equal truth and efficacy either in the literal or the allegorical way: nor do I find any reference to them in the Sacred Scriptures, which appears to be inconsistent with the allegorical acceptance of them."—(P. 131.) He then proceeds to examine some allusions to the Mosaic narrative in the New Testament.

Dr Geddes discusses this subject in the Preface to his translation of the Bible, published in 1790 (*see* vol. i., p. vii.); and in his *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, published in 1800 (vol. i., p. 23.) His conclusion is thus expressed:—"Do I believe, then, that the narrative of Genesis is not a literally true narration? or that it is in all, or many of its parts, a pure allegory? I believe neither the one nor the other: I believe it to be a most beautiful *mythos*, or philosophical fiction, contrived with great wisdom, dressed up in the garb of real history, adapted, as I have said, to the shallow intellects of a rude, barbarous nation; and perfectly well calculated for the great and good purposes for which it was contrived; namely, to establish the belief of one supreme God and Creator, in opposition to the various and wild systems of idolatry which then prevailed; and to enforce the observance of a periodical day, to be chiefly devoted to the service of that Creator, and the solacing repose of his creatures. In fact, what stronger motive could be urged to preserve a people from idolatry, than by shewing, in so minute a detail, that all the worship-objects of the surrounding nations were themselves but mere creatures, the great celestial luminaries (most probably the first objects of adoration) not excepted?"—(*Critical Remarks*, vol. i., p. 26.)

The erudite Dr Doig, speaking of the fondness of oriental nations for allegory and fiction, and the extent to which these abound in ancient history, observes:—"Every doctrine of religion, every precept of morality, was tendered to mankind in parables and proverbs. Hence Scripture speaks of understanding a proverb, the words of the wise, and their dark sayings. The eastern sages involved their maxims in this enigmatical dress for several reasons. They wished to fix the attention of their disciples, to assist their memory, to gratify their allegorical taste, to sharpen their wit and exercise their judgment, and sometimes perhaps to display their own acuteness, ingenuity, and invention. It was amongst the ancients a universal opinion, that the most sacred arcana of religion, morality, and the sublime sciences, were not to be communicated to the uninitiated rabble. For this reason every thing sacred was involved in allegorical mystery."—(*Encyclop. Brit.*, art. PHILOLOGY; 7th edit., vol. xvii., p. 377. See also the article EXOTERIC in the same work, vol. ix., p. 466, the articles EXOTERIC and RATIONALISM in the Penny Cyclopædia, vol. x., p. 131, and vol. xix., p. 310; Bishop Hurd's *Discourses on Prophecy*, vol. ii., p. 87; Dr Adam Clarke's account of the writings of Clement and Origen, in his *View of the Succession of Sacred Literature*, vol. i., pp. 124, 167; Bishop Marsh's *Lectures on the Several Branches of Divinity*, Part iii., Lect. 17; Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, vol. i., p. 115, and vol. ii., p. 467, articles ALLEGORY and PARABLE; and an article entitled THE MYTH, forming No. 5 of vol. i. of Chambers's *Papers for the People*.)

As the Egyptians, among whom Moses was educated, followed, as much as any nation of antiquity, this custom of delivering the sublimer parts of knowledge under the cover of symbols and emblems, it was natural that he should adopt that mode of instructing the Israelites. (*See Letter to Dr Waterland*, in Dr Middleton's *Miscell. Works*, vol. ii., p. 151.)

Even of the New Testament, although so much more modern than the Old, Gilbert Wakefield (a very competent authority on such a subject, and who, having quitted the Church whose doctrines he could no longer assent to, was as

is *mythical* in its character and design, or we must come to the harsh conclusion that it is absolutely *false*!

much at liberty, as he was naturally disposed, to declare his opinions), speaks as follows:—"The lively imagery, the emblematical contexture, the strong metaphors, the unqualified injunctions, and the bold peculiarities of oriental phraseology, have thrown a veil over the oracles of salvation, which only some interpreter, initiated into the discipline of universal philology, is calculated to remove. Explanations most rational and unexceptionable in themselves, can never gain acceptance with unlearned readers, but from that progressive confluence of illustration which I am now attempting" (in a Scripture Lexicon which was then in preparation) "to direct on peculiar difficulties from the current of Scripture phraseology; especially when article-manufacturers, creed-mongers, subscription-dealers, are prepared to pronounce every interpretation forced and unnatural, if it appear unfriendly to the mysteries of their tutelary goddess, DIANA OF THE EPHESIANS."—(*Memoirs*, vol. ii., p. 238.)

In 1816, the Rev. John Bird Sumner, who now enjoys the dignity of Archbishop of Canterbury, published a Treatise on the Records of Creation, in which the allegorical theory of Genesis is considered, and rejected as inadmissible. He observes, that the concurrence of Philo and Origen in maintaining it, "will not surprise those who are aware that the Fathers were, generally speaking, as bad reasoners as they were pious and sincere Christians," and who consider that the subject is one "upon which the Fathers had no clearer means of judging than ourselves."—(Vol. i., p. 39.) While agreeing most heartily with this eminent divine as to the general character of the Fathers as logicians, I yet venture most respectfully to suggest, that, by reason of their perfect familiarity with oriental modes of instruction, they *had*, in one important respect, a "clearer means of judging than ourselves" in the case before us; and that their having pushed the allegorical principle of interpretation to an absurd extreme, affords no presumption against the reasonableness of following it to any extent within the boundaries of common sense. Nor can I help observing, that Josephus (a learned, able, and, in comparison with his countryman Philo, sober-minded Jew) agrees in the main with the patristic principle of interpretation. Sumner's own opinion is stated thus:—"Two unanswerable reasons must forbid us, however pressed with difficulties, from resorting to this (the allegorical) explanation of them. First, these passages are referred to in other parts of Scripture, as of historical authority (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14.) Secondly, it would seem altogether unjustifiable in an author professing to relate matters of fact, and to sanction, on their authority, his legislative character, to introduce allegory into the most important subject of his narration. My inquiry, therefore, supposes the Mosaic account to contain not allegory, but fact."—(P. 40.) I cannot believe that this able writer, in thus adopting the supposition that the Mosaic account is *altogether historical*, could have sufficiently considered the astronomical, meteorological, and zoological consequences which the supposition entails, and which surely were no less fatal to it in 1816, than geology has since been proved to be. His words imply even the extravagant belief that Eve was overcome by the oral persuasion of a mere "beast of the field," which at that time had other means of locomotion than serpents now have, but, in consequence of the misdeed then committed by him, was declared by God to be "cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field," and doomed to go thenceforward upon his belly, and "to eat dust all the days of his life." In Milton's *Paradise Lost*, it is true, this subtle beast of the field is only the outer covering of a fallen angel, "the Arch-Enemy of mankind;" but be it remembered that here we have to do, not with any modern work of fiction, but with Hebrew writings in which not only is no fallen angel introduced in connection with the serpent, but the very existence of fallen angels is never once announced. The allusion in 2 Cor. xi. 13, being not to a spiritual enemy, but to "the *serpent*," as the "beguiler of Eve through his subtlety," seems to be rhetorical merely, and on that supposition should occasion as little difficulty as would have attended a similar allusion to Jotham's story of the trees going forth to anoint a king, which is given in Judges ix. 7-15 with as much *appearance of literal historical truth*, as the story of the fall is in Genesis. But with respect to the

But I think there is ground for maintaining that if we have proof, otherwise sufficient, of the Divine authority of the Pentateuch *gene-*

passage in I Tim. ii. 14, no such explanation, I admit, can well be resorted to ; and if so, then, supposing the words to be genuine, we are reduced to the necessity of choosing between two conclusions—either that St Paul was here teaching his disciple *exoterically*, (*i. e.*, as the Eastern sages used to instruct the common people), or that he was capable of holding, and of expressing to Timothy, an erroneous belief.

At the end of the sentence in which Sumner says that it would have been unjustifiable in Moses to introduce allegory into the most important subject of his narration, he subjoins the following very remarkable note at the foot of the page: “ Sir W. Jones saw this in a strong light. ‘ Either the first eleven chapters of Genesis,’ he says, (all due allowance being made for an Eastern style,) ‘ are true, or the whole fabric of our national religion is false.’ *As. Res.* i. 225.”

Nothing could have been more unfortunate than this summoning of Sir William Jones as a witness on behalf of orthodoxy. If the writer, when he penned the note here quoted, was acquainted with the works of that distinguished scholar, he must have known that to refer to him as a supporter of the view advocated in the Records of Creation, was precisely akin to the proceeding of him who is said to have adduced the words “ There is no God” in proof of atheism ; omitting the previous clause, “ The fool hath said in his heart.” If, on the other hand, he was *not* acquainted with those works, he acted with culpable rashness in concluding from a scrap in which so wide a reservation of “ all due allowance” is made, and which had reached him at second or third hand, that Sir William saw the orthodox view “ in a strong light.” I have much too high an opinion of Archbishop Sumner’s sense and honesty to imagine for a moment, that, even in early youth, and while performing the one-sided part of a prize-essayist and special pleader, he could knowingly misrepresent the opinion of the great Orientalist ; and the improbability of such an idea is strengthened by the fact that the parenthetical clause, as quoted, wants an important word, which, had it been before him, could not have failed to warn him (though wonderfully dull to the hint which the words even as printed were calculated to afford,) of the expediency of resorting to the writings of Sir William Jones in quest of precise information. For, in the original, the clause is—“ all due allowance being made for a *figurative* Eastern style ;” which qualification, being exceedingly comprehensive, might have authorised, in the mouth of Dr Middleton himself, the very words supposed to be so “ strongly” against his opinion.

Yet the suspicion of an *intention* to garble the clause is disagreeably suggested to us by the circumstance, that, in quoting it, the writer does not, in either of the first two editions of his work (which are all that I have seen), include it within the marks of quotation. This, however, may be in consequence of a mere typographical oversight.

The fact is, that Sir William Jones, in his Ninth Anniversary Discourse to the Asiatic Society, delivered on 23d February 1792, so far from countenancing the literal interpretation of this part of Genesis, *actually states in the plainest language the opinion which Sumner condemns, and which Dr Middleton so ably advocates!* If the reader is incredulous, let him read and judge of the following words:—“ After describing with awful sublimity,” says Sir William, “ the creation of this Universe, he (Moses) asserts, that one pair of every animal species was called from nothing into existence ; that the human pair were strong enough to be happy, but free to be miserable ; that, from delusion and temerity, they disobeyed their Supreme Benefactor, whose goodness could not pardon them consistently with his justice, and that they received a punishment adequate to their disobedience, but softened by a mysterious promise to be accomplished in their descendants. We cannot but believe, on the supposition just made” (for the sake of argument) “ of a history uninspired, that these facts were delivered by tradition from the first pair, *and related by Moses in a figurative style ;* not in that sort of allegory, which rhetoricians describe as a mere assemblage of metaphors, but *in the symbolical mode of writing adopted by Eastern sages, to embellish and dignify historical truth ;* and, if this were a time for such illustrations, we might produce the same account of the creation and the fall, expressed by sym-

rally, there is no imperative necessity to abandon the belief that the Decalogue, in which, as it stands in our Catechism, the six days' crea-

bols very nearly similar, from the Purávas themselves, and even from the Vêda, which appears to stand next in antiquity to the Five Books of Moses. . . . The connection of the Mosaic history with that of the Gospel by a chain of sublime predictions unquestionably ancient, and apparently fulfilled, must induce us to think the Hebrew narrative more than human in its origin, and consequently true in every substantial part of it, though possibly expressed in figurative language; as many learned and pious men have believed, and as the most pious may believe without injury, AND PERHAPS WITH ADVANTAGE, to the cause of revealed religion."—(*Works*, vol. i., pp. 134, 137.)

Now I do not mean to dispute the soundness of that verdict of posterity which pronounces Sir William Jones to have displayed, as a generalizer and reasoner, no pre-eminent abilities; since ample experience proves that the talent for languages bears no constant proportion to other intellectual gifts. But this, at least, I think may be affirmed with truth—that if the opinion of any single scholar, beyond any other in modern times, may be regarded as decisive of the question in hand, that scholar is Sir William Jones; a man who has never been excelled in his own particular department of knowledge; a sincere and thoughtful believer in the Divine origin alike of Christianity and of the elder dispensation it is a sequel to; and, equally with Locke himself, a devoted servant of truth, ever ready and eager to follow her whithersoever she might lead. "It is not," says he, in the essay from which the scrap quoted by Sumner is taken—"it is not the truth of our national religion, as such, that I have at heart; it is truth itself; and, if any cool unbiassed reasoner will clearly convince me, that Moses drew his narrative through Egyptian conduits from the primæval fountains of Indian literature, I shall esteem him as a friend for having weaned my mind from a capital error, and promise to stand among the foremost in assisting to circulate the truth which he has ascertained."—(*On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India*; Asiatic Researches, vol. i., p. 225; or *Works of Sir W. Jones*, vol. i., p. 233.) And in his Tenth Anniversary Discourse he says: "We cannot surely deem it an inconsiderable advantage, that all our historical researches have confirmed the Mosaic accounts of the primitive world; and our testimony on that subject ought to have the greater weight, because, if the result of our observations had been totally different, we should nevertheless have published them, not indeed with equal pleasure, but with equal confidence; for Truth is mighty, and, whatever be its consequences, must always prevail."—(*As. Res.*, vol. iv., p. iii., or *Works*, vol. i., p. 145. See also his Eighth Anniversary Discourse, *As. Res.*, vol. iii., p. 19, or *Works*, vol. i., p. 127; and *Memoirs*, p. 370.) All the pieces here quoted have, with others by the same author, been elegantly reprinted in two small volumes, entitled, "Discourses, &c., by Sir William Jones; with an Essay on his Name, Talents, and Character, by the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth. Selected and edited by James Elmes. London, 1824."

It has been the misfortune of this illustrious scholar to have his religious belief misrepresented also, in a more vital point, by his biographer Lord Teignmouth. According to that nobleman (whose inaccuracy in this instance may have arisen from his being but little accustomed to discriminate between shades of theological opinion), Sir William, in a certain prayer found among his papers, "expresses his exclusive reliance on the merits of his Redeemer for his acceptance with God" (*Memoirs*, p. 359.) Whereas, in reality, the prayer indicates the reverse of this; being exactly such as Priestley, Channing, or any other Unitarian, might have written: it does not even allude to the merits of a Redeemer, but expresses reliance on the divine mercy alone—"Admit me, not weighing my unworthiness, but through thy mercy declared in Christ, into thy heavenly mansions." (*Ib.*, p. 250.) His Lordship also represents Sir William as believing in "the divinity of our Saviour;" a tenet, the fact of his holding which is evident to this extent only—that he believed in the divine character of the Saviour, as peculiarly, and in a much higher sense than in the case of any ordinary man, the "Son of God" (a title which he points out was extensively applied by the Jews); but apparently without regarding Jesus as either eter-

tion and seventh day's rest are mentioned as the reason why the Sabbath was instituted, was really given by God. If, indeed, every word in the Pentateuch had been written by Moses, and if it had come down to us without addition or alteration, the conclusion would have been inevitable that the Fourth Commandment delivered to the Jews at Mount Sinai was *not* of Divine origin. But, without adverting to the ample discussions which have lately taken place among biblical scholars about the authorship and history of the Pentateuch,* it is sufficient to remind the reader, that, assuming Moses to have written those Books, still it is universally admitted, and indeed is undeniable, that numerous additions have been made to them in much later times. "In the Pentateuch," says Bishop Marsh, "we sometimes find names of places, which names were not given to those places till *after* the time of Moses. . . . Other passages, which could not have proceeded from the hand of Moses, are of the following description: 'These are the kings that reigned over the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel' (Gen. xxxvi. 31). These words were undoubtedly written after the establishment of monarchy in Israel, and therefore long after the time of Moses. But they do not prove that the Pentateuch itself was not written by Moses. They only shew, that we have here an *addition* to the text of Moses. Now such additions do not affect the general authenticity of the work, and are easily distinguished from what was written by Moses.

"Additions of another kind are such as that which is found in the thirty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy. The thirty-third chapter, which contains the blessings pronounced by Moses on the tribes of Israel, has evident tokens of being the conclusion of the work, as finished by Moses himself. But as some account of his death appeared a necessary addition to it, the supplement was made, and probably by Joshua, whence it was engrafted on the book itself."†

Now, as it happens, there is much reason to suppose that some of the priests, who, if they themselves understood not literally, at least knew that the Jewish common people did so understand, the story of the creation, thought proper to add to the Fourth Commandment, as written on the tables of stone at Mount Sinai, the "reason annexed"

nally coexistent with the Father, or his equal in power and glory. The perusal of two passages in his Works (vol. i., pp. 277, 496), in connection with the prayer above quoted, leaves on my mind a strong impression that Sir William Jones was a Unitarian.

* See De Wette's *Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, translated and enlarged by Theodore Parker (Boston, 1843); Dr Giles's *Hebrew Records—An Historical Enquiry concerning the Age, Authorship, and Authenticity of the Old Testament* (London, 1850); W. R. Greg's *Creed of Christendom, its Foundations and Superstructure*, chap. iii., on "The Authorship and Authority of the Pentateuch, and the Old Testament Canon generally" (London, 1851); *Sabbaths—An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions, &c.*, reprinted from the *Westminster Review* for Oct. 1850, p. 39; *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon*, by Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. (Andover, 1845); and *Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* (the unabridged edition), articles GENESIS, DEUTERONOMY, and PENTATEUCH.

† Lectures on the Several Branches of Divinity, Part VII., Lect. 34, pp. 66, 67, 68.

to it in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, from which mainly our ordinary copy is taken ;—the intention of which proceeding probably was, to dispose the people more than they might otherwise have been to keep holy the Sabbath, which the original commandment had barely appointed to be observed.

Eusebius tells us that the Jews, like other ancient peoples, “ were of two sorts, the learned and unlearned ; that the latter of these, or the multitude, were subjected by Moses to the literal observation of his laws, as delivered in words ; but the men of stronger minds were freed from that subjection, and trained to a more divine philosophy, and to penetrate into the hidden meaning.” Agreeably to which distinction, he says that “ they had public readers or interpreters called *Deuterotæ*, who explained the recondite and enigmatical sense, not promiscuously to all, but to such only as were qualified to receive it.” All which he confirms by the authority of Philo and Aristobulus, and the constant practice of the Essenes, who followed this figurative manner of expounding, which, even in those days, says Dr Middleton, was called ancient.*

That some of these *Deuterotæ*, or other expounders or custodiers of the Book of the Law, or its restorers after the Captivity, † made an addition to the Fourth Commandment, seems probable from the fact, that in the two copies of the Decalogue given in the Pentateuch, the words of that Commandment are slightly different, and the reasons annexed to it *in no respect the same*.

In Exodus xx., 8–11, we read : “ Remember the sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work : But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates : For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath-day, and hallowed it.”

But in Deut. v., 12–15, we read : “ Keep the sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work : But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates ; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm : therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day.

* Præpar. Evang., l. 8, x. xi. ; l. 11, v. ; quoted in Middleton’s *Miscellaneous Works*, vol. ii., p. 125.

† It is generally stated by biblical critics that Ezra, in unison with other distinguished men of his time, completed the collection of the Sacred Writings of the Jews. According to Dr Davidson, “ He revised the various books, corrected inaccuracies that had crept into them, and rendered the Old Testament text perfectly free from error. Thus a correct and genuine copy was furnished under the sanction of Heaven. Ezra, Nehemiah, and those with whom he was associated, were infallibly guided in the work of completing the canon.”—(Kitto’s *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, vol. i., p. 488, art. CRITICISM, BIBLICAL. See also the article EZRA in the same volume, p. 690.) For all this, however, there is no better authority than tradition ; and the notion that the collectors and restorers

It may be assumed that, whether or not Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch, *both* of these reasons were not inscribed upon the tables

of these books were inspired to do so with perfect correctness, is not only gratuitous, but at variance with the reasonable inference that if they *had* been so inspired, they would not have inserted, or allowed to remain, in a Divine Commandment, as the ground of the duty of Sabbath-observance, a statement which science disproves; nor have transmitted to posterity two discrepant editions of the Decalogue, and two so contradictory statements concerning the second or substituted pair of tables, as we find in the two books: namely, *1st*, that it was *Moses* who "wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments" (Exod. xxxiv., 27, 28); and *2dly*, that it was not Moses, but *the Lord*, who "wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, . . . and gave them" (says Moses) "unto me" (Deut. x. 2, 4.) If it be suggested that the text may have been corrupted in later times, I reply that this, if it could be proved, would only be getting rid of one source of uncertainty by opening a wider and more troublesome one.—Other scholars have made a more modest claim on behalf of Ezra. "Prideaux," says the author of the article BIBLE in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "is of opinion that Ezra made additions in several parts of the Bible, where anything appeared necessary for illustrating, connecting, or completing the work; *in which he MAY have been assisted by the same inspiration by which they were first written.* Among such additions are to be reckoned the last chapter of Deuteronomy, in which Moses seems to give an account of his own death and burial, and the succession of Joshua after him. To the same cause, our learned author thinks, are to be attributed many other interpolations in the Bible, which created difficulties and objections to the authenticity of the sacred text, nowise to be solved without allowing them."—(Vol. iv., p. 613, 7th ed.)

That Ezra and his coadjutors modernised the *language* of the Pentateuch, is an idea naturally suggested to the believer in its high antiquity, by the wonderfully little difference between its phraseology and that of books written a thousand years after the time of Moses. "It is one of the signal characteristics of the Hebrew language," says Dr John Nicholson, "as seen in all the books prior to the Exile, that, notwithstanding the existence of some isolated, but important, archaisms, such as in the form of the pronoun, &c. (the best collection of which may be seen in Hävernicks, *Einleit. in das Alte Test.* I., i., p. 183, seq.), it preserves an unparalleled general uniformity of structure. The extent to which this uniformity prevails may be estimated, either by the fact that it has furnished many modern scholars, who reason from the analogies discovered in the changes in other languages in a given period, with an argument to shew that the Pentateuch could not have been written at so remote a date as is generally believed (Genesius, *Gesch. der Hebr. Sprache*, § 8); or by the conclusion, *à fortiori*, which Hävernicks, whose express object it is to vindicate its received antiquity, candidly concedes, that 'the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, are the *earliest* in which the language differs sensibly from that in the historical portions of the Pentateuch' (*Einleit.* i., p. 180.) We are here solely concerned with the fact that this uniformity of type exists. The general causes to which it is to be ascribed are to be sought in the genius of the language itself, as less susceptible of change; in the stationary civilization of the Hebrews during the period; and in their comparative isolation as regarded nations of foreign language (See Ewald's *Hebr. Gram.*, § 7). The particular causes depend on the age and author assigned to each book falling within this period, and involve questions utterly alien to the scope of this article."—(Kitto's *Cycl. of Bib. Lit.*, vol. i., p. 824, art. HEBREW LANGUAGE.)

The causes here referred to will hardly satisfy those who remember that, even in Solomon's reign, the civilization of the Hebrews was much greater than in the time of Moses; that intercourse always existed between them and the Egyptians, and their other neighbours; and that there are natural internal causes for frequent changes in the forms of speech. But on this subject I refer to the works of De Wette and Dr Giles on the one side, and Moses Stuart on the other.

Dr Nicholson, in concluding the article above quoted, offers to British theolo-

of stone (for had they been so, it is likely that both would have been recorded in each of the two copies of the Decalogue); and some commentators have even concluded that the discrepance makes it doubtful if *either* of the reasons was. But supposing that one of the editions of the Commandment, including the reason annexed, is authentic, I think we are bound to prefer that given in Deuteronomy, which not merely omits the reference to an alleged fact of no special interest to the Israelites at the time, and which science utterly disproves,—but, with evident suitability to existing circumstances, represents the Sabbath as instituted in commemoration of their recent deliverance from Egyptian taskmasters.

Thus a discrepance, which has at all times been a source of perplexity to theologians, is found at last to be the means of delivering the Fourth Commandment, if not the whole Decalogue, or even the Jewish law in all its departments, from what, in other circumstances, might have seemed a fatal objection to its Divine authority!

The impossibility of giving any rational account of the difference between the two editions of the Commandment, on the supposition that both are genuine, and that a reason was annexed to the precept as written on the table of stone, may be seen from Bishop Watson's attempt, in his *Apology for the Bible*, to obviate the difficulty. Speaking of the Sabbath, he says: "As to there being two reasons given for its being kept holy—one, that on that day God rested from the work of creation; the other, that on that day God had given them rest from the servitude of Egypt—I see no contradiction in the accounts. If a man, in writing the history of England, should inform his readers, that the Parliament had ordered the fifth of November to be kept holy, because on that day God had delivered the nation from a bloody intended massacre by gunpowder; and if, in another part of his history, he should assign the deliverance of our church and nation from Popery and arbitrary power, by the arrival of King William, as a reason for its being kept holy, would any one contend that he was not justified in both these ways of expression, or that we ought from thence to conclude that he was not the author of them both?"

gians some advice, which they would do well to consider, as to the necessity of qualifying themselves to judge of, and, where necessary, discuss in a scholar-like fashion, the bold inquiries of the German theologians. These, he justly observes, "*will* force themselves on our notice. It is impossible for us much longer to be ignorant of their existence; for that which no English bookseller ventures to undertake, finds a more enterprising publisher in America, and soon visits our shores in an English dress. These investigations are conducted in a spirit of philological and historical criticism which has never yet been brought to bear, with such force, on the most important biblical questions. The wounds which they deal to the ancient traditions cannot be healed by reference to commentators whose generation knew nothing of our doubts and difficulties. The cure must be sympathetic; it must be effected by the same weapon that caused the wound. If the monstrous disproportion which books relating to ecclesiastical antiquity bear, in almost every theological bookseller's catalogue, over those relating to biblical philology, be an evidence of the degree to which these studies have fallen into neglect, and if the few books in which an acquaintance with Hebrew is necessary, which do appear, are a fair proof of our present ability to meet the Germans with their own weapons—then there is indeed an urgent necessity that theological students should prepare for the increased demands of the future."

Similar advice was given by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* so long ago as 1831 (vol. liv., p. 238), but with little apparent effect.

One may imagine, without much difficulty, the smile which must have played upon the sharp features of Tom Paine when he read this portion of Watson's answer to his *Age of Reason*; since, by evading the real difficulty, the Bishop here virtually confesses his inability to meet it. For the question is not about a difference between two "accounts" merely (though, even as he puts it, the case is but lamely handled by him), but about a discrepancy between *two copies of a law which was written on a table of stone*. A true historical parallel would have been the supposition, that a writer of English history had in one part of his work given a copy of an Act of Parliament, passed immediately after the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, ordaining the 5th of November to be kept holy for the express and sole reason that God had delivered the nation from a bloody intended massacre; and in another part of his history had given a second copy of the same Act, in which was assigned, not *this* reason, but the allegation that on the 5th of November an old British king, who lived about the time of the Trojan war, had finished the great Druidical temple of Stonehenge, and ordained that, in commemoration of this event, the day should be observed as a festival for ever. In such a case everybody would have seen in a moment, that both copies of the statute of James I. could not be *the* genuine Act of Parliament, and that the copy in which the Gunpowder Plot was mentioned was much the more likely to be so.—Baxter, with all his ingenuity, makes an equally deplorable figure. In answer to the question, "Why doth Deut. v. repeat it (the Fourth Commandment) in so different words?" he has nothing better to say than this: "Because the words are but for the sense, and they being kept in the ark as written in stone and safe from alteration, Moses, in Deut. v., gave them the sense, and added some of his own explication; and nothing is altered to obscure the sense." (*Works*, vol. xix., p. 186.) Would a similar explanation satisfy any reader of the supposed history of England? Would the theory be for a moment listened to, that the Act of Parliament being kept among the public records, and safe from alteration, the historian gave the sense of it, and added some of his own explication, without altering anything to obscure the sense? In the modern case supposed, an appeal *might* be made to the records of Parliament, and so the question be determined, whether the Gunpowder Plot or the completion of the temple of Stonehenge was the real origin of the festival; but how could Baxter, or how can *we*, who have no access to the tables on which the Decalogue was inscribed, discover that the words in the Exodus edition of the Commandment, and not those in the Deuteronomy edition, were those which were "written in stone?"

Dr Geddes, in his Translation of the Old Testament, prints the Decalogue in capital letters, and in Deuteronomy terminates those of the Fourth Commandment at the word "gates:" He then interpolates "&c.," to signify that Moses did not take the trouble to transcribe a second time the reason annexed in Exodus; and adds, in small letters, the reason which is annexed in Deuteronomy—thus representing it as not a part of what was written on stone, but an explanatory remark which Moses *did* take the trouble to add, in writing the Book of Deuteronomy. This is no doubt very ingenious; but even were such extravagant conjectures allowable, the question would still in vain demand a reply—Why cut off the "reason" from the Commandment as re-

recorded in Deuteronomy, and let it stand in that found in Exodus; instead of cutting it off from Exodus, and letting it stand in Deuteronomy? If the internal evidence of *probability* be regarded—even independently of the bearings of astronomy and geology on the question—is not the balance greatly in favour of *the latter*?

Before leaving the subject of the Jewish cosmogony, I cannot help soliciting the attention of the reader to a remarkable passage in a religious work lately published by one of the present Professors of science in the university of Edinburgh. “On the subject of Bible teaching in reference to the laws of nature,” says he, “the following remarks of Gaussen *deserve to be studied*: ‘Open the Bible, examine the fifty sacred authors therein, from Moses—who wrote in the wilderness 400 years before the siege of Troy—to the fisherman son of Zebedee, who wrote 1500 years later in Ephesus and Patmos, under the reign of Domitian; AND YOU WILL FIND NONE OF THOSE MISTAKES WHICH THE SCIENCE OF EVERY COUNTRY DETECTS IN THE WORKS OF PRECEDING GENERATIONS. Carefully go through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, in search of such faults; and as you carry on the investigation, remember that it is a book which treats of everything, *which describes nature, which recounts its wonders, which records its creation, which tells us of the formation of the heavens, of the light, of the waters, of the air, of the mountains, of animals, and of plants*;—that it is a book which acquaints us with *the first revolutions of the world*, and which foretells also its last;—that it is a book WHICH DESCRIBES THEM WITH CIRCUMSTANTIAL DETAILS, invests them with sublime poetry, and chants them in fervent melodies. . . . Well, search in its 50 authors, its 66 books, its 1189 chapters, and its 31,173 verses,—*search for a single one of the thousand errors with which every ancient and MODERN author abounds, when they speak of the heavens or of the earth, of their revolutions or their elements, AND YOU WILL FAIL TO FIND IT. . . . It never does violence to facts, nor to the principles of sound natural philosophy. NEVER IN ONE SINGLE INSTANCE will you find it in opposition to the just ideas which science has given us, regarding the form of our globe, its magnitude, AND ITS GEOLOGY. . . . There is, therefore, NO PHYSICAL ERROR WHATSOEVER IN THE SCRIPTURES; and this TRANSCENDENT FACT, which becomes more admirable in proportion as it is made the subject of closer investigation, is a striking proof of the inspiration which dictated them, EVEN TO THEIR LEAST EXPRESSIONS.*’”*

Either this Gaussen is acquainted with physical science, or he is not. If he *is not*, how comes he to make the bold and (as we must, on the supposition, regard them) most impudent and unwarrantable assertions which have just been quoted? If he *is*, then, unless insanity be presumed, he must *know* that what he here affirms is false; and he is basely playing upon the credulity of the ignorant.

Why the respectable Professor to whom I am indebted for my knowledge of the passage containing these romantic fictions, thinks that they “deserve to be studied” by the people of Great Britain, is a mystery of which I have in vain endeavoured to find a solution. That he, an educated layman, unencumbered by the trammels of the profes-

* *Phyto-Theology*; or, Botanical Sketches, intended to illustrate the Works of God, &c. By John Hutton Balfour, M.D., Prof. of Medicine and Botany in the University of Edinburgh. Pp. 205–8. Edinburgh, 1851.

Gaussen is a Professor in the Theological School of Geneva. The work in

sional theologian—that he, an able teacher of science in the metropolitan university of Scotland—believes in the Hebrew cosmogony and astronomy—as Gaussen, if sincere, unquestionably does—is a supposition hardly to be made. That, differing in opinion from Gaussen, he nevertheless conceives that the cause of religion may be served by presenting false assertions for the favourable consideration of his readers, is equally at variance with probability.* And, that he quotes those assertions in order to excite the laughter or indignation of knowing and discerning men, is inconsistent at once with the seriousness of his character, the nature and object of his work, and the manner in which the passage is introduced.

Only one other theory occurs to me, and it is this:—That having met the passage by chance, or had it thrust under his notice by some officious friend, he perused it hastily, stuffed it as hastily into the book he was compiling, was too busy to read or consider it in the proof-sheet, and sent it forth under the sanction of his authority, for the edification of the British people—and all this without suspecting for a moment that he was doing his cause the disservice of occasioning “the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme,” and tempting, perhaps, the more intelligent among his Christian brethren to “make shipwreck of their faith.” For, as the sober-minded Tillotson observes, “nothing hath been more pernicious to Christian religion, than the vain pretence of men to greater assurance concerning things relating to it, *than they can make good*; the mischief of which is this—that WHEN DISCERNING AND INQUISITIVE MEN FIND THAT MEN PRETEND TO GREATER MATTERS THAN ANY CAN PROVE, *this makes them doubt of all they say, and to call in question the truth of Christianity itself.*” †

But this mode of accounting for Gaussen’s appearance under such excellent patronage is not more satisfactory than the conjectures already dismissed; implying, as it does, on the part of the patron, such a reckless disregard of his own reputation, and want of respect for the

which this passage occurs is not named by Dr Balfour; but I am able to supply the omission by referring to p. 199 of a translation from the French, entitled, “‘It is written:’ Or, Every Word and Expression in the Scriptures proved to be from God. By Professor L. Gaussen. London, 1847.” The author, then, believes that *both* editions of the Fourth Commandment are genuine, and that God and Moses were each the writer on the tables of stone.

* “For it is no unreasonable discourse to say, that God will not be served with a lie; for he does not need one, and he hath means enough to support all those truths which he hath commanded, and hath supplied every honest cause with enough for its maintenance, and to contest against its adversaries. . . . Nothing is more dishonourable to God than to offer a sin in sacrifice to him, and nothing more incongruous in the nature of the thing, than that truth and falsehood should support each other, or that true doctrine should live at the charges of a lie.”—*Taylor’s Liberty of Prophesying*, Sect. xi.

See also Archbishop Whately’s Essay on Pious Frauds, in his work on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature.

† Tillotson’s Works, vol. ix., p. 242, ed. 1759; Sermon 222.

Strange to say, even Bishop Horsley is guilty of extravagance not far short of that of Gaussen, in reference to a kindred subject. He asserts that “the apostles and primitive teachers were *profound metaphysicians*, the best of moralists, *well-informed historians*, *accurate logicians*, and excellent in a peculiar strain of eloquence”!—(*Ordination Sermon preached before Dr Samuel Hallifax*, quoted in Wakefield’s Memoirs, vol. i., p. 284.) Wakefield comments on this passage with contemptuous severity, and takes occasion to lament that the dispositions of Horsley should have been “warped to such an excessive obliquity as displays itself throughout his writings.”

public, as it is impossible to ascribe to the eminent Professor in question. I therefore abandon the problem in despair.

It is sometimes said that the citizens of Glasgow dislike to be anywise excelled by their neighbours of the Scottish metropolis. What truth there is in the allegation I do not pretend to determine; but if there is any, they will perhaps learn with some interest, that, sublime as are the flights of Gaussen under the patronage of an Edinburgh Professor, those of a clerical townsman of their own, in reference to a leading department of the same subject, are, if not superior, at least fully equal, in heroism, to the achievements of the other. For, not content with making the general assertion "that the first chapter of Genesis proves itself to be an inspired document by its unadorned brevity and comprehensive truth;"* and that "without this history the world would be in comparative darkness, but that, *in the first page of Genesis, a child may learn more in an hour than all the philosophers in the world learned without it in thousands of years;*"† he intimates, that, so far from throwing discredit upon the Hebrew narrative, the discoveries of geologists have actually placed beyond all doubt its title to be considered as a revelation from above, by disclosing for the first time an amount of scientific knowledge on the part of the Jewish lawgiver, that is perfectly astounding to the well-informed reader of his writings. "Whence," asks Dr Eadie, "did Moses receive the knowledge which philosophy has been so long in reaching, through the paths of geology? Was the generation in which he lived more learned than any which succeeded for thousands of years? There is not the slightest shadow of evidence to sustain so incredible a position. *It could not be through the slow processes of geological investigation, either of himself or his contemporaries, that MOSES LEARNED THE SUBLIME TRUTHS WHICH WERE HIDDEN FROM ARISTOTLE AND PYTHAGORAS.* The superior wisdom which distinguishes the Hebrew prophet from all his contemporaries, and renders his simple narrative A STANDARD OF TRUTH IN ALL AGES, was from above. It was from Him who made the world that Moses learned the history of its creation."‡

If Voltaire himself had taken up the pen in order to throw ridicule upon the Scriptures, could he have produced anything half so skilfully contrived for the purpose, as this extract from a volume which, as we learn from its preface, is "in accordance with the spirit and principles of the Evangelical Alliance?"

I have searched Dr Eadie's pages with no little curiosity and diligence for the *details* of the profound geological knowledge which Moses is said to have possessed; but with most insignificant reward for my pains. The only item of information that I have discovered is a statement in p. 180, that "geology accords with Scripture, in affirming that the present system, with man himself, is of very recent origin;"—a feature wherein, *so far as it is true (i.e., in regard to the recent origin of man), the Jewish narrative is, upon Dr Eadie's own shewing, on an equality with Ovid's Metamorphoses—a passage of which, as translated*

* A Biblical Cyclopædia, &c., edited by John Eadie, LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church, and Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Cambridge Street, Glasgow. Glasgow, 1849. Art. CREATION, p. 181.

† Art. GENESIS, p. 282.

‡ Art. MOSES, pp. 413, 414.

by Dryden, is quoted in the very page where this evidence of the supernatural knowledge of Moses is adduced!! In that passage the Roman poet, after describing the reduction of chaos to order and harmony, and the subsequent creation of the lower animals, proceeds to mention the crowning work of the Deity:—

“A creature of a more exalted kind
Was wanting yet; and then was man design'd:
Conscious of thought, of more capacious breast,
For empire form'd, and fit to rule the rest.”

The resemblance between the two cosmogonies is evident enough, and Dr Eadie accounts for it by affirming (for he does not merely *conjecture*) that Ovid here delivers “a remnant of patriarchal tradition.” For my part, I affirm nothing where nothing can be known; I merely ask whether, independently of tradition, two narratives of primeval events might not naturally concur in representing the brutes which were to be ruled by man, as created *before* the man who was to rule them? In all human experience of government, the subjects have necessarily existed before the appointment of their governors; besides that it must ever have been known from observation, that the skill of human workers is increased by practice, and that a skilful artificer naturally tries to excel his former achievements. If, therefore, any critic should explain the coincidence, in the particular before us, between the Hebrew and Latin narratives, by saying that what was universally true of human rulers in relation to *human* subjects, might easily be imagined by Greek and Latin writers to be true of human rulers in relation to *brute* subjects; that these cosmogonists might, as naturally, imagine the Divine Artificer to have produced his masterpiece after, and not before, the less noble creatures; and that it would in reality have been more surprising if they had *not* concurred with the Jewish writer in so representing the order of events, than it is that they *do*;—if, I say, anybody should argue thus, I should be reluctant to condemn his suggestions as absurd.

When the present Archbishop of Canterbury wrote, about forty years ago, while geology was in a most crude and imperfect condition, his Treatise on the Records of Creation, he ventured to maintain only this, “That the Mosaic history *is not inconsistent* with geological discoveries.”* “All,” says he, “that I am concerned to establish, is the unreasonableness of supposing that geological discoveries, *as far as they have hitherto proceeded*, are hostile to the Mosaic account of the creation.”† Would he have taken up even *this* position at the present day? Assuredly not! What, then, shall we say of the discretion of Dr Eadie, in putting forward the late discoveries of geologists (which everybody else either believes to be, or is afraid of being, absolutely *fatal* to belief in the first chapter of Genesis *as a history*), as conclusive evidence that the narrative is literally true, and, because of its marvellous truth, must have been dictated by the Deity to a writer whose profound scientific knowledge, thus displayed, could have had no other than a Divine origin?

One other exquisite sample of Dr Eadie's mode of elucidating and

* Treatise on the Records of Creation, by John Bird Sumner. Lond., 1816. Vol. i., App., No. I.

† *Ibid.*, p. 283.

defending the Scriptures is worthy of notice. It occurs in the article **FIRMAMENT**, p. 269, where he says that the word *expanse* would more perfectly convey the meaning of the original word: that the Jews probably understood by it an immense arch overhead, studded with stars, and forming a sort of separating wall between the upper and lower waters (Ps. xix. 1; Dan. xii. 3); that it “represents a false idea, an idea current in Egypt; but the inspired narrative makes mention only of an *expanse*—speaks the truth, truth which modern science does not gainsay. ‘Let God be true, and every man a liar.’ He does not say that the concave above is a *solid*. Translations of his language say so; but he only says it was an ‘*expanse*’ which his benignant and wise power created.” Now, to create an *expanse* is to create *something expanded* or spread out; and this expanded thing must be in one of three states—solid, liquid, or aërial. When an *expanse* is mentioned, but not actually *said* to be solid, liquid, or aërial, how may we know in which of these states it is? Why, by considering the context, and drawing thence such inferences as it is capable of affording. Suppose you were told that “the maiden followed mournfully with her eyes the bark of her lover, as it glided o’er the blue *expanse*,” would you doubt that this *expanse* was a liquid one, although the speaker had omitted to “*say*” so? And if the fact of its liquidity were called in question on the ground of this omission, would you not reply, that your informant *had said as much* as that the sea or a lake was the *expanse* which the bark glided over? Now, although it is true, as Dr Eadie says, that “*God*” (or the writer in Genesis) “does not say that the concave above is a *solid*,” the most superficial examination of what is said about it, is sufficient to convince any man of ordinary intelligence that a *solid* is *meant*. For what does the writer tell us? Here are his words: “And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven.” The question, then, is, What sort of firmament was capable of dividing waters above it from waters below it? A *solid* firmament, *and that alone*, is the obvious and only reply. Yet because the narrative does not *say in so many words* that the blue vault of heaven “is a *solid*,” we are to put our understandings to sleep, and believe, forsooth, that nothing was meant but what modern science has proved (in opposition to the notion which was *of necessity* “current,” not merely “**IN EGYPT**,” but *everywhere*, and *at all times*, until the truth was discovered by Copernicus—nay, which is current to this hour among children and other ignorant persons,) to be merely the vaulted *appearance* caused by the blue atmosphere of the earth.* But to what purpose, after all, would this abnegation of our reason be? How could the aërial “*expanse*”

* By the ancient astronomers, “the sun, moon, and planets, were thought to be carried round the earth, fixed each to a separate orb or heaven of solid but transparent matter. . . . The other stars were supposed to be fixed in an outer orb, beyond which were two crystalline spheres (as they were called), and on the outside of all, the *primum mobile* or *first moveable*, which sphere was supposed to revolve round the earth in twenty-four hours, and by its friction, or rather, as most of the philosophers of that day chose to term it, by the sort of heavenly influence which it exercised on the interior orbs, to carry them round

which we had brought ourselves to discover in Genesis deliver us from our difficulties, unless we could prevail upon modern science to let us believe in waters *above* this expanse, as well as below it? Good reason, assuredly, had Mr Baden Powell for penning the remark above quoted, that "if the object be, instead of discovering truth, to say something plausible to satisfy prejudice, and avoid giving offence to popular belief, *there is no limit to the inventions which men will not readily swallow down, if only made palatable to their prepossessions.*"*

with a similar motion."—*Life of Galileo*, by Mr Drinkwater, in the *Library of Useful Knowledge*, p. 11, 12.

In chap. xiii. of the excellent biography from which this passage is taken, there is a detailed and most interesting account of the recantation which Galileo was compelled to make at Rome in 1633, of his belief in the earth's revolution on its axis. On that celebrated occasion, the great astronomer condescended to declare that he "abjured, cursed, and detested the false opinion which maintains that the sun is the centre of the system and immoveable; and that the earth is not the centre and moveable" (p. 62); but it is said that, as he rose from his knees, he stamped on the ground, and whispered to one of his friends "*E pur si muove*—(It does move though.)" Pascal, in the 18th of his celebrated letters to the Jesuits, says:—"It is in vain that you have procured against Galileo a decree from Rome, condemning his opinion of the earth's motion. Assuredly, that will never prove it to be at rest; and if we have unerring observations proving that it turns round, not all mankind together can keep it from turning, nor themselves from turning with it." Mr Drinkwater adds that the reluctance of the papal authorities at Rome "to admit what nobody any longer doubts, has survived to the present time; for Bailly informs us (*Histoire de l'Astronomie Moderne*), that the utmost endeavours of Lalande, when at Rome, to obtain that Galileo's work should be erased from the Index of prohibited books were entirely ineffectual, in consequence of the decree which had been fulminated against him; and in fact, both it and the book of Copernicus, 'nisi corrigatur,' are still to be seen on the forbidden list of 1828" (p. 64). Sir Charles Lyell, however, mentions that he "was assured in the same year by Professor Scarpellini, at Rome, that Pius VII., a pontiff distinguished for his love of science, had procured a repeal of the edicts against Galileo and the Copernican system. He had assembled the Congregation; and the late Cardinal Torozzi, assessor of the Sacred Office, proposed 'that they should wipe off this scandal from the Church.' The repeal," adds Lyell, "was carried, with the dissentient voice of one Dominican only. Long before that time, the Newtonian theory had been taught in the Sapienza, and all Catholic universities in Europe (with the exception, I am told, of Salamanca); but it was always required of professors, in deference to the decrees of the Church, to use the term *hypothesis*, instead of theory. They now speak of the Copernican *theory*."—(*Lyell's Principles of Geology*, 7th ed., p. 58.) Sir Charles quotes, on p. 41, a declaration which was extracted in 1751 by the Sorbonne, or Faculty of Theology in Paris, from the Count de Buffon, who had taught in his Natural History that "the waters of the sea have produced the mountains and valleys of the land—the waters of the heavens, reducing all to a level, will at last deliver the whole land over to the sea, and the sea successively prevailing over the land, will leave dry new continents like those which we inhabit." It is as follows:—"I declare that I had no intention to contradict the text of Scripture; that I believe most firmly all therein related about the creation, both as to order of time and matter of fact; and I abandon everything in my book respecting the formation of the earth, and, generally, all which may be contrary to the narration of Moses."—(*Hist. Nat.*, Tom. v., ed. de l'Imp. Royale, Paris, 1769.) This farce is a fit accompaniment to the recantation of Galileo.

* "Our long-continued litigation with sophists," says Isaac Taylor, (and, he might have added, our own long-continued practice of sophistry,) "has drawn us away from the full native force, to the smallest possible grammatical value of certain words and phrases. But the native force of language is nothing more than its *true value*, in all cases when an ingenuous writer adapts himself to ingenuous readers; and the denuded meaning which criticism evolves, bears much

How favourably does the candid and intelligent Dr John Pye Smith appear in comparison with such special pleaders as Dr Eadie! After remarking that the Hebrew language has no word for *air*, properly speaking (of which the Jews knew nothing), but only words signifying visible watery vapour, smoke, wind, a zephyr whisper, and a storm, he proceeds: "But of elastic fluids they had no idea. The word *firmament* strictly signifies a solid substance, extended by beating out, or rolling, or any other mode of working upon a ductile mass. The old word *firmament* was therefore the most proper."* He adds, in a note, this extract from an eminent American theologian: "I say, '*solid expanse*;' for nothing can be more certain than that the apparent welkin above us, in which the heavenly bodies seem to move, is spoken of in Genesis i., and in other parts of Scripture, as a solid and expanded arch or ceiling over our heads. Yet what reality is there in such a supposition? The scriptural writers were not commissioned to teach philosophy, nor astronomy; and they have always spoken of objects like those just mentioned, merely in an optical manner; in the way in which they present themselves to the eye, either of the body or of the mind."† Thus do these two divines not only hold the conclusion which I have maintained on the supposition that "*expanse*" is the correct translation, but utterly repudiate Dr Eadie's proposition that the Jewish writer (who, he affirms, is "God") "does not say that the concave above is a solid."

One other specimen of reconciliation of science with Scripture may be inserted here, as being equally well fitted with those already adduced, to excite the laughter or the sorrow of the reader. In a late number of an Italian Protestant Magazine called *L'Eco di Savonarola*, published in London, there is an article by a Signor Mapei on "Christianity from the Scientific Point of View;" in which he not only, like Dr Eadie, asserts the harmony of science and Scripture, but, unlike him, makes a real attempt to prove that such harmony exists. As a specimen of his arguments, a writer in the *Leader* of 27th March 1852, gives the following summary of his doctrine concerning one knotty point which has already engaged our attention. "In the Mosaic ac-

the same relation to the genuine sense of the writer, which a sear anatomical preparation, with its shrivelled fibres, and blanched bones, bears to the living man."—(*Saturday Evening*, by the author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, p. 377. Lond. 1832.)

In another essay, entitled "State of Sacred Science," in the same volume, this eminent writer assigns for the low condition of that science amongst us, a reason which powerfully co-operates with the foregoing, in producing its actual plight. "The simple circumstance," says he, "that books have become one of the most considerable articles of commerce, has reversed the direction of the influence of which the press is the medium. *Our literature is commanded, or controlled, by the people*, and only in a secondary sense commands them. THE READER has grown into an importance that makes him lord of the WRITER. Authors furnish (how should they do otherwise?) that which readers ask for, or will receive."—(P. 107.) Let theological writers, however, beware of forming too low an estimate of "that which readers will receive," or even will read without disgust and indignation. The intelligence of the people is now a stage beyond that in which all but a few were capable of being imposed upon by the misstatements and sophistries of ignorant or unscrupulous divines. To the latter class (if it still survive amongst us), I recommend the perusal of Archbishop Whately's *Essay on Pious Frauds*, in his work on the *Errors of Romanism*, &c., 4th ed., p. 73.

* Relation between Scripture and Geology, 4th ed., p. 188.

† Prof. Moses Stuart, in the *Amer. Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 142.

count, light is created before the sun, and Signor Mapei considers this a proof of the Divine inspiration ; for if Moses had not written under the impulse of Eternal Wisdom, he would not have written that which must have been so repugnant to his ideas ; as to him the sun must have seemed the source of all light ! Without pausing here," adds the eritie, " to inquire whence Signor Mapei learned that Moses imagined the sun to be the source of all light, we pass to his explanation. Science, he informs us, has proved the truth of Genesis, by proving that light does not emanate from the sun, ' but exists in the atmosphere (*esiste nell' atmosfera*), and the solar disc exercises an influence on it by setting the molecules in motion.' We leave this theory of light to Baden Powell or Brewster. Meanwhile who does not see that if the solar disc is requisite to cause the molecular movement named light, the blunder in Genesis remains unexplained as it did before ?"

It is sometimes said or insinuated by those who see that if the geologists are in the right, the Hebrew cosmogony cannot be literally true, that as geology is but an immature science, its cultivators may be rash in speaking so positively as they do, and the orthodox belief about the six days of creation may by and by turn out to be the true one after all. Dr King, for instance, says : " As regards the bearing of physical facts on the elucidation of Scripture, we are, if I mistake not, doing little more as yet than examining witnesses ; and we must exercise a little patience before we find ourselves in a condition to sum up the evidence, or to pronounce judgment. Geology is but feeling its way to the formation of a complete and coherent system. If in its present state it exhibited an apparent accordance with our interpretation of Scripture, new difficulties might arise from subsequent geological discoveries. It is enough for the present that apparent contradictions are becoming less prominent, while possible means of reconciliation are enlarging on the view."—(P. 65.) Now, it is true that geology is incomplete ; so are astronomy, chemistry, electricity, and all the other physical sciences. But, in each of them, innumerable facts and principles are ascertained by evidence so strong, that, if we regard them as doubtful, we can believe nothing whatever, but shall set ourselves afloat, without chart or compass, on the sea of universal scepticism. The question as to physical science in relation to Scripture, is not whether geology and astronomy are " complete and coherent systems," but simply *whether they have established facts which prove the scriptural narrative of the creation, if literally interpreted, to be false.* This question every man of competent knowledge and saue understanding has answered, and cannot help answering, in the affirmative ; and such being the case, the admitted defects of geology are not of the slightest consequence in the discussion. They no more weaken the facts already ascertained, than our ignorance about the relations of the planetary system to other sidereal groups, throws doubt upon the Copernican astronomy. That "*apparent contradictions*" between geology and Scripture "*are becoming less prominent,*" is precisely the reverse of the fact.

The difficulty of ascertaining God's truth has been a theme of remark and frequent complaint in every age. " Our business," says Dr Isaac Barrow, " is to find truth ; the which, even in matters of high importance, is not easily to be discovered : being as a vein of

silver, encompassed with earth and mixed with dross, deeply laid in the obscurity of things, wrapt up in false appearances, entangled with objections, and perplexed with debates; being therefore not readily discoverable, especially by minds clouded with prejudices, lusts, passions, partial affections, appetites of honour and interest; whence to descry it requireth the most curious observation and solicitous circumspection that can be; together with great pains in the preparation and purgation of our minds toward the inquiry of it.”*

This difficulty of the search for truth, has at all times and in all countries, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic (though most avowedly in the latter), brought into play that natural tendency of human nature to repose on the fancied infallibility of some authority in matters of faith.† This all are ready enough to acknowledge with respect to those who differ from them, but very apt to overlook in the case of themselves and their adherents. The Protestants marvel at the implicit deference paid by the Romanists to the Pope as an infallible guide, and are quick to discover weighty reasons why it should *not* be paid. His warrant, they admit, would be a very commodious way of settling the truth, if it were a way at all; “but,” says Jeremy Taylor, “it is none; for this can never end our controversies: not only because the greatest controversies are about this infallible guide, but also because, 1. We cannot find that there is, upon earth, any such guide at all; 2. We do not find it necessary that there should; 3. We find that they who pretend to be this infallible guide, are themselves infinitely deceived; 4. That they do not believe themselves to be infallible, whatever they say to us, because they do not put an end to all their own questions that trouble them; 5. Because they have no peace, but what is constrained by force and government; 6, and lastly, Because, if there were such a guide, we should fail of truth by many other causes: for, it may be, that guide would not do his duty; or we are fallible followers of this infallible leader; or we should not understand his meaning at all times; or we should be perverse at some times, or something as bad; because we all confess that God is an infallible guide, and that some way or other he does teach us sufficiently, and yet it does come to pass, by our faults, that we are as far to seek for peace and truth as ever.”‡

* Sermon on Rom. xii. 11, “Of Industry in our particular calling as Scholars.”

† See Whately’s *Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature*, 4th Edition, pp. xix., 107, 117.

‡ *Via Intelligentiæ*; Taylor’s *Works*, vol. vi., p. 375. He refutes the doctrine of the Pope’s infallibility at greater length in *The Liberty of Prophesying*, sect. vii. See also Chillingworth’s immortal work, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*; Bishop Burnet’s *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. 19; Mr G. Cornwall Lewis’s *Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion*; and Mr Martineau’s *Lecture on Catholic Infallibility*, in his *Rationale of Religious Enquiry*.

It is a curious fact, adverted to by Mr Martineau, but which does not readily occur to ordinary minds, that even those who think they are relying *entirely* upon an external infallible guide, do in fact rely first of all on *the infallibility of their own judgment*, in determining who is the infallible guide that they ought to follow. I cannot help adding, that, after all, it seems not less probable that the generality of educated and intelligent Roman Catholics now disbelieve the infallibility of the Pope, than it is certain that many members of Protestant churches have, to a greater or less extent, abandoned those doctrines of their professed creeds, which run counter to the reason and moral sentiments of mankind, to the established facts of science, or to the daily

So much for the insufficiency of the Roman Catholic mode of determining God's truth. But are *Protestants*, who so loudly exclaim against the pretensions of the Pope, exempt from all danger of this error of implicit submission to human authority? To this question, let the words of Archbishop Whately furnish a reply:—"By no means," says he. "Such might indeed have been the case, had the claim to infallibility for the decisions of the Church, and the comparative disregard of Scripture, been the *cause*, instead of being, as in truth it was, the *effect*, of the tendency to pay undue deference to human authority. The real cause of that tendency is to be sought in the principles of our common nature;—in the disposition to carry almost to idolatry the veneration due to the wise, and good, and great;—in the dislike of doubt and of troublesome investigation—the dread of perplexity and disagreement—and the desire of having difficult questions finally settled, and brought into the form of dogmas ready-prepared for acceptance in a mass. While this disposition continues to form a part of our nature, we can never, but by continual self-distrust, be safe from its effects."* And as multitudes who call themselves Protestants yield to the temptation thus clearly pointed out, so others of the same denomination—and among them, strange to say, not a few of those servile spirits themselves—usurp the position of judges and rulers over others, who, equally with them, are commanded to call no man Master on earth; stigmatizing "as heterodox all appeal to private judgment except their own judgment, and that of such as agree with them; and setting up the claim, either to *infallibility*, or—with still more presumption—a right to enforce on others the decisions of a *fallible* mind.

"This apparently perplexing inconsistency," continues the Archbishop, concurring with all the great champions of Protestantism, "may be unravelled and explained by asking the question,—when it has been admitted that the Scriptures are the sole unerring standard, and that we are not obliged to receive any thing that 'cannot be proved from Scripture,'—proved to whom? A 'standard to whom?' If the Scriptures are the standard to *us* the Christian people, and we are bound in conscience to receive only what is thence proved to *our* conviction, then, we are left in possession of the liberty of private judgment; but if it be meant that *we* are to receive whatever is proved to *your* satisfaction from Scripture,—if Scripture is to be the standard for *you*, but *your* faith is to be the standard for *ours*,—then, instead of liberty you place on us a *double* yoke; you impose *two* restrictions instead of one; both and each calling for a miraculous attestation of your infallibility. We are required to believe, first, that whatever you declare is *Divine truth*; and secondly, over and above this, that it

experience of human life. Bishop Watson, in a Charge delivered nearly fifty years ago, affirms that such was even then the fact. "The Pope's infallibility," says he, "is not now what it was formerly esteemed to be; since Catholics, learned and liberal Catholics, tell us, 'that kings no longer dread the effects of Pontific rage—that Vatican fulminations are no longer formidable—that Roman infallibility is laughed at even at Rome itself—that a Pope's bull is, as such, as little regarded at Paris, Vienna, Madrid, and Lisbon, as it would be at Berlin, Copenhagen, Petersburg, or London.'"—*Watson's Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. i., p. 38. See also the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xci., p. 523.

* Errors of Romanism. &c. p. 117; Essay IV., on Undue Reliance on Human Authority.

is a truth *revealed in Scripture*; and we are to take *your word* for both. 'Jesus I know; and Paul I know; but who are ye?'

"Whenever therefore we refer, in proof or disproof of any doctrine, to the Articles or Liturgy, for instance, we not only should not appeal to them *alone*, but we should also carefully point out that we refer to them not as the *authorised* formularies of a *Church*, but simply as the *writings of able and pious men*; which would be deserving of attention, supposing them to be merely private sermons, &c. To refer to them as *backed by the Church's sanction*, adds to them no legitimate force in respect to the abstract truth of any position."*

In proof of the fact that the tendency to pay undue deference to human authority is not peculiar to the Romanists, or even confined to religious subjects, Archbishop Whately refers to the appeals which pretended students in philosophy used to make to the decisions of Pythagoras, and subsequently to Aristotle's, as precluding all further dispute or doubt. Dr Thomas Brown, also, in his 44th Lecture on Moral Philosophy, brings before us in vivid colours the sad spectacle of intellectual slavery presented in "those long ages of the despotism of authority, when Aristotle was everything, and reason nothing; and when the crime of daring to be wiser, was the worst species of treason, and almost of impiety—though it must be owned," he significantly adds, "that this rebellion against the right divine of authority was not a guilt of very frequent occurrence. . . . It is at least as melancholy as it is ludicrous," says he, "to read the decree which was passed, so late as the year 1624, by the Parliament of Paris, in favour of the doctrines of Aristotle, in consequence of the rashness of three unfortunate philosophers, who were accused of having ventured on certain theses that implied a want of due respect for his sovereign infallibility. In this, all persons were prohibited, under pain of death (*à peine de la vie*), from holding or teaching any maxim against the ancient and approved authors, (*contre les anciens auteurs et approuvés*). In this truly memorable edict, the Parliament seem to have taken for their model the *letters patent*, as they were termed, which, about a century before, had been issued against Peter Ramus by Francis I., a sovereign who, for the patronage which he gave to literature, obtained the name of *protector of letters*, but who, as has

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 124, 125. The italics in these extracts are the author's own.

It is maintained by Dr Stebbing, who seems to have been as great a champion of Church-authority as a contemporary writer who will be quoted by and by, that "those explications of Scripture, which, after the maturest deliberation, and the use of all proper helps, are agreed upon by a whole body of men, are less liable to be faulty and defective, than those which particular persons may frame to themselves." Archdeacon Blackburne, by whom this passage is quoted, comments upon it as follows:—"In plain English, *you will always be safest with the majority*. For where is the body of men who will not pretend to the *maturest deliberation*, and the use of the *properest helps*? . . . Considerations of this kind must, in the event, drive every man headlong into the established religion, whatever it happens to be, or by whomsoever devised; whether by a synagogue of Pharisees, a Turkish divan, a Council of Trent, or, what the Remonstrants liked as little as any of them, a Synod of Dort."—(*The Confessional*, 2d ed., p. 60, chap. iii.; or Blackburne's Works, vol. v., p. 197.)

On the subject of Protestant Infallibility, see Bishop Hoadly's Letter to the Pope, already quoted; Bishop Watson's Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i., p. 317, *et seq.*; Mr Blanco White on Heresy and Orthodoxy; and the works named in the notes on pages 29 and 107.

been truly said, was far from being the *protector of reason*. Yet this proclamation, which condemns the writings of Ramus for the enormous guilt of an attempted improvement in dialectics, and which prohibits him ‘under pain of corporal punishment, from uttering any more slanderous invectives against Aristotle, and other ancient authors received and approved,’ professes, in its preamble, to have been issued by the monarch from his great desire for the progress of science and sound literature in France.”

To Aristotle succeeded Descartes, as the scientific authority from whom there was no appeal; and when the Newtonian philosophy claimed a hearing, the wise men of the age were in a fever of alarm. “When one considers,” says Professor Playfair, “the splendour of Newton’s discoveries, the beauty, the simplicity, and grandeur of the system they unfolded, and the demonstrative evidence by which that system was supported, one could hardly doubt that, to be received, it required only to be made known, and that the establishment of the Newtonian philosophy all over Europe would very quickly have followed the publication of it. In drawing this conclusion, however, we should make much too small an allowance for the influence of received opinion, and the resistance that mere habit is able, for a time, to oppose to the strongest evidence. The Cartesian system of vortices had many followers in all the countries of Europe, and particularly in France. In the universities of England, though the Aristotelian Physics had made an obstinate resistance, they had been supplanted by the Cartesian, which became firmly established about the time when their foundation began to be sapped by the general progress of science, and particularly by the discoveries of Newton. For more than thirty years after the publication of those discoveries, the system of vortices kept its ground; and a translation from the French into Latin of the *Physics* of Rohault, a work entirely Cartesian, continued at Cambridge to be the text for philosophical instruction. About the year 1718,* a new and more elegant translation of the same book was published by Dr Samuel Clarke, with the addition of notes, in which that profound and ingenious writer explained the views of Newton on the principal objects of discussion; so that the notes contained *virtually* a refutation of the text: they did so, however, only *virtually*, all appearance of argument and controversy being carefully avoided. Whether this escaped the notice of the learned Doctors or not, is uncertain; but the new translation, from its better Latinity, and the name of the editor, was readily admitted to all the academical honours which the old one had enjoyed. Thus, the stratagem of Dr Clarke completely succeeded; the tutor might prelect from the text, but the pupil would sometimes look into the notes; and error is never so sure of being exposed as when the truth is placed close to it, side by side, without anything to alarm prejudice, or awaken from its lethargy the dread of innovation. Thus, therefore, the *Newtonian* philosophy first entered the University of Cambridge under the protection of the *Cartesian*.”†

* It was in 1697 that this translation was published. Professor Playfair here gives by mistake the date of the fourth and last edition of it.

† Dissertation Third, prefixed to the *Encyc. Brit.*, p. 566. The author adds in a note,—“The Universities of St Andrews and Edinburgh were, I believe, the first in Britain where the Newtonian philosophy was made the subject of

If such things took place among the cultivators of the physical sciences, we need not be surprised to read of similar proceedings among the professors of the medical art. Accordingly, it is observed by Dr John Gregory, in his admirable Lectures on the Duties and Qualifications of a Physician, that the warm admiration of antiquity which prevailed among scientific men in general at the restoration of learning, had the same effect on physicians as on others, in attaching them strongly, and very properly, to the ancient writers in their own profession. "It had been happy, however," he adds, "for mankind, if, instead of a blind admiration of Hippocrates, justly styled the father and founder of medicine, they had imbibed some portion of his spirit for observation. Hippocrates will always be held in the highest esteem, for his accurate and faithful description of diseases; for his candour, his good sense, and the simple elegance of his style. But, instead of prosecuting his plan, and building on the foundation he had laid, his successors employed their time in commenting on his works. Galen began with writing largely on what he reckoned the genuine productions of Hippocrates, in which he endeavours to reconcile all his seeming contradictions, and to prove the truth of his observations by a variety of arguments, not founded on his own extensive experience, but on the Aristotelian philosophy; some of them, indeed, subtle and ingenious, but for the most part weak and sophistical. This manner of commenting on books of observation, is extremely absurd. The first inquiry here ought to be into the truth of the facts. Till these are confirmed by similar observations, it is a waste of time and labour to attempt an explanation of their causes. Hippocrates has left us a number of excellent observations, together with some that are found to be true only in certain cases, and under certain limitations; some peculiar to the climate and country in which he lived, some so obscure that they cannot be understood, some ill-founded, and a great number that seem curious and important, in regard to which not one of his numerous commentators has taken the trouble to inquire whether they were true or false. Every one of them has, after the example of Galen, attempted to prove the truth of his observations, not by similar observations of their own, but by hypothetical reasoning, drawn from the prevailing philosophy of the times they lived in. Thus the noble foundation of observations begun by Hippocrates, and the example he has set of faithful and accurate description, have, in a great measure, been neglected, while physicians, in all ages, have fondly attempted to support their opposite theories by his authority, in which they were favoured by the obscurity of some parts of his writings. Not only his observations, but his opinions (of which indeed he was very sparing), till very lately, were opposed to the authority of facts, which appealed for their truth to the experience of every man of candour and common sense; so that a physician, in writing his own observations, found himself under a sort of necessity to shew that they agreed with those of Hippocrates, at least that they did not contradict them. The effect of this was, that the truth of Nature was often perverted, in order to make it correspond to the sentiments of Hippocrates, or even to the authority of Galen. This

the academical prelections. For this distinction they are indebted to James and David Gregory, the first in some respects the rival, but both the friends, of Newton."

introduced a corruption into the very source of all solid knowledge in medicine; and, at the same time, encouraged a pompous display of learning in writing on medical subjects, that wasted the time and tired the reader, who wanted to know what Nature said, not what Hippocrates and Galen thought, in medicine. Neither is this pedantry yet extinct in Europe; there being few medical books written in some parts of it, which are not stuffed with numerous quotations from the ancients, containing some trite observations, that answer no other purpose but to make a parade of erudition.”*

Compare now this account of the practice of the old physicians with Ostervald’s description of what is still pretty generally the habit of those who have the cure of souls. “The Holy Scripture,” says he, “is the foundation of religion and piety; but commentaries are the stores from which the sense of Scripture is drawn, and from which preachers commonly take the matter of their sermons. Few of them endeavour to find out the sense of a text by their own industry; *they consult their commentaries like oracles, and they blindly follow their decisions*: it is, therefore, highly requisite that these books should not lead into error those who have recourse to them. When a blind man leads another, they both fall into the ditch. If, then, the guides to whose conduct preachers give up themselves are deceitful and false, the word of God will neither be well understood nor well preached, and both preachers and people will err.”†

* On the Duties and Qualifications of a Physician. By John Gregory, M.D., F.R.S., late Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. Edition 1820, pp. 141-3. See, in Thomson’s Life of Cullen, p. 118, an account of the idolatry with which the system of Boerhaave was regarded a hundred years ago in Edinburgh, and the odium which that illustrious Scottish physician incurred by improving on it.

Bishop Sprat, in his History of the Royal Society, Part I., Sections V. and XIV., adverts to the like idolatry, among the ancient Greek philosophical sects, of the great men whom they followed; and the ill effects of dogmatical philosophy in slackening men’s industry in the pursuit of truth, and rendering them “more imperious, and impatient of contradiction, than becomes the calmness and unpassionate evenness of the true philosophical spirit.”

† A Treatise concerning the Causes of the present Corruption of Christians, and the Remedies thereof. By J. F. Ostervald. Translated into English by C. Mutel, 2d edit. 1702. Reprinted by Bishop Watson in his Collection of Theological Tracts, vol. vi., from p. 296 of which the above extract is taken. Watson says—“This book was highly esteemed by Bishop Burnet; and indeed all the writings of Mr Ostervald have been very favourably received in the world in general.” I add the following extract from pp. 297-8, as being not wholly inapplicable to the theological literature of Scotland even at the present day. “Divinity books are, for the most part, too scholastical. The method of the school has been long in vogue; and though the schoolmen’s ways of handling divinity may justly be looked upon as a defiance to sense and religion, yet that method has prevailed to that degree, that for some ages it was not lawful to swerve from it. Of late years, indeed, the schoolmen have lost a great deal of their credit; and in divinity, as well as in philosophy, many persons have no longer that blind deference for them which was paid heretofore. Yet, for all that, a great number of divines do still set up that method for their rule, and it is still as it were sacred in colleges and universities. Common places to this day savour too much of the barbarism of the schools, and we find there but too many remainders of that dry and crabbed theology, which had its birth in the ages of ignorance. Instead of those simple and clear ideas, which render the truth and majesty of the Christian religion sensible, and which satisfy a man’s reason, and move his heart, we meet with nothing in several bodies of divinity but metaphysical notions, curious and needless questions,

From the rapidly extending operation of the influences which have dethroned Aristotle, Descartes, Hippocrates, St Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas, we may reasonably expect the dethronement of those theological leaders who are at present the idols of their unreasoning train, and who by their systems (says Bishop Watson), “have as much obstructed the progress of revealed truth as systems in philosophy have done that of natural truth.” But “it will require as much application of genius, industry, and learning, to free the Christian world from the dominion of corrupted doctrine, as it did to free the philosophic world from the dominion of Aristotle.”* That decided progress is now being made in this difficult work of emancipation, is known to all who do not confine themselves to some little theological Goshen, and who have eyes to see and wisdom to understand the signs of the times.

Some adopt, as the test of truth, the “general consent” of the Christian Church in all ages and places—according to the maxim of Vincentius Lirinensis, “*quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus creditum est*” “But,” as Archbishop Whately observes, “to seek for a system of Christian doctrine which shall fulfil these conditions, is like the search for the universal medicine. Practically, they limit the term ‘all’ to the ORTHODOX; *i.e.*, those whose doctrines are true. So that we must first ascertain what doctrines are true, in order to distinguish the persons by whose judgment we are to be guided as to the ques-

distinctions, and obscure terms. In a word, we find there such intricate theology, that the very apostles themselves, if they came into the world again, would not be able to understand it, without the help of a particular revelation. This scholastic divinity has done more mischief to religion than we are able to express. There is not any thing that has more corrupted the purity of the Christian religion, that has more obscured matters, multiplied controversies, disturbed the peace of the Church, or given rise to so many heresies and schisms. This is the thing which confirms so many ecclesiastics in their ignorance and prejudices, and which keeps them from applying themselves to the solid arts of divinity, and to that which is proper to sanctify men.”

* Considerations on the Expediency of Revising the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England; Miscell. Tracts, vol. ii., p. 104.

The following extract from Dr Chalmers’s Diary appears in his Life by Dr Hannah, vol. i., p. 340:—

“August 23.—Went to Dundee with Dr Jones, where I made a variety of calls. I hope that his free and unshackled, and scriptural divinity, will help to overthrow the spiritual tyranny of systems over me. O my God, may I count no man master; but make me a little child, and may I take my lesson as the Bible offers it to me.”

In a subsequent part of this Appendix (Note G), the reader will find a plain and earnest rebuke which Dr Chalmers administered about thirty years ago to the citizens of Glasgow, for their obtrusive clergy-worship, and the servility with which they were then—as, it is to be lamented, not only they but many others in Scotland still are—accustomed “to receive for doctrines the commandments of men,” by whom “the word of God” is in danger of being “made of none effect through their traditions.” From another manly divine, the venerable Dr John Brown, I quote the following remark:—“There has been, and still is, on the part of some human expositors, an assumption of an authority which does not belong to them, and on the part of many professors of Christianity too easy a submission to these unauthorized claims.”—(*The Law of Christ respecting Civil Obedience*, 3d edit. p. 338. Edin. 1839.)

tion, What doctrines are true?"* This acute prelate remarks elsewhere, that if those who, when we inquire what we are to receive as sanctioned by the unerring judgment of the Universal Church, reply, Whatever has been believed *always, everywhere, and by all*, "are requested to make out a list of the articles of faith which fulfil these conditions, and to prove them to be such, they do not find it easy. They do, however, often find it easy to make an *unlearned* Christian believe, that what their Church and their party hold, is to be received by him as possessing this claim."†

The same fallacious kind of argument was employed a few years ago by an able advocate of the principles of the Sabbath Alliance. "In regard," says he, "to the divine authority, moral character, and perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment, there is no difference of doctrine among the Churches of the Reformation. *Individuals have disputed it, but Churches have not*; AND THIS IS SO IMPORTANT AND CONCLUSIVE A FACT, *verified by the standards of all Evangelical Churches*, that it entirely absolves me, *both as a layman UNENTITLED to speak ex cathedra*, and as a man contending for an ecclesiastical principle, from the duty of entering into any laboured vindication of its truth. *All men of common sense must feel, that what is distinctly declared in the standards of ALL TRUE CHURCHES, is more likely to be true than the random assertions of very honourable, but (ecclesiastically) very ignorant individuals*, who here and there set themselves to kick against the foundation-principles of these Churches," &c.‡

To me, I confess, this mode of reasoning appears Popish and unscriptural—Popish, because it amounts to a flat denial of the duty, if not even of the right, of private judgment; and unscriptural, because it is directly opposed to the plain injunctions delivered by St Paul in the 14th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans.§ But waiving such

* Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature, 4th edit., p. 110. See also Mr Cornewall Lewis's Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, pp. 82, 99.

† Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion, 6th edit., p. 223; Essay II., "On the Omission of Articles of Faith, &c., in the New Testament."

‡ The Sabbath Railway System Practically Discussed. By James Bridges, Esq. Fourth Edition, pp. 4-5. Edinburgh, 1847.

§ "Les modifications de la doctrine chez les protestans ayant été un fruit de leur affranchissement, et le principe de cet affranchissement étant ce qui caractérise leur communion à côté de l'Eglise romaine, le nom de *protestans*, est bien le nom qui leur convient. *La formation de cette communion, et son existence, ne sont autre chose qu'une PROTESTATION contre le principe de l'autorité.*"—(*Memoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes*. Par Alexandre Vinet. Paris, 1826. Ch. xix., p. 145.)

"There is nothing more evident," says Archdeacon Blackburne, "than that every Christian hath a right to search the Scriptures; a right which he cannot transfer, either to any Church, or to any single person, because it is his indispensable duty to exercise it personally for himself. And if it is his duty to *search*, it must also be his duty to *determine* for himself; and, if he finds just cause, to dissent from any or all the human establishments upon earth. Some writers on this subject discover an inclination to deny the right of private judgment in *every case* where it is opposed to church authority. These we leave to reconcile their principles with their separation from Rome."—(*The Confessional: or, A Full and Free Inquiry into the Right, Utility, Edification, and Success, of establishing Systematical Confessions of Faith and Doctrine in Protestant Churches*. 2d ed., p. 31. London, 1767.) Of the author of this able

considerations, and directing our attention to the argument in its purely logical aspect, what do we find to be its substance? Simply this—that *those Churches, and they alone*, are true Churches, and teach the truth, *which teach the opinions of Mr Bridges*;—and again, *the opinions of Mr Bridges are “conclusively” proved to be true*, by being found in the standards of all true Churches! Wherein, I desire to know, does this vicious circle differ from that of the Romanists, who prove the infallibility of their Church from its own interpretations of Scripture, and the authority of its interpretations of Scripture from its

treatise (which was at first anonymous), Bishop Watson says that he “is well known to be a very learned clergyman of the Church of England. . . . The controversy,” he adds, “is still unsettled. It is still a question, whether any Christian Church has a *right* to require from its public teachers any other profession of faith than that of a belief in the Bible, as containing a revelation from God. It is still a question, whether, granting the abstract right, the *use* of it be *expedient* in any degree, and to what degree, in the present condition of the Church of England.”—(*Catalogue of Books in Divinity, appended to vol. vi. of his Collection of Theological Tracts.*)

Attention has been recalled to this subject in an excellent pamphlet published in 1851 by Mr Joseph Taylor Goodsir, lately minister of Largo, who found himself compelled by conscientious scruples to resign his charge. It is entitled, “Dogmatic and Systematic Standards considered, in an Address to the Office-bearers and Members of the Church of Scotland.” Whatever may be urged on behalf of such standards, in relation to church-establishments either in alliance or not with the state, this at least no consistent and sensible Protestant will deny, that they are a galling yoke upon the necks of both clergy and laity considered as searchers for religious truth, and cannot fail to be, in the case of the former especially, a snare to the conscience, an impediment to free and candid inquiry, and consequently a drag upon the extension of religious knowledge. On this subject the remarks of Mr Goodsir, at pp. 63–66, are particularly worthy of attention.

Mr Baden Powell observes: “Among those who most strenuously uphold the principle of ‘the Bible only,’ and freedom of conscience (it must be confessed), there is very commonly to be found an adherence to dogmas not a little inconsistent with those professions. There is clearly implied, if not avowed, a reference to *some power, vested somewhere*, to settle the *true doctrine* and interpretation of the Bible. Thus we have certain classes of dissenters distinguishing themselves as ‘orthodox.’ Now this claim to ‘orthodoxy’ must suppose *some authority besides* the Bible. It is not alone the church authority, handed down in an exclusive apostolic succession, which is inconsistent with the *sole* recognition of Scripture; but any rule of doctrine *whatever*, other than that in which a number of individuals voluntarily agree. To uphold the Bible *alone*, is to uphold every man’s right to interpret it: less than this, is to maintain the Bible with a *divided* authority; the word of God, *conjointly* with some rule of man’s devising.

“The advocates of tradition are not backward to notice this inconsistency, and to press it upon the consideration of all who are desirous of keeping to what is called orthodoxy, and cannot but thus perceive the necessity of a paramount authority to lay down wherein it consists, and which must have a far higher origin than any mere human opinion.

“The professed principle of ‘the Bible and the Bible only,’ when taken in conjunction with this disposition (not avowed, nor perhaps even perceived) to adopt what were *in reality other dogmatic standards*, has commonly driven Protestant divines to find in *Scripture*, authority for tenets which no unprepossessed mind could possibly detect *there*: and to stretch the logic of theology to the most extravagant length of inference, holding out, as decisive proofs of some doctrinal system, single texts, or expressions, or else what they term ‘the general tenor of Scripture;’ where to all legitimate reasoning there could appear nothing but the remotest allusion, the most entirely imaginary parallel, or often no connexion or relation whatever.”—(*Tradition Unveiled*, pp. 16, 17.)

infallibility? Strange that one who, "as a layman," justly considers himself "unentitled to speak *ex cathedra* in regard to the Divine authority, moral character, and perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment," should, at the very same moment, not merely determine by the exercise of his reason, for his own satisfaction and guidance, but likewise assume that he has an unquestionable title to "decide *ex cathedra*" for others, the far more complicated questions, WHICH ARE THE TRUE CHURCHES? and, DO ALL TRUE CHURCHES, (*i.e.*, all ecclesiastical societies which may with truth be called Churches—*i.e.*, which *are* Churches,) AFFORD CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF THE TRUTH OF A DOCTRINE BY INSERTING IT IN THEIR STANDARDS? If, as a layman, he may, and must, solve these great problems for himself, why may not he—and if he, why not all other "very honourable individuals"—however "(ecclesiastically) ignorant" he may guess them to be—solve also *the smaller problem* for themselves, without feeling it incumbent on them to apply for an *ex cathedra* solution to those "true Churches," on whose word they cannot believe even the fundamental proposition that they *are* "true Churches," and not mere pretenders to that honourable status?

The pointed terms in which Mr Bridges refers to his character of "a layman," in acknowledging the absence of a right to speak *ex cathedra* on a theological question, plainly indicates that, had he been a *clergyman* instead of a layman, he would not have scrupled to demand for himself, as the representative of a true Church, and by virtue of his clerical status, the antichristian position of a "lord over God's heritage," and the deferential obedience of every lay-servant of Him whose emphatic injunction to his disciples it was, that they should "call no man on earth Master." Does Mr Bridges forget that not merely the clergy, but the people also, constitute a Church; and that he himself, as a Presbyterian, repudiates the notion of an earthly priesthood endowed beyond other mortals with the Holy Ghost, or vested with authority in matters of faith?

Justly and emphatically are the rights of laymen asserted by Milton, himself a layman of profounder learning than that of nine-tenths of the clergy of his time, and who, as many other men of genius have been, was deterred from joining the clerical body by an invincible repugnance to "subscribe slave."* "Every member of the Church," says he, "at least of any breeding or capacity, so well ought to be grounded in spiritual knowledge, as, if need be, to examine their teachers themselves. Acts. xvii. 11: 'They searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.' Rev. ii. 2: 'Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not.'"†

In the same strain writes the brave Bishop Watson, who, notwithstanding the laying on of hands by a "successor of the Apostles" at

* "In the service of the Church, by the intentions of my parents and friends, I was destined of a child, and in mine own resolution: till coming to some maturity of years, and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the Church, that he who would take orders must subscribe slave, and take an oath withal, which, unless he took with a conscience that would retch, he must either straight perjure, or split his faith: I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude and forswearing."—(*The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty*, B. II., Introd.; Milton's Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 482.)

† *Of True Religion, Heresy, and Schism*; Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 516.

his ordination, is so humble as to think himself no wiser than those who have never enjoyed the benefit of that solemn rite. "Laymen," says he, "are as much interested in the truth of Christianity as churchmen are; and, in this enlightened age, are as capable of seeing what is revealed in their Bible."* Nay, he does not scruple to confess—"Was I compelled to receive a creed of human composition, I would more willingly, in these enlightened times, receive one from such men as Locke" (a layman, an Independent, and, as he suspected, and we now know, a Unitarian†), "Clarke, or Tillotson, than from either Athanasius or Arius, or even from hundreds of contentious or political bishops, assembled in solemn council at Nice, Antioch, or Ariminum."‡

One other brief quotation on this subject shall suffice: it is from a letter addressed by the wise, upright, and accomplished Dr John Aikin to Dr Haygarth of Chester, who seems to have expressed a doubt whether Aikin (at that time engaged in writing the lives of theologians among others, for his well-known "General Biography," and who had mentioned to his friend that he did not think himself much the better or wiser for all the *theological* matter he had been obliged to go through—an inquirer into such points, without the deciding bias of interest, being more likely to end in doubt than in conviction) was a competent judge of the matters he had been investigating. "I must remonstrate with you, my friend," says he, "about your opinion of my incapacity as a theologian. Do you think that it requires a black coat to form a just notion of matters accessible to every man of reading? Is it not even an advantage to be free from the shackles of sect and profession?" He adds: "I flatter myself that no liberal man can take exception at my articles under that head. I have studiously avoided any mixture of personal opinion, and have faithfully endeavoured to assign to every one his just merits as a man and a scholar, not regarding the particular cause he has supported. However, it was certainly right that this department should be assigned to another hand, and it is already turned over to a proper person."§

* Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii., p. 88.

† Locke's Unitarianism has been placed beyond reasonable doubt, in his *Life* by Lord King, ed. 1830, vol. ii., pp. 103, 104, 187.

‡ Miscell. Tracts, vol. ii., p. 115.—It is finely remarked by the Hon. Robert Boyle, in his treatise on the Usefulness of Natural Philosophy, that, "as anciently among the Jews, by virtue of an Aaronical extraction, men were born with a right to priesthood; so reason is a natural dignity, and knowledge a prerogative, that can confer a priesthood without unction or imposition of hands."—(*Boyle's Works*, vol. i., p. 425, ed. 1744.)

Whiston says of the clerical scholars of his day—"To observe such laymen as Grotius, and Newton, and Locke, laying out their noblest talents in sacred studies, while such clergymen as Dr Bentley and Bishop Hare, to name no others at present, have been, in the words of Sir Isaac Newton, fighting with one another about 'a play-book' (Terence)—this is a reproach upon them, their holy religion, and holy function, plainly intolerable."—(*Whiston's Memoir of Dr S. Clarke*, p. 143.)

§ Memoir of Dr John Aikin, by his daughter Lucy Aikin, vol. i., p. 229. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without expressing the respect and admiration which I have long entertained for this excellent man. With his "Letters to his Son," which are perhaps the most valuable production of his well-balanced, well-stored, and truly liberal mind, I became acquainted in early life, and from the re-perusal of them have uniformly derived fresh pleasure and improvement. The calm philosophy, rational piety, comprehensive sym-

If the common Catechism of the Church of England be its standard, then, by Mr Bridges's rule, the Church of England is no true Church ;

pathies, and fine taste, which characterise them throughout, have always had a most agreeable and tranquillising influence on my feelings ; and I offer with confidence the opinion, that a better book of the kind could hardly be selected for study by a thoughtful youth, desirous to obtain sound notions of human life, and of the sources of solid enjoyment. The letters on Strength of Character,—on the Pursuit of Improvement,—on Prejudice, Bigotry, Candour, and Liberality,—on Religious Societies,—on the Analogy between Mental and Bodily Disease,—on Spleen and Low Spirits,—on Consolation,—on the Inequality of Conditions,—on the Prevalence of Truth,—on Second Thoughts and Middle Courses,—on Cheap Pleasures,—on Independence,—on the Choice of a Wife,—on Party,—on a Criterion of Perfection in Writing,—on Authority in Matter of Opinion,—on the Character of Ajax,—on the Value of Life,—on Openness and Sincerity,—On the Advantages of a Taste for Poetry,—on the Best Mode of Encountering the Evils of Life,—on the Comparative Value of Different Studies,—and on the Experience of Life—are peculiarly well fitted to produce a beneficial effect on intelligent and earnest readers at the susceptible period of youth. To such readers I recommend also the pleasing and instructive Memoir of Dr Aikin by his daughter, with the Miscellaneous Pieces to which it is prefixed. Among young people he is extensively known, in conjunction with his excellent sister Mrs Barbauld, as the principal author of “Evenings at Home,” one of the most improving and interesting books for juvenile readers in the English language. He had a fine taste for poetry, and compiled the “Select Works of the British Poets,” which is deservedly still in public favour. In perusing, some years ago, the Life of William Roscoe, by his Son, I was pleased to find in the letters of that eminent and most estimable man, an echo of my own feelings towards Dr Aikin, and expressions of the same high appreciation of his works, which I had long entertained. (See vol. i., p. 292, and vol. ii., pp. 297 and 300.) The two were intimate friends for many years, and to Roscoe Dr Aikin dedicated his translation of the Life of Huet. In a letter to Miss Aikin after her father's death, Mr Roscoe writes as follows :—“My long acquaintance with him is indeed connected with the most pleasing recollections. From having accompanied him to his little botanical garden in the vicinity of Warrington, I first imbibed a relish for these pursuits : and I well remember that on his recommendation I first was led to the perusal of modern writers of Latin poetry—occupations which have afforded me an inexhaustible source of pleasure. To this I might truly add the information and delight which I have derived from his writings, which have always appeared to me to be the perfect image of his own elegant, correct, and highly cultivated mind, and which, I have no doubt, from the variety and utility of their subjects, and the purity and precision of their style, will continue to be admired as long as any relish remains of what is truly excellent.”

The reader, I hope, will accept it as a sufficient excuse for this digression, that the more such works as those of Aikin and Roscoe are studied, and the more the liberal spirit which animated these men shall be diffused, the more will the *practice* of the principles of religious liberty be extended amongst us. Of *profession* there is enough and to spare ; and as one motive for drawing up the present treatise is the hope that it may contribute to hasten the time when profession and practice will go together, I shall here add another passage from Mr Roscoe, extracted from a letter to the Rev. Dr Butler, (vol. ii., p. 445.) “The assertion and defence of truth,” he writes, “is incumbent upon every one, and particularly upon every teacher of religion ; but there is one truth, paramount to all the rest, which is the very basis of religious inquiry, without which all discussion is absurd, viz., that every person, in his spiritual concerns, has a right to adopt such opinions as appear to him to be right. This being previously understood, a free and useful discussion may take place ; but, until this foundation be once established, nothing but confusion and dissension can ensue. You, my dear Sir, would concede this liberty as freely as you would claim it, and your liberal sermon does much towards recommending and enforcing it ;

for, as Dr Arnold has pointed out, the "duty towards God," which is expressly given as a summary of the first four Commandments to us, as *Christians*, says not one word about the Sabbath, but simply about loving God, worshipping him, and serving him truly *all the days* of our life.* But assuming, in spite of this notable omission, that she does really stand the above-mentioned test of a true Church, still the fact will stare us in the face, that she has been so unhappy as to nourish many who, if thus tested, are discovered to be none of her "true" children, how much soever they may have added to her respectability by their talents, learning, and zeal for her interests and the Christian cause. For by none has the doctrine of Mr Bridges about the Fourth Commandment been more explicitly repudiated than by Cranmer and Ridley,† Chillingworth,‡ Taylor,§ Warburton,|| Paley,¶ Whately,** and Arnold (*Life*, vol. ii., p. 208);

but, after all, *it is much to be feared that these sentiments are rather those of the individual than of the body; and that neither Luther nor any of the Churches founded under his sanction tolerate, in the full and fair meaning of the word, any opinions but their own.*"

* *Life of Dr Arnold*, 5th edit., vol. i., p. 364; and Heylin's *History of the Sabbath*, Part II., p. 239. Lond., 1636.

† See Heylin, *loc. cit.*, and the Act 5 and 6 Edw. VI., c. 3, quoted by him on p. 236; also quotation from Cranmer's Catechism in Whately's *Thoughts on the Sabbath*, p. 11.

‡ See his letter to Dr Sheldon, dated September 21, 1635, stating his reasons for resolving, greatly to the increase of his mental tranquillity, not to accept preferment in the English Church at the expense of doing violence to his conscience by subscription to articles which, in some important particulars, he was unable to believe. "For," he writes, "to say nothing of other things, which I have so well considered as not to be in a state to sign them, and yet not so well as to declare myself against them; two points there are, wherein I am fully resolved, and therefore care not who knows my mind. One is, that to say the Fourth Commandment is a law of God appertaining to Christians, is false and unlawful; the other, that the damning sentences in St Athanasius's Creed (as we are made to subscribe it) are most false, and also in a high degree presumptuous and schismatical. And therefore I can neither subscribe that these things are agreeable to the word of God, seeing I believe they are certainly repugnant to it; nor that the whole Common Prayer is lawful to be used, seeing I believe these parts of it certainly unlawful; nor promise that I myself will use it, seeing I never intend either to read these things which I have now excepted against, or to say Amen to them."—(*Letter from William Chillingworth to Dr Sheldon*, dated Sept. 21, 1635, in Chillingworth's *Life* prefixed to his *Works*, ed. 1742, p. vi.)

§ *Works*, Heber's ed., vol. iii., p. 28.

|| *Divine Legation of Moses*, B. iv., Note RRRR.

¶ *Moral Philosophy*, B. iv., ch. vii.

** *Thoughts on the Sabbath*; to which is subjoined, an Address to the Inhabitants of Dublin, on the Observance of the Lord's Day. By Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin, 3d edit., Lond., 1845.—This work affords in a small compass a remarkably clear, comprehensive, and impartial view of the controversy about the alleged obligation of the Mosaic Sabbath-law. The author's conclusion is, that the Lord's Day, and the old Sabbath, are two independent institutions; that with the latter the members of the Church of England have nothing to do; and that the former ought to be observed by them in obedience to the authority of the Church, even independent of (supposed) Apostolic example, and ancient usage. "The Lord's Day," says he in his preface, "is so precious in the eyes of every right-minded Christian, and its proper observance of such manifold utility, that it cannot, I trust, be regarded as labour misapplied, to adduce such considerations as may tend to promote this observance. And I am convinced that the most effectual, as well as the only justifiable, means for

nay, than by Bishop Horsley himself,* the most able among the recent advocates of the Christian Sabbath! If to these Churchmen

accomplishing this object, will be found in the placing of this duty on its *true* foundation." The "true foundation" on which he places it, is the authority of the Church of England; and this foundation may be true enough to the members of that Church (who, at confirmation, acknowledge it to be their duty "to submit themselves to all their governors, teachers, *spiritual pastors and masters*"): but it is no foundation at all to *other* Christians. The *universal* true foundation, I take it, is the suitability of the institution to the nature of man. See Note R. in this volume.

* Horsley's Sermons, Sermon xxii. There are two other sermons by this prelate on the Sabbath; and the whole may be seen in Dr Vicesimus Knox's collection of "Family Lectures," pp. 292-310. The following extract from Sermon xxiii. is in a different strain from the tracts of the Scottish Sabbath Alliance, and shews that the *foundation* on which we rest the duty of sabbath-observance is not merely of speculative interest, but fruitful of practical results:—

"Private devotion," says he, "is the Christian's daily duty; but the peculiar duty of the Sabbath is public worship. As for those parts of the day which are not occupied in the public duty, every man's own conscience, without any interference of public authority, and certainly without any officious interposition of the private judgment of his neighbour,—every man's own conscience must direct him what portion of this leisure should be allotted to his private devotions, and what may be spent in sober recreation. Perhaps a better general rule cannot be laid down than this,—that the same proportion of the Sabbath, on the whole, should be devoted to religious exercises, public and private, as every man would spend of any other day in his ordinary business. The holy work of the Sabbath, like all other work, to be done well, requires intermissions. An entire day is a longer space of time than the human mind can employ with alacrity upon any one subject. The austerity, therefore, of those is little to be commended, who require that all the intervals of public worship, and whatever remains of the day after the public duty is satisfied, should be spent in the closet, in private prayer, and retired meditation. Nor are persons in the lower ranks of society to be very severely censured—those especially who are confined to populous cities, where they breathe a noxious atmosphere, and are engaged in unwholesome occupations, from which, with their daily subsistence, they derive their daily poison—if they take advantage of the leisure of the day to recruit their wasted strength and harassed spirits, by short excursions into the purer air of the adjacent villages, and the innocent recreations of sober society; provided they engage not in schemes of dissipated and tumultuous pleasure, which may disturb the sobriety of their thoughts, and interfere with the duties of the day. The present humour of the common people leads, perhaps, more to a profanation of the festival than to a superstitious rigour in the observance of it: but, in the attempt to reform, we shall do wisely to remember, that the thanks for this are chiefly due to the base spirit of puritanical hypocrisy, which in the last century opposed and defeated the wise attempts of government to regulate the recreations of the day by authority, and prevent the excesses which have actually taken place, by a rational indulgence.

"The Sabbath was ordained for a day of public worship, and of refreshment to the common people. It cannot be a day of their refreshment, if it be made a day of mortified restraint. To be a day of worship, it must be a day of leisure from worldly business, and of abstraction from dissipated pleasure: but it need not be a dismal one. It was ordained for a day of general and willing resort to the holy mountain; when men of every race, and every rank, and every age, promiscuously—Hebrew, Greek, and Scythian—bond and free—young and old—high and low—rich and poor—one with another—laying hold of Christ's atonement, and the proffered mercy of the gospel, might meet together before their common Lord, exempt for a season from the cares and labours of the world, and be 'joyful in his house of prayer.'"

To Scottish readers this passage will have a strange appearance, when viewed

we add the Nonconformists Baxter* and Milton,† the Quaker Barclay,‡ and, though last not least, the father of all “the Churches of the Reformation,” Martin Luther himself,§ we shall have a pretty

as the production of one who is justly styled by Dr Parr “the renowned champion of orthodoxy” (Parr’s *Works*, vol. iii., p. 284), and as part of a sermon written to enforce the duty of observing the Lord’s Day. The language in which this High Church and High Tory bishop, writing in the last decade of the eighteenth century, speaks of the Puritans, would not be employed by any respectable English prelate of the present day, when the character of these remarkable men is so much better understood. We can now acknowledge the sincerity and high motives of many even among violent fanatics—though without renouncing our belief, that base men and hypocrites might find it for their interest to join an influential body of the saints. To what extent I concur with Bishop Horsley in his unqualified panegyric on the so-called “wise attempts of government to regulate the recreations of the day by authority,” will appear a little farther on. That they were well meant is probable enough; that they were *wise*, either ecclesiastically or politically, few, I suppose, will now be found to maintain.

Dr Vicesimus Knox, in his essay “On the Amusements of Sunday,” is as liberal to the common people as Horsley is: he recommends a rural walk in the intervals of divine service, as both pleasurable and very conducive to their health; adding that “their little indulgences at the tea-houses are highly proper and allowable.”—(*Essays, Moral and Literary*, by Vicesimus Knox, D.D., late Master of Tunbridge School; No. XX.)

* Baxter’s *Works*, by Orme, xiii., 415; vi., 322; xix., 190. Mr Orme, in his *Life* of this eminent theologian, p. 569, speaking of his treatise on the Divine Appointment of the Lord’s Day, says—“I consider this one of the most judicious of Baxter’s works. It judiciously combines controversial and practical discussion, both of which are managed with great fairness, and display great accuracy of scriptural knowledge.”

† Milton’s *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, compiled from the Holy Scriptures Alone, pp. 228, 412–421, 600–612.

‡ Barclay’s *Apology for the Quakers*, Prop. xi., § 3, 4. See also *Essays on the Principles of Morality*, by Jonathan Dymond, 4th ed., p. 32. It is understood that the Quakers in general concur with these distinguished writers in regard to the Sabbath.

§ “As for the Sabbath or Sunday,” says Luther, in speaking of the Ten Commandments, “there is no necessity for its observance; and if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because Nature likewise teaches us to give ourselves, from time to time, a day’s rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the Word of God preached.”—(*Werke*, II, 16: quoted in Hazlitt’s translation of Michelet’s *Life of Luther*, p. 271; Lond., 1846.)

Again he says: “The Gospel regardeth neither Sabbath nor holidays, because they endured but for a time, and were ordained for the sake of preaching, to the end God’s word might be tended and taught.”—(*Colloquia Mensalia*, or *Table Talk*, translated by Captain Henry Bell, ch. xxxi., p. 357; Lond., 1652.)

The following injunctions of this Reformer have often been quoted: I borrow them from a little work entitled “*Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century*,” p. 20; Lond., 1846. “Keep the Sabbath holy for its use both to body and soul; but if any where the day is made holy for the mere day’s sake, if any where any one sets up its observance upon a *Jewish* foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty.” How well these principles have been reduced to practice by his countrymen, will appear from the following information given me by a friend who, when a lad, resided for some time with a clergyman at Hesse-Cassel. “The Elector of Hesse,” says he, “was a great ally of Luther, and Cassel is a strictly Protestant place (Lutheran); yet, on the first Sunday I was with K——, he, a Lutheran divine, asked me to go with him to the play. I remember being surprised, but, thinking he should know best, made no scruples about accompanying him. I

imposing list of men who, it seems, are not to be regarded as true members of any true Church !

have often gone with him Sunday excursions, starting at daybreak and not returning home till late in the day. On such occasions the boys did not turn out, but K—— had a number of friends fond of natural history, and several of them were with us. Our usual Sunday routine there, was to go to church in the forenoon, dine at twelve, and then start for the country—always ending at a tea-garden, where there were music and dancing. K——, as a general rule, went to the play on Sunday ; he had a subscription-ticket, and when he could not go himself, he sent one of the boys. He was not an ordained minister, but preached occasionally for his friends. He was a very worthy conscientious man, and, having the charge of youth, was not likely to act in opposition to general opinion.” Luther, in his Table Talk, chap. 72, recommends theatrical representations as a highly useful school of good manners, and vehicle of instruction in the ways of the world : that, under good regulation, they are so, and might be made to give impressive and delightful lessons in virtue and wisdom, has been the opinion of many other excellent men. He goes so far as to say, that “Christians ought not altogether to fly and abstain from comedies because now and then gross tricks and dallying passages are acted therein ; for then it will follow, that by reason thereof we should also abstain from reading the Bible. Therefore it is of no value that some allege such and the like things, and for those causes would forbid Christians to read or act comedies.” And it does not appear that what he thought thus profitable in general, he discountenanced on Sundays.

Even Calvin, while plainly expressing the opinion (in which, as far as it goes, Christians of almost every denomination concur with him), that the weekly Sabbath is “a politic and ecclesiastical arrangement,” “subservient to the peace of Christian society,” and that Gentile Christians “adopt it as a necessary remedy for preserving order in the Church,”—states with equal plainness his belief, that we should practise abstinence from manual labour, not “as a kind of religious observance,” but “on the ground of interference with sacred study and meditation ;” that “there can be no doubt that on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished ;” that “Christians, therefore, should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days ;” and that, after the introduction of Christianity, “it being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished ; and, as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace, in the Church, another day was appointed for that purpose.” “The whole,” says he, “may be thus summed up : As the truth was delivered typically to the Jews, so it is imparted to us without figure ; first, that during our whole lives we may aim at a constant rest from our own works, in order that the Lord may work in us by his Spirit ; secondly, that every individual, as he has opportunity, may diligently exercise himself in private, in pious meditation on the works of God, and, at the same time, that all may observe the legitimate order appointed by the Church, for the hearing of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and public prayer ; and, thirdly, that we may avoid oppressing those who are subject to us. In this way, we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets, who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment (this they term, in their language, the taxation of the seventh day), while the moral part remains, viz., the observance of one day in seven. *But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity ; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews.* And of a truth, we see what profit they have made by such a doctrine. Those who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews in the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism ; so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah (Isa. i., 13 ; viii., 13) apply as much to those of the present day, as to those to whom the prophet addressed them. We must be careful, however, to observe the general doctrine, viz., in order that religion may neither be lost nor languish among us, we must diligently attend on our religious assemblies, and duly avail ourselves of those external aids which tend to promote the worship of God.” (*Cal-*

But the most surprising fact of all remains to be adduced. *From the date of the Reformation in Scotland, to the year 1647, when the Westminster Confession was adopted, THE STANDARD OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND WAS SILENT AS TO THE DUTY OF KEEPING HOLY THE SABBATH-DAY!* For proof of this statement I refer to the original Confession prepared by John Knox in 1560; the 16th chapter of which, entitled, "What works are reputed good before God," runs in the following terms:—"We confess and acknowledge, that God has given to man his holy law, in which not only are forbidden all such works which displease and offend his Godly Majesty; but also are commanded all such as please him, and as he hath promised to reward. And these works be of two sorts; the one are done to the honour of God, the other to the profit of our neighbours; and both have the revealed will of God for their assurance. To have one God, to worship and honour him; to call upon him in all our troubles; to reverence his holy name; to hear his word; to believe the same; to communicate with his holy sacraments;—are the works of the First Table. To honour father, mother, princes, rulers, and superior powers; to love them; to support them, yea, to obey their charges (not repugning to the commandment of God); to save the lives of innocents; to repress tyranny; to defend the oppressed; to keep our bodies clean and holy; to live in sobriety and temperance; to deal justly with all men, both in word and in deed, and finally, to repress all appetite of our neighbour's hurt;—are the good works of the Second Table, which are most pleasing and acceptable unto God, as those works that are commanded by himself. The contrary whereof is sin most odious, which always displeases him and provokes him to anger:—as not to call upon him alone when we have need; not to hear his word with reverence; to contemn and despise it; to have or to worship idols; to maintain and defend idolatry; lightly to esteem the reverent name of God; to profane, abuse, or contemn the sacraments of Christ Jesus; to disobey or resist any that God has placed in authority (while they pass not over the bounds of their office); to murder, or to consent thereto, to bear hatred, or to suffer innocent

vin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, translated by H. Beveridge, vol. i., pp. 459–466. Edin. 1845). From these extracts it is abundantly evident that the Westminster divines have not Calvin on their side when they declare that "the Fourth Commandment requireth the *keeping holy* to God," by Gentile Christians, "one whole day in seven, to be a *holy Sabbath* to himself;" that it "is to be *sanctified* by a holy resting all that day," &c.; and that "the *profaning the day* by idleness," &c., is thereby forbidden to us. The phrase, "sabbath-desecration," so much in the mouths of our modern Calvinists, would have grated on the stern Reformer's ear, and have drawn from him a hearty denunciation of their "gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism." His doctrine plainly is, that, as there are now no *holy places* (temples), or *holy men* (priests), so have we no *holy days* or other *holy times*; from which it follows, that the much-complained-of sin of sabbath-desecration or profanation is, among us, as impossible as the sin of sacrilege. Nor is there any inconsistency between his teaching thus, and believing, with most theologians of the age in which he flourished, that the Mosaic law is *in some measure* binding on the Gentiles.

In Geneva, where Calvin ruled and died, Sunday afternoon is at present much devoted to social and recreative occupations: music and dancing abound; and when there is such an occurrence as the ascent of a balloon, crowds of respectable people assemble to witness it, and seem to think that they are innocently employed in doing so.

blood to be shed, if we may gainstand it; and, finally, the transgressing of any other commandment in the First or Second Table,—we confess and affirm to be sin, by the which God's hot displeasure is kindled against the proud and unthankful world. So that good works we affirm to be these only that are done in faith, at God's commandment, who in his law has expressed what be the things that please him: And evil works, we affirm, not only those that are expressly done against God's commandment, but those also that, in matters of religion and worshipping of God, have no assurance but the invention and opinion of man, which God from the beginning has ever rejected; as by the Prophet Esaias and by our Master, Christ Jesus, we are taught in these words,—‘ In vain do they worship me, teaching the doctrine being precepts of men.’”*

It thus appears, 1. That in the opinion of John Knox and his coadjutors, the sanctification of the Sabbath is not one of the “good works” required by God of Christians; for had these illustrious men believed it to fall within any “commandment of the First and Second Tables,” they assuredly would have *specified* it with the others: †
 2. That it *is* a Christian duty “to deal justly with all men, both in word and deed;” which truth the bargain-breakers of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company may with advantage lay to heart:
 3. That inasmuch as the *keeping holy* of days by Gentile Christians is a work that hath “no assurance but the invention and opinion of man,” it is an “evil work,” tending to kindle the hot displeasure of God: And, lastly, that since the sanctification of the Sabbath is thus not merely not affirmed to be a duty, but positively discountenanced as an evil work, by the standard of John Knox's Church, that Church, if Mr Bridges's test may be relied upon, existed for nearly a century before it acquired the character of an “*evangelical*” or “*true Church*”!! ‡

* The Works of John Knox, collected and edited by David Laing, vol. ii., pp. 107–9. Edinburgh: printed for the Bannatyne Club. 1848.—The Confession may be seen also in the folio Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, 1814, vol. ii., p. 526; in Dunlop's Collection of Scottish Confessions, vol. ii., p. 52; and in Dr H. A. Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum*, p. 340; Leipsic, 1840.

† As Knox's *principle* was, so does his *practice* appear to have been. In a letter from Randolph the English ambassador to Cecil, dated 30th November 1562, the following passage occurs: “Upon Sunday at night, the Duke supped with Mr Knox, where the Duke desired that I should be.”—(Wright's *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, vol. i., p. 114.) This was evidently a meeting for business, as well as for social enjoyment.

‡ After all, the real question between Mr Bridges and the bulk of his opponents is, not whether the Fourth Commandment have divine authority, moral character, and perpetual obligation; but whether, admitting that it has, they may regard the running of a morning and evening railway-train on Sundays as a proceeding *entitled to take its place in the universally recognised category of “works of necessity and mercy;”* i.e. works, which it is on the whole more conducive to the welfare of the community to do, than to leave undone. *This* is a question for the decision of which Mr Bridges can appeal to no Church, “true” or false; for no Church has ever decided it. *He* decides it for *himself*, and by the very same right which he has to do so, *I* and others decide it for *ourselves*: The two decisions are unfortunately different; but if he say that we have erred, we say with equal authority that *he* has erred—and so, while the Judge who is over all pronounces no decision, each of us must be permitted to believe himself in the right, and his opponents to be mistaken. Even between orthodox Sabbatarians, the like difference is found to occur. One of them publicly

It was long since remarked by Jeremy Taylor, that “to know which is the true Church is so hard to be found out, that the greatest questions of Christendom are judged before you can get to your judge, and then there is no need of him. For those questions which are concerning the judge of questions must be determined before you can submit to his judgment; and if you can yourselves determine those great questions which consist much in universalities, then also you may determine the particulars, as being of less difficulty.”* This argument is quite “conclusive,” not only against the Pope and the Roman Catholic Councils, but against every Church that represents herself to be the true one, and, as such, claims, either expressly or in effect, the power to determine God’s truth, and directly or indirectly attempts to punish those who deny her claim.

“That there is but one true way of finding truth,” says the prelate just quoted, “is agreed upon, and therefore almost every Church of one denomination that lives under government propounds to you a system or collective body of articles, and tells you that is the true religion, and they

professed in Glasgow a few years ago the opinion that it would be sinful to travel on Sunday to close the eyes of a dying parent; but in Aberdeenshire the Free Church Presbytery of Turriff highly approves of Sunday-travelling in order to worship God in a distant Free Church, rather than in a near one belonging to the sinful Establishment. The case in which this was made known to the world came before the Presbytery in January 1852, and the proceedings of their meeting were reported in the newspapers. The parties were, the minister and the kirk-session of Macduff, and Mr Adam, late banker there; and the facts were as follows. Mr and Mrs Adam, having resided some months in another parish, at a distance from any Free Church, had attended worship in the Established Church—and found that proceeding brought against them as a sin, when they applied at Macduff for their communion-tokens. Mr Adam thus described what took place when the application was made to the session:—“We explained what was perfectly known, that for a short time we had been attending the parish church of King-Edward. The Moderator (Mr Leslie, the minister of the congregation), said, ‘We hold you to have been absent from religious ordinances altogether—we hold the Established Church to be no church.’ The Moderator, addressing Mrs Adam most rudely and violently, asked what she had to say for her conduct, and said, ‘What has become of your Free Church principles? You were a Free Church person from the commencement, I thought.’ Mrs Adam, in reply, said, ‘I was unable to come to Macduff, and rather than hire a conveyance on the Sabbath-day and keep a person from church, I thought it my duty to walk to the church within my reach; and were I placed in similar circumstances, I would just do as I have done. Do you think it proper to hire a conveyance on the Sabbath-day?’ The Moderator answered, ‘Most certainly, to come to the house of God.’” The tokens, however, were granted; but Mr Adam having brought the matter publicly before the congregation on the Sacrament Saturday, the session withdrew them that night. The Presbytery decided that the session had acted rightly, and the speakers were unanimous in holding that it was right to hire men and horses on Sunday, and wrong to appeal from a kirk-session to a congregation. The *Banffshire Journal* remarks:—“It would appear from the debate, that the using of carriages on Sabbath, if employed in order to proceed to church, is not merely a matter to be tolerated, but to be enjoined. We were quite aware that the practice was tolerated, but we never before happened to observe it recommended. We by no means find fault with the recommendation. We merely point attention to it as—shall we say?—an advance in charity.”

* Liberty of Prophecy, sect. ix., § 2. See also Whately’s *Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c.*, 2d edit., pp. 155, 255, 256; his *Lessons on the History of Religious Worship*, 2d edit., p. 230, Lesson x., § 8; and Mr Cornwall Lewis on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, pp. 63–65, 111, *et seq.*

are the Church and the peculiar people of God. Like Brutus and Cassius, of whom one says, ‘Ubicunque ipsi essent, prætexebant esse rempublicam,’ ‘They supposed themselves were the commonwealth;’ and these are the Church, and out of this Church they will hardly allow salvation. But of this there can be no end: for divide the Church into twenty parts, and in what part soever your lot falls, you and your party are damned by the other nineteen; and men on all hands almost keep their own proselytes by affrighting them with the fearful sermons of damnation; but, in the meantime, here is no security to them that are not able to judge for themselves, and no peace for them that are.”*

As a commentary on this passage, look at the terms in which our own Church, whose purity we regard as so much beyond that of her sister across the Tweed, is spoken of by an English divine: “Such a Church,” says he, “I think altogether as unworthy of the name of a Church, as a band of rebels in any country who have overthrown the civil constitution of it would be of the name of a kingdom, state, or republic; because such a pretended Church is not only a variation from the Catholic Apostolic Church, but a sworn destructive confederacy against it, even the abomination of desolation in the house or kingdom of God, of which their pastors are not ministers, but by principle most malicious enemies; not pastors of the flock, but wolves.”†

The descendants of the warriors of Bothwell Bridge and Drumclog may well open their eyes wide at such an announcement of “God’s truth” even from the mouth of a fanatic. But it is not by fanatics alone that this persuasion has been expressed; for Jeremy Taylor himself, addressing a university audience, gives utterance to the very same opinion, embodied, however, in soberer, though not less emphatic language. After quoting the observation that “Truth is lasting, and ever full of blessing,” he remarks, that “this very observation will give good light in our questions and disputes; and I give,” says he, “my instance in episcopal government, which hath been of so lasting an abode, of so long a blessing, hath its firmament by the principles of Christianity, hath been blessed by the issues of that stabiliment; it hath for 1600 years combined with monarchy, and hath been taught by the Spirit which hath so long dwelt in God’s Church, and hath now, according to the promise of Jesus, that says, ‘the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church,’ been restored amongst us by a heap of miracles; and, as it went away, so now it is returned again in the hand of monarchy, and in the bosom of our fundamental laws. *Now that doctrine must needs be suspected of error, AND AN INTOLERABLE LIE, that speaks against THIS TRUTH, which hath had so long a TESTIMONY FROM GOD, and from the wisdom and experience of so many ages, of all our ancestors, and all our laws.*”‡ Another passage in the same discourse will afford to Scottish

* Via Intelligentiæ: A Sermon preached to the University of Dublin, shewing by what Means the Scholars shall become most learned and most useful. Taylor’s Works, vol. vi., p. 375.

† Hicke’s Answer to the Rights of the Christian Church, pref., p. 200. See also, in Dr John Brown’s excellent work on Civil Obedience, App., note I., p. 226, the ravings of another bigot against the dissenting ministers, including those of “*the Kirk*,” which, he tells us, “very rebelliously and impiously rejected Episcopacy.”

‡ Via Intelligentiæ; Works, vol. vi., p. 406.

Churchmen, and to Presbyterians in general, a still more striking proof of the uncertainty of Scripture—interpreted, as it must always be, by fallible human beings—as a *standard of divine truth*: let the reader keep in mind that this sermon was preached shortly after the Restoration of Charles II. “A man would think it a very easy thing to understand the thirteenth chapter to the Romans, ‘Whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God:’ and yet we know a generation of men to whom these words were so obscure that they thought it lawful to fight against their king. A man would think it easy to believe that those who were ‘in the gainsaying of Korah,’ who rose up against the high priest, were in a very sad condition; and yet there are too many amongst us who are in the gainsaying of Korah, and think they do very well; that they are the godly party, and the good people of God. Why? What is the matter? *In the world there can be nothing plainer than these words, ‘Let every soul be subject to the higher powers;’ and, that you need not make a scruple who are these higher powers, it is as plainly said, ‘There is no power but of God;’ all that are set over you by the laws of your nation, these ‘are over you in the Lord;’* AND YET MEN WILL NOT UNDERSTAND THESE PLAIN THINGS; *they deny to do their notorious duty, and yet believe they are in the right; and if they sometimes obey ‘for wrath,’ they oftener disobey ‘for conscience sake.’* Where is the fault? *THE WORDS ARE PLAIN, THE DUTY IS CERTAIN, THE BOOK LIES OPEN; but, alas! ‘it is sealed within,’ that is, ‘men have eyes and will not see, ears and will not hear.’*”—(P. 382.)

Observe, these are the words, not of a presumptuous sciolist, or “consecrated cobbler,” but of a prelate famed throughout Christendom for the holiness of his life, and whose controversial writings are characterised by one of the profoundest scholars that ever held office in the Church of England, as “fraught with guileless ardour, with peerless eloquence, and with the richest stores of knowledge, historical, classical, scholastic, and theological.”* It took nearly a century’s hard fighting, sometimes with sword as well as pen, to convince the adherents of the Stewarts, in opposition to this so “plain truth” and “certain duty,” that duties are *reciprocal* between the higher powers and their subjects; and that when a king plays the faithless tyrant, he instantly forfeits, by the very act of doing so, the power which he has of God—since he thus ceases to perform the conditions on which it was granted him. The divine right of Episcopacy, however, is still lovingly cherished by the English mind; even more so, perhaps, than the *ius divinum* of Presbytery is among ourselves. In a work lately published by Mr Ruskin, under the quaint title of “Notes on the Construction of Sheepfolds,” the question is put, “But how to unite the two great sects of paralysed Protestants?” To which he answers: “By keeping strictly to Scripture. The members of the Scottish Church have not a shadow of excuse for refusing Episcopacy. It has indeed been abused among them—grievously abused; *but it is in the Bible, and that is all they have a right to ask!*”

Now all this, you see, is reckoned “God’s truth” on the other side of the Tweed, although on this side it is but erroneous “man’s truth;” just as that which *we* confidently style “God’s truth,” is, as you like-

* Dr Parr’s Letter to Milner; Works, vol. iii., p. 428.

wise perceive, sometimes denounced by our neighbours (with a degree of confidence at least equal to our own, and resting on the very same foundation,) as error which we are "without a shadow of excuse" for holding. As a contrast to Bishop Taylor's view of God's truth about Episcopacy and passive obedience to the sovereign, take the assertion of the counter "truth" by his contemporary Dr Owen, the friend of Oliver Cromwell; and judge how ridiculous such displays of dogmatism must be in the eyes of all who can admit the notion that their own side of a question is not the only one that *may* be true. "*It hath pleased God,*" says that earnest and able divine, "so to order things in this kingdom *that the work of recovering his worship to its PURITY, and restoring the civil state to its liberty,* should be both carried on at the same time by the same persons. Are there none now in this kingdom to whom [*i.e.*, according to whose allegation] *this reforming* is an almost everting of God's worship? And are there none that have asserted that our new religion hath caused all those tumults and bloodshed? *And doth not every unprejudiced man see that these are HELLISH LIES and malicious accusations,* having indeed neither ground nor colour, but only their coincidence in respect of time?"*

Who shall decide when *such* doctors disagree?—each of them so worthy of our respect for his eminent talents, piety, learning, and love of truth :

"How shall we e'er discover which is right,
When both so eagerly maintain the fight?
Each does the other's arguments deride;
Each has the Church and Scripture on his side."†

If one *must* be wrong, may not *both* have erred? And if only one, how can this fact be *authoritatively* made known? "It were well," says one of these very theologians (who, however, as it appears, did not profit on every occasion by the wisdom he expresses); "it were well if men would as much consider themselves as the doctrines, and think that they may as well be deceived by their own weakness, as persuaded by the arguments of a doctrine which other men, as wise, call inevident."‡ And Baxter observes: "It is a hard thing to be certain on either side in those controversies which have multitudes, and in a manner equal strength, of learned, judicious, well-studied, godly, impartial men for each part."§ Even those who are orthodox (in his own acceptance of the term), have, as he elsewhere admits, "their errors, and are not orthodox in all things;" so that when a man has the good fortune to think rightly on the points where *they* err, he must either adopt their errors and become a *real* schismatic, or reject them and be "esteemed and called a schismatic" by the erring orthodox! "For thinking themselves in the right,"

* A Country Essay for the Practice of Church Government there; Owen's Works, vol. xv., p. 84, Russell's ed.

† Pomfret's "Reason." These lines are applied by the poet to a shockingly scurrilous controversy between South and Sherlock about the Trinity; of which a brief notice will be found in Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature, vol. i., p. 442, and some specimens in Dr Vicesimus Knox's Winter Evenings, Ev. lxx., "On the Spirit of Controversy." The reader has already seen (p. 48) a fine flower of rhetoric, culled from the pages of Dr South.

‡ Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, Epistle Dedicatory.

§ Baxter's treatise "Of Falsely-pretended Knowledge;" Works, vol. xv., p. 57.

says he, "they will too often take it for their duty to let fly at others, as erroneous or dangerous persons, that are not of their mind; and in this mistake THEY THINK THEY DO GOD SERVICE TO DEFAME DISSENTERS, and raise jealousies and suspicions of them, and bid men take heed of them, as of them that hold some dangerous opinions; WHEN IT IS THEMSELVES THAT ARE DECEIVED, and should turn those jealousies and cautious homewards."*

"Disputes in religion," says the sagacious Selden, "will never be ended—because there wants a measure by which the business would be decided. The Puritan would be judged by the word of God: *If he would speak clearly, he means himself, but he is ashamed to say so*; and he would have me believe him before a whole Church, that has read the word of God as well as he. One says one thing, and another another; and there is, I say, no measure to end the controversy. 'Tis just as if two men were at bowls, and both judged by the eye: One says it is his cast, the other says it is my cast; and having no measure, the difference is eternal. Ben Johnson satirically expressed the vain disputes of divines by Inigo Lantherne, disputing with his puppet in a Bartholomew fair. It is so: It is not so: It is so: It is not so: crying thus one to another a quarter of an hour together."†

Nothing could be better put than this; and as Selden was a member of the Westminster Assembly, perhaps in uttering these remarks he had the disputes of his clerical colleagues especially in his eye.

It is truly refreshing to contrast with the violent and dogmatic language of our old theologians, the following calm and rational statement, by Bishop Watson, of a *principle* which bears on one of the subjects of the foregoing extracts from Taylor and Owen. Brief as it is, it lays the axe with great effect to the root of many a tedious controversy. "It might be expected," says he, "that different Churches would with too much warmth endeavour to support their different modes of Government and Worship, by attempting to prove them correspondent to such as were established by the Apostles; *taking it for granted, that the nearer they approached to the model of an Apostolic Church, the more perfect they would become*: NOT CONSIDERING, IN THE FIRST PLACE, THAT THE APOSTLES MIGHT, FOR THE SAKE OF GAINING THE JEWS TO CHRISTIANITY, HAVE A RESPECT IN A GREAT MANY PARTICULARS TO THE FORMS OF THE JEWISH SYNAGOGUE, WHICH ARE IN NO WISE BINDING UPON CHRISTIANS OF LATER AGES; *nor, in the second, that the apostles were endued with such extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, as might make their example, in many instances of spiritual discipline especially, very unfit for future Christians to follow.*"‡

These warnings—to which hundreds equally strong might be added—against the error of paying too much respect to the opinions of men, whether speaking as individuals, or in the collective capacity of "true Churches" claiming or having ascribed to them the faculty of teaching God's truth, and it alone,—might well suffice here; but the practice is unhappily so prevalent, so deep-rooted, and in its consequences so hurtful, that I am induced to extract the following clear and pointed observations upon it by Locke, from an "Essay on Study," first published by Lord King in his Life of that illustrious

* Treatise of Self-Denial, chap. 48; Works, vol. xi., p. 290.

† Table-Talk; Works, vol. iii., part ii., p. 2068.

‡ Charge delivered in 1813; Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i., p. 164-5.

philosopher—"the man," as Charles James Fox truly says, "who was destined to be the most successful adversary of superstition and tyranny."*

"Our first and great duty," says he, "is to bring to our studies and to our inquiries after knowledge a mind covetous of truth; that seeks after nothing else, and after that impartially, *and embraces it, how poor, how contemptible, how unfashionable soever it may seem.* This is that which all studious men profess to do, and yet it is that where I think very many miscarry. Who is there almost that has not opinions planted in him by education time out of mind; which by that means come to be as the municipal laws of the country, *which must not be questioned, but are then looked on with reverence as the STANDARDS OF RIGHT AND WRONG, TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD;* when perhaps these so sacred opinions were but the oracles of the nursery, or the traditional grave talk of those who pretend to inform our childhood; who receive them from hand to hand without ever examining them? This is the fate of our tender age, which being thus seasoned early, it grows by continuation of time, as it were, into the very constitution of the mind, which afterwards very difficultly receives a different tincture. When we are grown up, we find the world divided into bands and companies; not only as congregated under several politics and governments, but united only upon account of opinions, and in that respect, combined strictly one with another, and distinguished from others, especially in matters of religion. If birth or chance have not thrown a man young into any of these, which yet seldom fails to happen, choice, when he is grown up, certainly puts him into some or other of them; often out of an opinion that that party is in the right, and sometimes because he finds it is not safe to stand alone, and therefore thinks it convenient to herd somewhere. Now, in every one of these parties of men there are a certain number of opinions which are received and owned as the doctrines and tenets of that society, to the profession and practice whereof all who are of their communion ought to give up themselves, or else they will be scarce looked on as of that society, or at best be thought but lukewarm brothers, or in danger to apostatize.

"It is plain, in the great difference and contrariety of opinions that are amongst these several parties, *that there is much falsehood and abundance of mistakes in most of them.*† Cunning in some, and ignorance in others, first made them keep them up; and yet how seldom is it that implicit faith, fear of losing credit with the party or interest (for all these operate in their turns), suffers any one to question the tenet of his party; but altogether in a bundle he receives, embraces, and, without examining, he professes and sticks to them, *and measures all other opinions by them.* Worldly interest also insinuates into several men's minds divers opinions, which, suiting with their temporal advantage, are kindly received, and in time so riveted there, that it is not easy to remove them. By these, and perhaps other means, opinions come to be settled and fixed in men's minds, *which, whether true or false, there they remain in reputation as substantial material truths,* and so are seldom questioned or examined by those who entertain them; and if they happen to be false, as in most men the greatest part must necessarily be, they put a man quite out of the way in the

* Fox's History of the Reign of James II., p. 54.

† That is to say, much that the honest members of most parties (or churches) regard as at once *their own truth* and *God's truth*, while it is *only* their own.

whole course of his studies; and though in his reading and inquiries he flatters himself that his design is to inform his understanding in the real knowledge of truth, yet in effect it tends and reaches to nothing but the confirming of his already received opinions, the things he meets with in other men's writings and discourses being received or neglected as they hold proportion with those anticipations which before had taken possession of his mind. This will plainly appear if we look but on an instance or two of it. It is a principal doctrine of the Roman party to believe that their Church is infallible; this is received as the mark of a good Catholic, and implicit faith, or fear, or interest, keeps all men from questioning it. This being entertained as an undoubted principle, see what work it makes with Scripture and reason; neither of them will be heard,—though speaking with never so much clearness and demonstration,—when they contradict any of the doctrines or institutions; and though it is not grown to that height, barefaced to deny the Scripture, yet interpretations and distinctions evidently contrary to the plain sense and to the common apprehensions of men, are made use of to elude its meaning, and preserve entire the authority of this their principle, that the Church is infallible. On the other side, make the light within our guide, and see what will become of reason and Scripture. An Hobbist, with his principle of self-preservation, whereof himself is to be judge, will not easily admit a great many plain duties of morality. The same must necessarily be found in all men who have taken up principles without examining the truth of them. It being here, then, that men take up prejudice to truth without being aware of it, and afterwards, like men of corrupted appetites, when they think to nourish themselves, generally feed only on those things that suit with and increase the vicious humour,—this part is carefully to be looked after. These ancient pre-occupations of our minds, these several and almost sacred opinions, are to be examined, if we will make way for truth, and put our minds in that freedom which belongs and is necessary to them. *A mistake is not the less so, and will never grow into a truth, because we have believed it a long time, though perhaps it be the harder to part with; AND AN ERROR IS NOT THE LESS DANGEROUS, NOR THE LESS CONTRARY TO TRUTH, BECAUSE IT IS CRIED UP AND HAD IN VENERATION BY ANY PARTY, though it is likely we shall be the less disposed to think it so.* Here, therefore, we have need of all our force and all our sincerity; and here it is we have use of the assistance of a serious and sober friend, who may help us sedately to examine these our received and beloved opinions; for the mind by itself being prepossessed with them cannot so easily question, look round, and argue against them. They are the darlings of our minds, and it is as hard to find fault with them, as for a man in love to dislike his mistress: there is need, therefore, of the assistance of another, at least it is very useful impartially to shew us their defects, and help us to try them by the plain and evident principles of reason or religion.*

* Lord King's Life of Locke, edit. 1830, vol. i., pp. 188–193. See also, in vol. ii., p. 196, part of Locke's unpublished Defence of Nonconformity. I strongly recommend likewise the perusal of his small but invaluable treatise on the Conduct of the Understanding, a good edition of which may be procured for sixpence, and which young men desirous of mental improvement, and emancipation from prejudice, will find it advantageous to study. There is much excellent matter also in Dr Ibbot's Sermons on the Right and Duty of Private

Let us now direct our attention to the people of Scotland in particular, and inquire what is recognised among *them* as THE STANDARD OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH. In *words* they of course acknowledge as such the Bible alone; but everybody familiar with the general *practice* of the orthodox, is aware that the Westminster Confession and Catechism, as *the true and authorized exponents* of Scripture, have with them the supreme authority *in fact*. I have even heard a minister of the Established Church expressly refer to them, in conversation, as the standards of truth; thus setting at nought the declaration of one of the very documents he was idolizing, that the Bible alone, as interpreted by its reader, is the written standard of religious truth. In that act of his, there was a more glaring inconsistency than even in the conduct of the son who, when desired by his father to go and work in the vineyard, answered, "I go, sir," and went not (Matt. xxi. 30): for the son's promise was not incongruous in itself, but was broken by his subsequent neglect; whereas, whoever professes to regard the Westminster Confession as the standard of truth, does *by that profession itself* shew that his idolatry of it is but *verbal*, although, in his ignorance or forgetfulness, he may fancy it to be *real*. Such inconsistency, it may be hoped, is far from being general amongst the clergy; but however this may be, there is unhappily no room for doubt, that, in the opinion of many *laymen* who self-complacently enrol themselves among "the people of God," whoever disbelieves any article laid down in the Confession or Catechism, is by the mere fact of doing so convicted of heresy: he is "unsound in the faith;" a holder of "dangerous error;" one who deserves to be frowned upon, shunned, thwarted, slandered, despitefully used, and, as far as may be, persecuted into the way of salvation.

Documents on which reliance so implicit is reposed in matters of the highest importance, surely ought to have something in their origin and history to justify such confidence. It is worth our while, therefore, to bestow some pains in endeavouring to find out whether good grounds for thorough confidence exist.

Were the compilers of the standards of the Church of Scotland fallible or infallible? "Fallible, of course!" is the universal reply.

Were these fallible compilers, then, *less likely* to misunderstand the Scriptures than other fallible men?

This is a question which some may never have thought of putting to themselves; but, if their principles agree with their practice, they must, now when it is put, of necessity answer "Yes."

Who, then, it may next be inquired, *were* these profound and knowing persons who were less liable to mistake than other mortals, and whose

Judgment, forming part of vol. ii. of the Boyle Lectures;—Dr Isaac Watts's treatises on the Improvement of the Mind, and on Logic or the Right Use of Reason in the Inquiry after Truth;—Dr Abercrombie's tract on the Culture and Discipline of the Mind;—Dr Channing on Creeds, in vol. i., p. 353 of the Belfast edition of his Works;—Section III. of Outline of the Opinions of Jeremy Bentham, prefixed to his Works, and abridged in Burton's Benthamiana, p. 364;—Dr Drummond's Letters to a Young Naturalist, p. 168 (Lond. 1831); and Dr Thomas Brown's charming description of "the philosophic spirit," in the penultimate paragraph of his 1st Lecture on Moral Philosophy. Finally, the classical and exhaustive treatises of Mr Samuel Bailey on The Formation and Publication of Opinions, and The Pursuit of Truth, ought to have a prominent place in the library of the independent thinker.

interpretations of Scripture we should receive, if not implicitly, at least with that reverence which is ever due to the wisest and best of men ?

There are many who, were you to propose to them this question, would find it a perplexing one, and perhaps begin to wonder that it had never occurred to their minds. After considering a little, they might find it necessary to confess their inability to name a single man who had a hand in preparing the standards of the Church : "It was the Assembly of Divines at Westminster that did the business ; but really they had never thought of inquiring who these divines were !"

To dispel this strange ignorance about an object of so much respect, you make known to them the fact that there is prefixed to the Confession a list of the divines who composed the Assembly which produced it. In that list are specified ninety-eight Englishmen, with five clerical and three lay commissioners from the Church of Scotland.

The list having been attentively perused, you next invite your friends to assign the reasons which have convinced them that the persons named in it were so wise, learned, and unprejudiced, that their published interpretations of Scripture ought to be accepted with reverence by all succeeding generations.

After a long pause, during which the list is once more carefully scanned, the answer perhaps drops out, that a grave and learned Assembly of Divines who met for the special purpose of deliberating on the meaning of Scripture, was surely much better qualified to determine the true meaning than any private Christian can be ; that those were the bright and favoured times of the Church, when the Holy Spirit was more abundantly poured out than in these latter days, and when God's truth was more clearly discerned than, but for the labours of those godly divines, it could now have been by us ; and, in short, that as the Church and everybody says and knows that the Confession of Faith is entirely in accordance with Scripture, none but a caviller like yourself can pretend to have a doubt upon the subject.

Hereupon you beg leave to remind them that your question was simply this—Wherein lies that superiority of the men who assembled at Westminster, which renders it fit that their interpretations of Scripture should be humbly received by all other Christians, on pain of being treated as heretics ? "Why, pray, ought you and I, and everybody else, to adopt, without hesitation or question, the theological opinions of Dr Humphrey Chambers of Claverstoun, Thomas Micklethwait of Cherryburton, Andrew Pern of Wilby, Daniel Cawdrey of Great Billing, Henry Scudder of Colinborn, or even Alexander Henderson of Edinburgh (wise and excellent as he was), or that 'worthy servant of Christ,' yet fierce champion of intolerance, the Reverend Samuel Rutherford of St Andrews ?"

To this precise and pertinent question, blank looks are the sole answer you receive ; and you correctly infer that the notion has now happily entered the minds of your friends, that, after all, the Confession *may* contain an error or two which the learning and sagacity of later generations have brought to light. So far well ; but you wish to deepen the impression that has been made, and to render it so permanent, that to doubt the infallibility of Humphrey Chambers and Henry Scudder shall never more be considered the same thing as to call in question the revealed truth of God. With this view, you proceed to lay before them such a historical sketch as the following.

In the year 1643, shortly after the abolition of Episcopacy in England, an "Assembly of learned and godly divines and others" was summoned by the Long Parliament, to meet in Henry VII.'s Chapel at Westminster, for the purpose of *deliberating, and, when required, advising the Legislature*, as to the form of Church-government "most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other Reformed Churches abroad;" "and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions."*

The Assembly is described by Dr Hetherington as "composed of the great master-minds of the age" (p. 2); but the sober truth is to be found in the statement of Milton, that the divines "were neither chosen by any rule or custom ecclesiastical, nor eminent for either piety or knowledge above others left out; only as each member of Parliament in his private fancy thought fit, so elected one by one."† Most of them, nevertheless, appear to have fully or partially deserved the eulogium which Baxter accords them; namely, that "the divines there congregated were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial abilities, and fidelity; and," he adds, "being not worthy to be one of them myself, I may more freely speak the truth, even in the face of malice and envy; that, as far as I am able to judge by the information of all history of that kind, and by any other evidences left us, the Christian world, since the days of the apostles, had never a synod of more excellent divines than this and the Synod of Dort."‡ Such a testimony from such a man is sufficient to outweigh any amount of disparagement from royalist writers like Clarendon and Butler.§ Isaac Walton's assertion that many of the members were very unfit to judge of the Church-controversies which they endeavoured to settle,|| may be quite true; and so far as the Independents and Erastians in the Assembly are concerned, and the controversies related to Church-government, Dr Hetherington himself will hardly object to the character thus given, since he declares himself unable to regard the judgment even of the learned Lightfoot as "entitled to much deference" (p. 309). Baillie, one of the Scottish commissioners, remarks upon another member of the Assembly—"one Mr Coleman, a professed Erastian"—that he was "a man reasonably learned, but stupid and inconsiderate, half a pleasant, and of small estimation."¶ That the learning of *some* of the members did not merit even the faint praise of being "reasonable," appears from a passage in Whitelock, which perhaps will surprise the reader. "Divers members of both Houses," says he, "were members of the Assembly of Divines, and had the same liberty

* See the Ordinance of Parliament in Rushworth's Historical Collections, vol. v., p. 337, or in Hetherington's History of the Westminster Assembly, p. 92.

† Milton's Fragment of a History of England, quoted in Orme's Life of Baxter, p. 70. See also Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, B. v., vol. i., p. 414, edit. 1702.

‡ Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, Part I., p. 93.

§ See Clarendon, vol. i., p. 415; also Butler's Remains, and the Notes to Hudibras, Part I., canto i., v. 811, and to canto ii., v. 702.

|| Walton's Life of Bishop Sanderson.

¶ Baillie's Letters, Bannatyne Club edition, vol. ii., p. 360; and Hetherington, p. 284.

as the divines to sit and debate, and give their votes in every matter which was in consideration amongst them; in which debates Mr Selden* spake admirably, and confuted divers of them in their own learning. And sometimes when they had cited a text of Scripture to prove their assertion, he would tell them, 'Perhaps in your little pocket-bibles with gilt leaves' (which they would often pull out and read) 'the translations may be thus, but the Greek or the Hebrew signifies thus and thus;' and so would totally refute them."†

This passage is omitted by the reverend historian of the Assembly, probably because he did not consider that it would be for edification.

It appears from Lightfoot's Journal of the Proceedings of the Divines, that they had many warm debates, and that the question in

* "The chief of learned men reputed in this land, Mr Selden."—(*Milton's Prose Works*, vol. ii., p. 66.) "Three of the most learned men that England ever bred, Sir Henry Spelman, Sir Robert Cotton, and Mr Selden."—(*Biog. Brit.*, vol. vi., Part i., p. 4278.) "The immense learning and robust sense of Selden."—(*Coleridge's Table-Talk*, vol. i., p. 85.)

† Whitelock's Memorials of the English Affairs, &c., p. 68. Lond., 1682.—Of the learning of most of the *Scottish* clergy in the seventeenth century, the following account is given in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xx., p. 27. After remarking that the genius of the *Scottish* Reformation was decidedly friendly to the cultivation of literature, and that its great champions were all persons of great learning and literary attainments, the writer proceeds as follows:—"The decline of classical learning that became visible among our clergy upwards of a century thereafter, was so far from being a natural consequence of their Presbyterian establishment, that we do not scruple to refer it altogether to the tyranny by which that Establishment was crushed, and the depression in which all its members were held during the period that elapsed from the union of the crowns to the Revolution 1688. The crown, and a great proportion of the nobility, being bent upon the establishment of Episcopacy, subjected the Presbyterian ministers to the most barbarous persecution; and by degrading them in point of fortune, and driving them from all places of honour and distinction, not only deprived them of the means of liberal instruction, but naturally led them to adopt that vehement, but low and vulgar tone which was accommodated to the rank of the greater part of their hearers, and was naturally produced by the operation of strong feelings upon minds excluded from the means of liberal information."

Such were the men who seem to be adopted as models by certain of the *Scottish* Presbyterian clergy of the present day, and whose oracular dogmatism was rebuked by Cromwell in his celebrated "Letter to the General Assembly of the Kirk," where he pointedly addressed them as follows:—"I am persuaded that divers of you, who lead the people, have laboured to build yourselves in these things; wherein you have censured others, and established yourselves [upon the Word of God.] *Is it, therefore, infallibly agreeable to the Word of God, all that YOU say? I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, THINK IT POSSIBLE YOU MAY BE MISTAKEN.*"—(*Carlyle's Cromwell*, vol. ii., p. 20.) "We look at ministers" says he with equal plainness, in a letter to the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, dated 12th September 1650, "as helpers of, not lords over, God's people. I appeal to their consciences whether any trying their doctrines and dissenting, shall not incur the censure of sectary? *And what is this but to deny Christians their liberty, and assume the Infallible Chair? WHAT DOTHE HE WHOM WE WOULD NOT BE LIKENED UNTO DO MORE THAN THIS?*"—(Vol. ii., p. 61.)

It is not surprising that Sir Walter Scott, in treating of the prosecutions for witchcraft in the middle of the seventeenth century, should mention it as undeniable, "that the Presbyterian ecclesiastics, who, in Scotland, were often appointed by the Privy Council commissioners for the trial of witchcraft, *evinced a very extraordinary degree of credulity in such cases*, and that the temporary superiority of the same sect in England was marked by enormous cruelties of this kind."—(*Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*, p. 253.)

dispute was sometimes decided by a narrow majority.* Two of the more amicable discussions, on subjects of general interest, may here be quoted, as specimens of the manner in which the business of the Assembly was conducted.

The first, which was on the question, Whether parents should be required to profess their faith at the baptism of their children? is recorded by Lightfoot as follows:—

“*Thursday, Oct. 10, 1644.* . . . Then began we upon our work; the question, ‘Whether the parent, at the baptizing of his child, is to answer any question, or make any profession of his faith, and stipulation in behalf of the child?’ The Scots did urge it mightily, because of the use of it in all reformed Churches.

“Mr Marshal moved, that it might be utterly omitted; but Mr Henderson shewed what distaste this might give to other Churches.

“Dr Gouge moved with the Scots, and so did Mr Gattaker.

“Mr Wilson opposed it as unwarrantable, to make any memorials which God hath not made.

“Mr Walker: In all times there hath been a stipulation; and baptism being the seal of the covenant, *ergo* is not to be put to a blank.

“Mr Nye: 1. This will be an unnecessary burden: 2. This will break uniformity; for though some will do this, others will not.

“Mr Calamy: Those that were baptized by John, and those catechumens that professed, did it not only ‘*nomine suo*,’ but also of their children.

“Mr Bridges: It is the proper work of Christ to appoint memorials. If such confession be made, and that in regard of child, so it hangs baptism too much upon a confession; or in regard of parent, and then it may be a wrong to put that to him that is a member, and not member alike.

“This debate held us all day; at last it was voted affirmatively, that the parent should make a profession at the baptism of his child.”†

The subject of the next extract is the Sabbath:—

“Then fell a debate, whether we should handle the celebration of the Sabbath in our Directory, or Catechism and Confession, and how we should do it, to avoid offence of Judaism on one hand, and profaneness on the other; and how we may bring in the private duties of the Sabbath in our own families in a Directory for Public Worship. But it was concluded to fall upon the work, and so to it we went. . . .

“Mr Wilkinson, sen., put this query,—How should we regulate iron-works and glass-works? but this was answered by this next proposition.

“Second Prop.: ‘To abstain from all unnecessary labours, worldly sports, and recreations.’

“The debate upon this was, about putting in prohibition of worldly discourses; and some moved to add, ‘worldly thoughts.’ This was scrupulous, whether we should not be a scorn to go about to bind men’s thoughts; but at last it was concluded on to be added, both for the more piety, and for that the Fourth Command includes it.

* See Lightfoot’s Works by Pitman, vol. xiii., pp. 10-15, 143, 147, 159, 214, 267, 297, 300, 309. Baillie also speaks of “the wrangling humour which long predominated in many.”—(Vol. ii., p. 248.)

† *Ib.*, pp. 315, 316.

“Third Prop. : ‘That there be no feasting on the Sabbath.’

“This Mr Marshal opposed, and Dr Temple and I myself. They instanced in Christ’s feasting, Luke xiv., and in his feasting, at least dining, with all his disciples in Peter’s house, Matt. viii.

“Therefore it was proposed thus,—‘That the diet on the Sabbath day be so ordered, that no servants or others be unnecessarily kept from the public service ;’ and so it was passed.”*

On one occasion Dr Burgess told the Assembly how “they were scandaled by reports that they carried all things in a tumultuary way.”—(P. 186.) On another, when they took into consideration “the sad tidings of my Lord General’s defeat in the west,” and “what might be the cause that God is so provoked,” a committee was, after a whole day’s fruitless debate, appointed “to draw up something to that purpose.” Next day (10th Sept. 1644), “the first work was, the committee appointed yesterday, brought in what they conceived the causes of our present misery :—As, 1. The sins of the Assembly ; as neglect of the service, as in slackness in coming, and departing at pleasure : 2. By absenting from prayers : 3. Manifesting neglect in the time of debate, and neglecting committees : 4. Some speaking too much, some too little : 5. By irreverent carriage : 6. By heats in debating : 7. Driving on parties : 8. Not serious examination of ministers.” The sins of the armies and Parliament are next specified—those of Parliament including, “Not active in suppressing Anabaptists and Antinomians ;” “Not suppressing stage plays, taverns, profaneness, and scoffing of ministers ;” “Not a free publishing of truths, for fear of losing a party.” The journal proceeds—“When this was read over, we fell upon debate of them ; and, first, Mr Henderson moved, that our private failings here might not be published to the world, which was thought most rational by divers ; *only we sadly convinced ourselves of them here amongst ourselves.*”—(Pp. 309, 310.)

Dr Hetherington has imitated the prudence of Mr Henderson in regard to the publication of these failings. The passage, however, affords a curious specimen of the deliberations of “the great master-minds of the age,” and an instructive exhibition of the notions then entertained by “master-minds” as to the manner in which the affairs of this world are administered by the Deity. But, without dwelling on such considerations, I proceed to observe, that even if the expression of self-reproach here quoted be supposed to have derived some little exaggeration from the puritainical medium through which the conduct of the writer and his colleagues was viewed, still it is plain that such an Assembly as this was by no means the best possible tribunal for the settlement of religious truth ; and that its decisions (had it pretended *to decide with authority*) would have deserved no extraordinary amount of reverence from other Christians. Besides, may not Jortin’s remark upon the ancient councils of the Church be as applicable to the Westminster Divines, as it is to some large deliberative ecclesiastical assemblies in still later times than theirs ? “In the Nicene Council,” says that learned and candid historian, “there were undoubtedly not a few learned, pious, and virtuous prelates, and holy confessors ; and some worthy persons, though not so many, in

*Lightfoot, vol. xiii., pp. 327-9.

some of the subsequent general councils: but *in such assemblies the best and the most moderate men seldom have the ascendant, and they are often led or driven by others who are far inferior to them in good qualities.*"*

It is but justice to the Westminster Divines to add, that, whatever may have been the case with Samuel Rutherford and some of his brother Presbyterians individually, the Assembly as a body, so far from claiming any such idolatry as that with which they are commonly regarded, have expressly declared in their Confession, that "all synods or councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore *they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice*, but to be used as an help in both:" and that it is only "*if consonant to the word of God*" (of which consonance every particular Christian is, and must be, the judge for himself), that "their decrees and determinations are to be received with reverence and submission."† Again, "The supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."—(Chap. i., art. x. See also chap. xx., "Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience," art. ii.) What the Assembly understood by "the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture," could be nothing but the judgment of any Christian reading it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; the reality of which guidance, as it could not be certainly known to other Christians, so could never be reasonably proposed by him as the means of determining the controversies he might have with them. For if he, believing himself to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, finds in Scripture "truths" which other men, equally convinced that they enjoy Divine guidance, declare to be contrary to Scripture, then, if *this* believer may legitimately and *authoritatively* adduce what *he* regards as the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture, his opponents are entitled to do likewise; and so the Holy Spirit may be made to contradict Himself. The views of Selden—the most distinguished member of the Westminster Assembly—on the point before us, appear from the following passage in his *Table Talk*:—"When the preacher says, 'This is the meaning of the Holy Ghost in such a place,' in sense he can mean no more than this—that is, 'I, by studying of the place, by comparing one place with another, by weighing what goes before and what comes after, think this is the meaning of

* Remarks on Eccl. Hist., by John Jortin, D.D., vol. ii., p. 35. Edit. 1805.

The following passage is quoted from Baxter by a dissenting minister of Edinburgh, in a pamphlet published a few years ago, in which it is said to refer to the Westminster Assembly. Not having observed it in Baxter's Works, which are extremely voluminous, and no reference being given in the pamphlet, I cannot tell where it occurs; but both from the style and the matter it appears to be perfectly authentic. "I have lived," says Baxter, "to see an assembly of ministers, where three or four leading men were so prevalent as to form a confession in the name of the whole party, which had that in it which particular members did disown. And when, about a controverted article, one man hath charged me deeply with questioning the words of the Church, others, who were at the forming of that article, have laid it all on that same man, the rest being loath to strive much against him; and so it was he himself was the Church, whose authority he so much urged."

† Westminster Confession, chap. xxxi., art. iv. and iii.

the Holy Ghost, and for shortness of expression I say, the Holy Ghost says thus, or this is the meaning of the Spirit of God.' So the judge speaks of the king's proclamation, 'This is the intention of the king: not that the king had declared his intention any other way to the judge; but the judge examining the contents of the proclamation, gathers by the purport of the words the king's intention, and then for shortness of expression says, 'This is the king's intention.'''*

Bishop Hoadly treats of an analogous subject in his *Vindication of the Ancient Prophets*, addressed to Sir Richard Bulkely. "If," says he, "you will not believe that Almighty God will suffer *you*, who do truly seek him, to be so deluded as to take that for his inspiration which is not, how can others believe that he will suffer *them* to be so deluded as not to lead them to the acknowledgment of his hand in this matter, when they make it their business to attend upon him, and pray him to lead them into all important truth? For it is as great a crime not to believe in that dispensation to which he plainly attests, as it is to believe in what he doth not truly attest to. And therefore, if he may suffer as good Christians as any are (which you cannot deny), to be so deluded as not to believe in what you believe in, why may not he suffer others to be so deluded as to believe in it, supposing it not to be from him? The case is equally reasonable, or absurd, on both sides. Besides, by this way of arguing, if there be but one of these good Christians who believes any dispensation to be the immediate hand of God, this is ground enough for all the world besides, who believe him to be a good Christian in other respects, to embrace the same belief, without 'trying the spirits' or being at any trouble: for as sure as God is (say you, with an air of assurance peculiar to some sort of persons), such a Christian cannot be deluded. That God will suffer a truly honest Christian, who constantly depends upon him, to be eternally lost, through any failure in his brain, I can by no means think. But that God will preserve such an one from all error, and especially in cases in which imagination and constitution bear a great and perhaps to him an irresistible sway, I see not the least shadow of reason to believe; and most absurd are the consequences of such an assertion."†

When finished, the Confession was, on 3d December 1646, presented to Parliament by the whole Assembly in a body; and the title which they gave it was not *A Standard of divine Truth*, but "The humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines and others, now by the authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Confession of Faith." It would have been strange if a man like Henderson, of whom Baillie says that "a more modest, humble spirit . . . lives not this day in the Reformed Churches,"‡ and whose good sense and moderation were equal to his modesty, had sanctioned a higher pretension.

On 22d March 1648, the Commons declared their agreement with the Assembly in the doctrinal part of the Confession, and desired the same might "be made public," for this purpose merely—"that this

* Selden's Works, vol. iii., part ii., p. 2059.

† Hoadly's Works, vol. i., p. 127.

‡ Baillie's Historical Vindication of the Church of Scotland, quoted in Aiton's Life of Henderson, p. 610.

kingdom, and all the Reformed Churches of Christendom, may see the Parliament of England differ not in doctrine."* Its title was equally unassuming: "Articles of Religion approved and passed by both Houses of Parliament, after advice with an Assembly of Divines called together by them for that purpose."

As Lightfoot's Journal comes down no farther than the end of 1644, till which time the form of Church-government was the main subject of discussion, it affords but little indication of the extent to which differences of opinion on *doctrinal points* prevailed among the members. As, however, only Calvinists were summoned, considerable unanimity on the leading articles of faith may be presumed to have existed. But that the unanimity was by no means perfect, appears from the following information given by Neal:—"Nor is it to be supposed that the Confession of Faith itself, which determines so many abstruse points of divinity, should have the unanimous and hearty consent of the whole Assembly or Parliament: for though all the divines were in the anti-Arminian scheme, yet some had a greater latitude than others. I find in my MS. the dissent of several members against some expressions relating to reprobation, to the imputation of the active as well as passive obedience of Christ, and to several passages in the chapters Of Liberty of Conscience, and Church Discipline; but the Confession, as far as related to articles of faith, passed the Assembly and Parliament by a very great majority. Various censures," he adds, "have been passed by learned men upon this laboured performance: some have loaded it with undeserved reproaches; and others, perhaps, have advanced its reputation too high. . . . Upon the whole, the Assembly's Confession, with all its faults, has been ranked by very good judges among the most perfect systems of divinity that have been published upon the Calvinistic or anti-Arminian principles in the last age." †

Baillie writes in 1646:—"Our Assembly, with much ado, at last have wrestled through the whole Confession, and all is now printed. The House of Commons requires to put Scripture to it before they take it into consideration; and what time that will take up, who knows? We had past a quarter of the Catechise, and thought to have made short work of the rest; but they are fallen into such mislikes, and endless janglings, about both the method and the matter, and all thinks it will be a long work." ‡

In a speech delivered, after his return from London, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland at Edinburgh, on 6th August 1647, Baillie congratulated that august body that "a large Confession of Faith is perfected with far greater unanimity than any living

* Rushworth, vol. vii., p. 1035.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 321, ed. 1822. Dr Hetherington says:—"It is exceedingly gratifying to be able to state, that throughout the deliberations of the Assembly, when composing the Confession of Faith, there prevailed almost an entire and perfect harmony. There appear indeed to have been only two subjects on which any difference of opinion existed among them. The one of these was the doctrine of election, concerning which, as Baillie says, they had long and tough debates: 'Yet,' he adds, 'thanks to God, all is gone right according to our mind.'—(Baillie, vol. ii., p. 325.) The other question was, whether the Lord Jesus had appointed a church government distinct from that of the civil magistrate?"—(Hist. of Westm. Assem. p. 300.)

‡ Baillie's Letters, vol. ii., p. 415.

could have hoped for, among so many learned divines, in so distempered a place and distracted a season. I am confident, if the judgment of many my wiser do not deceive, this piece of work is so fine and excellent, that whenever you shall be pleased to look upon it, the sight of it shall draw from the most censorious eye a good acceptance."*

The "distempered" character, here noted, of the place where, and the "distracted" condition of the time when, the Confession was drawn up, are circumstances which no reflecting reader can overlook in estimating the probability of the Confession of Faith being a correct interpretation of Scripture. For, as "in troubled water you can scarce see your face—or see it very little, till the water be quiet and stand still,—so in troubled times you can see little truth, but when times are quiet and settled, then truth appears."† And, as Locke has remarked of confessions of faith generally, in his Essay for the Understanding of St Paul's Epistles by consulting St Paul Himself, "most of them are visibly made with partial views, and adapted to what the occasions of that time, and the present circumstances they were then in, were thought to require for the support or justification of themselves."‡ That this was the case with the Westminster Confession, would be evident to all who are familiar with the history of the times which produced it, even if we had not the express testimony of another of the Scottish commissioners, namely George Gillespie, that the actual "intention of framing it was to meet with all the considerable errors of the present time—the Socinian, Arminian, Popish, Antinomian, Anabaptist, Independent errors. The Confession of Faith," says he, "sets them out, and refutes them, so far as belongs to a Confession."§

Now, it is a well known tendency of human nature to fly from one extreme to another. In combating an opinion, we are prone to maintain its opposite with excessive confidence in our own knowledge and judgment—to overlook any weakness that may lurk in the grounds of our belief, and to perceive nothing but the most amazing fallacy in the reasons of our opponents. And men who have long suffered oppression, are apt, when the yoke is shaken off, to discard some good and lawful portions of government along with those which have justly become obnoxious to them. History is full of examples of such phenomena, and no history more so than that of the struggles of the English and Scottish Puritans against the tyranny of the Stewarts and the Prelatists throughout the seventeenth century. The members of the Westminster Assembly were all of the party which, after long and intense suffering, had just succeeded in emancipating itself from civil and ecclesiastical misrule; and it would have been wonderful indeed, if their tenets had failed to shew marks of an overstrained antagonism to the institutions and doctrines of their oppressors. Accordingly, we find it stated by Dr Hetherington, that the Dissenting Brethren who were members of the Assembly "had suffered so much from prelatist despotism, that they entertained a perfect horror of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, even to a most absurd extent, rendering

* Baillie's Letters, vol. iii., p. 11.

† Selden's Table-Talk; Works, vol. iii., Part ii., p. 2074.

‡ Locke's Works, vol. viii., p. 20, ed. 1823.

§ Gillespie's speech to the General Assembly at Edinburgh, 6th August 1647; Appendix to Baillie, vol. iii., p. 450.

them incapable of calm deliberation on the subject.”* Nor was it strange, he adds, that this should be the case, and that “by the strength of a violent revulsion and rebound, they should spring to the opposite conclusion, that there ought to be no power or jurisdiction, except that of the civil magistrate.”†

If, then, a violent revulsion was so natural in *this* instance, might not the like revulsions naturally occur in others? Might not the obtrusive Arminianism of Laud impel the Calvinistic divines to an indefensible extremity of Calvinism; and might not the earnest men whose horror and indignation had been excited by the tyrannical enforcement of the reading of the Book of Sports, spring, by the strength of a violent revulsion and rebound, to excess of Puritanical Sabbatarianism? How probable such an event was, may be judged from the representation which Dr Hetherington, himself entertaining the Sabbatarian opinions expressed in the Confession and Catechism, has furnished of the feelings with which the Book of Sports was regarded by the Nonconformists of the seventeenth century. “The strongly-contrasted tendencies of the two contending parties, Prelatists and Puritans,” says he, “were rendered very apparent in the year 1618, by the publication of the King’s Book of Sports. This book was drawn up by Bishop Moreton, at the king’s direction, and dated from Greenwich, May 24, 1618.‡ The pretext for producing such a book was, that the strictness of the Puritans in keeping the Sabbath-day alienated the people, and left them exposed to the temptations of the Jesuits, who took occasion to seduce them back to Popery. To prevent this His Majesty proposed, not that the people should be more carefully instructed in religion, but that, after Divine service, they should be indulged in such recreations as dancing, archery, leaping, May-games, Whitson-ales, morrice dances, setting up of May-poles, and such like amusements. That the people should meditate on their religious duties, and prepare to practise the instructions given them in God’s Word, did not seem to His Majesty at all a desirable matter,—it might have led them to favour Puritanism. Queen Elizabeth disapproved of preaching, lest it should teach the people to think, and perhaps to inquire into matters of state. King James aimed at the same result by making their only leisure-day, when they might possibly attempt the dangerous practice of cultivating their minds, a day of mere recreation. The reason is obvious. Thinking men cannot be slaves; and both these sovereigns were desirous of establishing a complete despotism. Religious men must think, and think solemnly and loftily; therefore, to prevent this, religion must give place to giddy mirth, and God’s hallowed day must be profaned by every kind

* Hist. of Westm. Assem., p. 241.

† *Ib.*, p. 245. See also p. 307.—“There is,” says Lord Bacon, “a superstition in avoiding superstition, when men think to do best if they go farthest from the superstition formerly received; therefore care should be had that (as it fareth in ill purgings,) the good be not taken away with the bad, which commonly is done when the people is the reformer.”—(*Essay Of Superstition.*) Even men of learning are subject to this tendency, though usually to a less extent than “the people.” Southey avows it in a letter to Sharon Turner, where he says: “I have an instinctive abhorrence of bigotry. When Dissenters talk of the Establishment, they make me feel like a high Churchman; and when I get among high Churchmen, I am ready to take shelter in dissent.”—(*Life and Correspondence*, vol. iv., p. 156.)

‡ “Fuller, vol. iii. pp. 270–273.”

of idle recreation. And what must be said of the High Church party, who lent their aid in this fearful desecration, and despotic scheme? Were they the friends of pure and holy religion, of rational improvement, of public freedom?

“This Book of Sports, however, was at first ordered to be read merely in the parish churches in Lancashire; but one author asserts that it would have been speedily extended over the kingdom but for the decisive refusal of Abbot, who had recently succeeded Bancroft in the archbishopric of Canterbury. But though a partial enforcement of this desecrating production was all that it could, at that time, obtain, its promulgation gave serious ground of dissatisfaction and dread to all the more decidedly pious persons in the kingdom, both Puritans and Churchmen, and tended not a little to confirm the growing jealousy of High Church measures.”—(P. 60–61.)

Again, speaking of the revival of the Book of Sports by Charles I. in 1633, and after commenting on Laud’s prohibition of doctrinal controversy respecting the Arminian tenets, and of afternoon lectures, which were generally conducted by Puritan nonconformists, he observes:—“The same sort of instinctive perception of the readiest method of promoting mental and moral degradation led Laud to persuade the king to revive the Book of Sports. This was accordingly done in the year 1633, in the name of that sovereign whom the Church of England still delights to style ‘The Martyr,’ though it would not be easy to tell of what cause he was the martyr, unless it were of prelatie profanity, superstition, and despotism. It was not over one county that the Book of Sports was now to be set up, in opposition to the Word of God; the bishops were directed to enforce the publication of it from the pulpit through all the parish churches of their respective dioceses. This caused great distress of mind to all the pious clergymen. Some refused to read it, and were suspended in consequence; others read it, and immediately after having done so, read also the Fourth Commandment, ‘Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy;’ adding, ‘This is the law of God; the other is the injunction of man.’ And notwithstanding the employment of both power and guile, the people generally refused to turn God’s appointed times of holy rest into periods of heathen saturnalia.”—(P. 66.)

The following details, given by Baxter in his treatise on the Divine Appointment of the Lord’s Day, shew how offensively this ill-judged measure was in some places carried into execution:—“I cannot forget,” says he, “that in my youth in those late times, when we lost the labours of some of our conformable godly teachers for not reading publicly the Book of Sports and Dancing on the Lord’s days, one of my father’s own tenants was the town-piper, hired by the year (for many years together), and the place of the dancing-assembly was not an hundred yards from our door, and we could not on the Lord’s day either read a chapter, or pray, or sing a psalm, or catechise, or instruct a servant, but with the noise of the pipe and tabor, and the shoutings in the street, continually in our ears; and even among a tractable people, we were the common scorn of all the rabble in the streets, and called Puritans, Precisians, and Hypocrites, because we rather chose to read the Scriptures than to do as they did; (though there was no savour of Nonconformity in our family.) And when the people by the book were allowed to play and dance out of public

service-time, they could so hardly break off their sports, that many a time the reader was fain to stay till the piper and players would give over; and sometimes the morrice-dancers would come into the church in all the linen and scarfs, and antic dresses, with morrice-bells jingling at their legs. And as soon as common-prayer was read, did haste out presently to their play again."*

Cordially disapproving, as I do, of *every* form of imposition by human authority in matters of faith and worship, I cannot but concur (on that ground) with Dr Hetherington, in condemning the imposition, by Charles II., of the reading of the Book of Sports, upon clergymen who held it in abhorrence. But I should be sorry to be believed capable of regarding the proceedings of either James or Charles in reference to that measure, with precisely the feelings which Dr Hetherington, looking at them from the Puritanical point of view, and under the influence of violent Puritanical prejudices, gives vent to in the passages quoted above. With respect to King James in particular, I am so far from going along with him in his denunciation, that, on the contrary, I altogether sympathise with the avowed, and (as we ought to believe until the contrary be shewn) the real motives, which led that good-natured monarch into a course which, when followed less wisely by his son, occasioned such deep and well-founded dissatisfaction. That James's purpose was to make Sunday "a day of *mere* recreation," or that he entertained any but the design ascribed to him by D'Israeli, of "rendering the Sabbath a day for the poor alike of devotion and enjoyment, hitherto practised in England, as it is still throughout Europe,"† I see not the slightest reason to conclude; everything tends to shew that his aim was merely the excellent one of protecting his subjects from the Puritanical tyranny of some local authorities, who, by forbidding the accustomed sports of the people on Sundays, had led to the laying of a just complaint before him. If the clear testimony of Fuller and Collier may be believed in preference to the unvouched assertion of Dr Hetherington, James went no farther than to proclaim that the people *should enjoy their ancient liberty*; and his proceeding, apart from any political inexpediency which may be attributable to it, was, in my opinion, worthy of all commendation. Fuller, in his Church History, under date May 29, 1618, introduces the subject as follows:—"King James having last year in his progress passed through Lancashire, took notice that '*by the preciseness of some magistrates and ministers in several places of this kingdom, in HINDERING people from their recreations on the Sunday, the Papists in this realm being thereby persuaded that no honest mirth or recreation was tolerable in our religion;*'‡ whereupon, the

* Baxter's Works, vol. xiii., p. 444. For an account of the *rise* of modern Sabbatarianism in England, see Note F.

† D'Israeli's Inquiry into the character of James I., in his Miscellanies of Literature, p. 345, ed. 1840. "Plays," he adds, "were performed on Sundays at court, in Elizabeth's reign; and yet 'the Protestants of Elizabeth' was the usual expressive phrase to mark those who did most honour to the reformed."

‡ "With our own ears," says he, "we heard the general complaint of our people;" and he laments that while they were denied "lawful recreations," they had substituted more vicious ones: alehouses were more frequented—drunkenness more general—tale-mongery and sedition, the vices of sedentary idleness, prevailed—while a fanatical gloom was spreading over the country.—(*D'Israeli*, p. 345.)

Court being then at Greenwich, he set forth a Declaration to this effect, that ‘*for his good people’s lawful recreations, his pleasure was, that AFTER THE END OF DIVINE SERVICE, they should not be disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawful recreations; such as dancing, either of men or women; archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations; nor from having of May-games, Whitsun-ales, or morris-dances, and setting up of May-poles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same be had in due and convenient time, WITHOUT IMPEDIMENT OR LET OF DIVINE SERVICE: and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decorating of it, according to their old custom; withal prohibiting all unlawful games to be used on the Sundays only, as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and (at all times in the meaner sort of people by law prohibited) bowling.*’”*

Considering how widely the Puritanical notions had by this time spread in England, we need not wonder that “when this Declaration was brought abroad,” great “grief and distraction thereby was occasioned in many honest men’s hearts, who looked on it, not as local for Lancashire, but what in process of time would enlarge itself all over England.” “However,” adds the historian, “there wanted not many, both in Lancashire and elsewhere, who conceived the Declaration came forth seasonably, to suppress the dangerous endeavour of such, who now began in their pulpits to broach the dregs of Judaism, and force Christians to drink them. So that those legal ceremonies, long since dead, buried, and rotten in the grave of our Saviour, had now their ghosts, as it were, walking; frightening such people with their terrible apparitions, who were persuaded by some preachers to so rigorous observation of the Sabbath, that therein it was unlawful to dress meat, sweep their houses, kindle the fire, or the like. Yea, and the Papists, in Lancashire especially (a frontier country, as I may term it, of Papists and Protestants, where the Reformed Religion had rather a truce than a peace, standing on its guard and posture of defence), I say, in Lancashire the Romanists made advantage of this

* “The King,” says D’Israeli, “whose gaiety of temper instantly sympathised with the multitude, and perhaps alarmed at this new shape which puritanism was assuming, published what is called the ‘Book of Sports,’ and which soon obtained the contemptuous term of the ‘The Dancing Book.’”

“On this subject, our recent principles have hitherto governed our decisions; with our habits formed, and our notions finally adjusted, this singular state-paper has been reprobated by piety; whose zeal, however, is not sufficiently historical. It was one of the state-maxims of this philosophic monarch in his advice to his son,

“‘To allure the common people to a common amitie among themselves; and that certain daies in the yeere should be appointed for delighting the people with public spectacles of all honest games and exercise of arms; making playes and lawful games in Maie, and good cheare at Christmas; as also for convening of neighbours, for entertaining friendship and heartlines, by honest feasting and merriness; so that the Sabbathes be kept holie, and no unlawful pastime be used. This form of contenting the people’s minds has been used in all well-governed republics.’”

“James, therefore, was shocked at the sudden melancholy among the people. In Europe, even among the reformed themselves, the Sabbath, after church-service, was a festival-day; and the wise monarch could discover no reason why, in his kingdom, it should prove a day of penance and self-denial.”—*Op. cit.*, p. 345.

The *Basilicon Doron*, of which a passage is here quoted by D’Israeli, was published in 1598, before its royal author’s accession to the English throne.

strictness, to pervert many to Popery; persuading them, that the Protestant religion was the school of Tyrannus, where no lawful liberty was allowed. And no wonder if many common people were hereby fetcht off unto them, starting aside as a broken bow, chiefly because overbent for lack of lawful recreation."

It is easy to say, as Dr Hetherington does, that the King by this proceeding lent his aid in "a fearful desecration" of the Sabbath. But those who employ such phraseology forget that *his* interpretation of Scripture (like that of the people who complained to him), in regard to the character and duties of the Lord's Day, was very different from *theirs*; that he had been brought up in the Church of Scotland, whose first Confession of Faith, as we have seen, gives no countenance whatever to what in his reign was really the *newfangled Judaism* of the Puritans; that he had afterwards become the Head of a Church whose Catechism is equally silent as to the duty of Sabbath-observance; and that the first day of the week, in which neither Luther, Calvin, Crammer, nor Knox, recognised any quality of *holiness*, was as little considered by King James as by them to be susceptible of "desecration" by any innocent recreation indulged in before or after the time of public worship. In judging of a man's conduct and motives, we are bound to consider the point of view from which *he* looks at the subject, and not merely *our own*.

The upshot of the business is recorded by Fuller as follows:—"But now, after so long and many diversities of opinions and arguments on several sides, their own fear proved at last their only foe: the King's goodness taking away the subject of their jealousy; so that *no minister in the county was enjoined to read the Book in his parish*, wherewith they had so affrighted themselves." *

* From the words here printed in italics, we may learn the lesson that in a case where party-spirit so easily came, and still comes, into play, great caution ought to be exercised before giving ear to such uncharitable insinuations as Dr Hetherington has indulged in against King James. Fuller, I take it, is as trustworthy an authority as we can follow, in judging whether the Declaration was really *ordered to be read by the clergy*; seeing that, although "to the established church of England he was a steady friend," yet he "at the same time was so candid and liberal towards Protestant Nonconformists, that among the bigoted and intolerant of his communion he incurred the suspicion and charge of Puritanism."—(*Aikin's Gen. Biog.*, vol. iv., p. 263.) Jeremy Collier, also—another respectable ecclesiastical historian—after quoting the Declaration, writes as follows: "To prevent the ill use of this liberty, there were several restraints in the indulgence. First, these recreations were to be so managed as not to hinder the performance of public duty at church. Secondly, that no recusant should have the benefit of this liberty. Nor, thirdly, *such as were not present at the whole of divine service*. And, fourthly, that none should have the freedom of this relaxation, but such as kept to their own parishes. However, this Declaration was somewhat shocking to a great many people; and the clergy *were apprehensive* the reading it in churches *would have been enjoined them*: and though 'twas published only for the use of Lancashire, they were afraid the order might be enlarged, and reach the whole kingdom. But whatever the first intentions of the Court might have been, the Declaration was afterwards in a manner dropt, AND NO CHURCHMAN OBLIGED TO READ IT."—(*Eccles. Hist. of Britain*, vol. ii., p. 712. Lond. 1714.)

Dr Hetherington, it is likely, has followed on this subject the very suspicious authority of Arthur Wilson, whose History of the Life and Reign of King James I. is included in the second volume of Bishop Kennet's Complete History of England, published at London in 1706. We there read, that "among all the dances that these times were guilty of, none of the masqueradoes presented

With respect, again, to the conduct of *Charles*, it will appear, on consideration, that his apologists are not wholly without the means of

so horrid a vizard as the Churchman's; for some of the bishops, pretending recreations, and liberty to servants and common people (of which they carved to themselves too much already), procured the King to put out a book to permit dancing about May-poles, church-ales, and such debauched exercises upon the Sabbath-day after evening praying (being a specious way to make the King, and them, acceptable to the rout): *which book came forth with a command, enjoining all ministers to read it to their parishioners, and to approve of it; and those that did not were brought into the High Commission, imprisoned, and suspended.* This book being only a trap to catch some conscientious men, that they could not otherwise with all their cunning ensnare; for they would preach the Gospel in a fool's coat (as some of them expressed), rather than be silenced for a surplice. And their conjuring of them with the cross in baptism, and the circle of the ring in marriage, could not make a well-composed reason and a sound conscience then start at it: But when so frightful an apparition as the Dancing Book appeared, *some of the ministers left all for fear, others by force, they were so terrified with it.* These, and such like machinations of the Bishops, to maintain their temporal greatness, ease and plenty, made the stones in the walls of their palaces, and the beam in the timber, afterwards cry out, moulder away, and come to nothing: whereas, if those in most authority had not been so pragmatical, but holy, prudent, and godly men (as some others of the function were), their light might have shined still upon the mount, and not have gone out as it did, offensive to the nostrils of the rubbish of the people."—(*Kennet*, vol. ii., p. 709.) Now this is not *history*, but the vituperation of a spiteful pamphleteer, whose passion has either obliterated all regard for truth, or seriously impaired his memory. It is perfectly clear that in this passage Wilson confounds the *revival* of the Book of Sports with its *first publication*: for not even Dr Hetherington alleges that in James's reign any "were brought into the High Commission, imprisoned, and suspended;" nor could anything be more plainly inaccurate than the assertion that some of the bishops "*procured the King to put out the Book,*" instead of its having been suggested to him by the complaints in Lancashire. Wilson's narrative was written and published during the Commonwealth—when historians generally were disposed to exaggerate the faults of James and his bigoted son. But in this writer's case there was also a *special* reason for the tendency to view James's character in a strongly hostile spirit; for having been secretary and intimate friend of Robert Devereux, the last Earl of Essex of that name, he naturally participated in the indignation and hatred of that nobleman towards the King. Dr Welwood, a Scottish physician and historian, who contributed notes to Bishop Kennet's reprint of Wilson, and whose own mind is said to have been "tinctured with the prejudices or prepossessions of one who had been a sufferer in the civil contests" of the seventeenth century (*Gorton's Biog. Dict.*, vol. ii., p. 1169), candidly admits, that "though our author was well furnished with what was necessary towards writing the history of King James's reign, it must be owned he has done it with an air of prejudice, if not in some places of rancour; which may in part be attributed to his friendship to his patron the Earl of Essex, and his resentments of the injuries done to that nobleman by King James and his favourites; and more particularly by Somerset in the affair of his lady, which it's no wonder the Earl nor his friends could never forget."—(*Kennet*, vol. ii., p. 662.) To the monarchy and hierarchy in the abstract, however, Wilson disclaims hostility, in some verses prefixed to his work:—

"I have no envious eyes against the Crown,
Nor did I strive to pull the Mitre down:
Both may be good; but when heads swell, men say,
The rest of the poor members pine away,
Like ricket-bodies, upwards overgrown,
Which is no wholesome constitution."

He lived from 1595 to 1652; and we learn from Anthony Wood, that though he had laid up materials for his history some time before, he did not perfect it till a little before his death. The same writer remarks the want, in that

palliating his conduct. Even assuming (they might say) that, theologically and politically, he was in the wrong, still, in ordering the Book of Sports to be read by the English clergy, he did not exceed

history, of "the principal matters conducing to the completion of the historical faculty, viz., *matter from record, exact time, name and place* : which by his endeavouring too much to set out his bare collections in an affected and bombastic style, are much neglected." "Some," he adds, "call it an infamous pasquil."—(*Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iii., p. 319, ed. 1813.)

Who the "one author" is, that, according to Dr Hetherington, "asserts that the Book of Sports would have been speedily extended over the kingdom, but for the decisive refusal of Abbot," I have not been able to discover ; and if such an author there be, I say that he states as a *fact* what he merely *conjectures*—though, had innocent and lawful sports been forbidden by meddling magistrates and ministers throughout the kingdom, as they were in Lancashire, I see not how the King would have been blameable for interposing his authority everywhere, to protect the people from an encroachment which was equally such, whether the theological opinions of the encroachers were true or false. Even the following note by Welwood is probably inaccurate, being at variance with what Fuller and Collier so positively affirm. "There were several of the bishops," says he, "that declared their opinion against the Book of Sports ; and Archbishop Abbot being at Croydon the day it was ordered to be read in churches, flatly forbade it to be read there ; which King James was pleased to wink at, notwithstanding the daily endeavours that were used to irritate the King against him."—(*Kennet*, vol. ii., p. 709.) This improbable rumour (for it is nothing more) about the order to read the Book in churches, and the counter-mandate of Abbot, is repeated in the Life of that prelate in the *Biographia Britannica* (vol. i., p. 14, 2d ed.) ; where, however, Welwood's note is the only authority referred to in support of the allegation. Neal ascribes that note to Wilson himself, in saying that "the Declaration was ordered to be read in all the parish-churches of Lancashire, which abounded with Papists ; and Wilson adds, that it was to be read in all the churches of England, but that Archbishop Abbot, being at Croydon, flatly forbid its being read there."—(*Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. ii., p. 106, ed. 1822.) In writing this, Neal must have overlooked a statement in the preface to Kennet's collection, that "the learned Dr Welwood has been prevailed with to add some notes and observations of his own upon it ; . . . all which notes and observations are printed at the bottom of the pages."

I conclude, then, 1. That James's Declaration never was ordered to be read by the clergy out of Lancashire ; 2. That the balance of proof is greatly against the notion of its having been ordered to be read even by the clergy in Lancashire ; and 3. That if the Lancashire clergy were ordered to read it, none of them suffered the slightest inconvenience for refusing.

It is grievous to find so liberal and honest a writer as Mr Brook allowing himself, in mentioning King James's Book of Sports, to be misled into the assertion, that "all ministers were commanded to sanction this stimulus to licentiousness, by reading it in their public congregations ; and those who refused to comply with the profane mandate, were prosecuted in the High Commission, suspended, and imprisoned." He is even so careless as to attribute to Bishop Kennet himself, as its *writer* (instead of editor), the passage where Wilson says that this alleged mandate was a trap to catch men of tender consciences, who could not be otherwise ensnared.—(*History of Religious Liberty*, by Benjamin Brook, vol. i., p. 401. London, 1820.)

To crown all, we have it on the very high authority of the conscientious and painstaking Dr M'Crie, that "it was the English Solomon who, in his wisdom, first discovered this project for promoting the happiness of his good subjects ;" namely, the project of "sports and pastimes, appointed by authority to be held on the Sabbath ;" as if Sunday sports were never known before, or King James had ever enjoined them ! And this notable piece of information we get from the Doctor while he is in the very act of exposing, with a masterly hand, the unfaithfulness of the picture which Sir Walter Scott has drawn of the Cove-

the power which lawfully belonged to him as Head of the Church ; while those of them who were guilty of disobedience to this constituted authority, thereby forfeited their title to retain office in the ecclesiastical society whose rules they had broken—and so could not with reason complain of deprivation of their benefices. With regard to the *imprisonment* and *banishment* of recusants, we might be reminded that in the seventeenth century the right and even *duty* of the magistrate to promote “ the true religion ” (by which phrase he could understand no other than his own), was, to say the least, not more violently asserted by the Episcopalians, than it was by the Puritans when *his* religion happened to be *theirs* ; and that it was only when he patronised what they believed to be error, that they ever complained of his conduct. We might further be told that the Puritans, when they in their turn tasted the sweets of power, imposed upon all, with a despotism as gross and grievous as that of Charles, the sort of Sabbath-observance which to them appeared agreeable to the Word of God, though by others it was esteemed Judaical and superstitious ;*

nanters and their oppressors in the novel of *Old Mortality*.—(*Miscellaneous Writings of the late Thomas McCreic, D.D.*, p. 274.)

With such examples of misapprehension before us, we can hardly wonder at what seems to be the commonly received notion, that the Declaration popularly called the Book of Sports, was a *formularly* like the Book of Common Prayer, prescribing a routine of Sunday recreations, which the clergy were at their peril to *enjoin* from the pulpit, and the people to *practise* with the utmost submission to their “ spiritual pastors and masters.”

The Declaration may be seen at full length in Rushworth, vol. ii., p. 193.

* See Neal, iii., 139, and iv., 28, 144 ; ed. 1822.—By an Act of Parliament passed during the Protectorate, it was enacted, “ that all persons not having a reasonable excuse, to be allowed by a justice of peace, shall resort to *some church or chapel, where the true worship of God is performed, or to some meeting-place of Christians not differing in matters of faith from the public profession of the nation, on penalty of two shillings and sixpence for every offence.*” The following is a Scottish ecclesiastical act, passed at Edinburgh on 7th June 1709, “ for the Observation of the Lord’s Day ;” it is taken from a volume published there in the same year, entitled “ The Queen’s Pious Proclamation for the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for Suppressing and Punishing of Vice, Profaneness, and Immorality ; with an Abbreviate of the Laws to that purpose : As also, a Collection of some Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Town-Council of Edinburgh, and Kirk-Sessions of that City, to the same effect.”—“ The General Meetings of the Kirk-Sessions of Edinburgh, taking to their serious consideration that the Lord’s Day *is profaned by people’s standing on the streets, and vaging to fields and gardens, and to the Castle-hill ; as also by standing idle gazing out at windows, and children, apprentices, and other servants, playing on the streets and other places ; and finding that there are divers Acts of the Town-Council of this City, and General Sessions, for preventing the profanation of the Lord’s Day, according to the Acts of Parliament and General Assembly ; therefore the General Sessions do resolve to see to the execution of these good Acts, and do hereby warn all the inhabitants of this city, that none of them presume to profane the Lord’s Day, which all are commanded to remember to keep holy ; and do seriously exhort parents and masters of families to keep their children and servants within doors upon that holy day, and to take care that all belonging [to] them do sanctify the same, and punctually attend the public worship of God ; with certification that notice will be taken of such as shall be found transgressing in the premises, and they called before the Kirk-Session and censured for the same, and if they do not amend, THEY WILL BE REFERRED TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE TO BE PUNISHED.* And in order to the better observation of the said Acts, not only is each Session to take their turn in visiting the streets in time of public worship on the Lord’s Day,

that even in our own generation, when religious liberty is somewhat better understood than it was two hundred years ago, the Puritans, with Sir Andrew Agnew at their head, made desperate efforts to procure a legislative enactment, compelling the whole nation to observe the Lord's Day in a manner as rigorous as that in which the Jews were required to observe their Sabbath; and finally, that, to this day, all well-governed Churches, whether Presbyterian or Episcopal, are accustomed to deprive of ecclesiastical office and emolument such of their members as, by violating the conditions on which office is held, render themselves liable to expulsion. Such representations, it must be confessed, would neither be destitute of force, nor unsupported by the history of England from the Reformation to the Commonwealth. For in that history, as Bishop Heber most justly observes, "there is abundant proof, that (much as every religious party, in its turn, had suffered from persecution, and loudly and bitterly as each had, in its own particular instance, complained of the severities exercised against its members) no party had yet been found to perceive the great wickedness of persecution in the abstract, or the moral unfitness of temporal punishment as an engine of religious controversy. *Even the sects who were themselves under oppression exclaimed against their rulers, not as being persecutors at all, but as persecuting those who professed THE TRUTH; and each sect, as it obtained the power to wield the secular weapon, esteemed it also a duty, as well as a privilege, not to bear the sword in vain.*" *

as hath been the laudable custom of this city; but also every Session is to take care of visiting their own parishes AND SUSPECTED HOUSES therein, at other convenient hours on the Lord's Day, by an elder and a deacon by turns, with a beadle and officer; and likewise when the day is long, that each Session go with their beadles and officers through the streets after sermons, for the ends above-mentioned, and reprove such as they find transgressing; and when persons do not take with reproof, and do not refrain from such practices in time coming, that they be complained of to the Session, in order to be censured, and referred to the civil magistrate to be punished according to the Acts made thereunto: And recommends to sessions, and members thereof, to hold hand to the execution of the Acts of the Town-Council, dated the 9th of August 1693, and 28th of February 1701, for Preventing the Profanation of the Lord's Day; and ordains this Act to be read from the pulpits of all the churches of this city yearly, the first Sabbath of April, that none may pretend ignorance."

Had these holy inquisitors been in authority at Jerusalem when the Lord Jesus Christ "vaged" through the corn-fields on the Sabbath, they undoubtedly would not only have accused his disciples, as the Pharisees did, of profaning the sacred day by plucking the ears of corn and rubbing them in their hands; but have outdone, in the display of their regard for formalism, that most strict of Jewish sects, by denouncing both him and his followers as Sabbath-breakers on the score of the vaging itself.

* Heber's Life of Jeremy Taylor, p. 27. The same remark had previously been made in nearly the same words by Benjamin Franklin; Works, vol. v., p. 14, Lond. 1833; and the observation is repeated by Archbishop Whately, in his Essays on the Errors of Romanism, &c., 4th ed., p. 138.—For examples of the fact stated, we need go no further than the enumeration, by the Westminster Assembly's committee, of remissness in "suppressing Anabaptists and Antinomians," as one of the Parliamentary sins which had kindled the Divine wrath, manifested in "my Lord General's defeat in the West" (*ante*, p. 137); or than Samuel Rutherford's "Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience" (London, 1651), of which a specimen will afterwards be presented, and which good Bishop Heber characterises as "perhaps the most elaborate defence of persecution which has ever appeared in a Protestant country."—(*Op. cit.*, p. 317, Note L.) It is recorded by Rushworth, that in a letter from

What a beautifully consistent figure the State makes in Great Britain—in the southern and northern divisions of which two different

the Westminster Assembly to the Belgic and other Reformed Churches, they lamented that “all the good and just laws of this kingdom against Papists (concerning their lives, liberties, and goods), are suspended; . . . houses of superstition in England and Ireland set up and not discountenanced; beside the seldom or never questioned transportation of many young persons to seminaries in foreign parts” (vol. v., p. 372.) And Baillie, in his Letters, repeatedly expresses his abhorrence of the toleration advocated by the Independents in the Assembly, “both for themselves and other sects.” “We hope,” says he, “*God will assist us to remonstrate the wickedness of such a toleration*” (vol. ii., p. 328.) “For this point, both they (the Independents) and we contend *tantum pro aris et focis*” (p. 350.) In a Memorandum which he furnished to the Earl of Lauderdale, “to make our friends sensible of the importance of the ordinance against blasphemies and errors,” he says: “The blasphemies, heresies, and errors, which abound everywhere, cries to Heaven for vengeance against the land; and in special against the House of Commons, by whose connivance only they have grown, and who most easily might suppress them, if they did really endeavour it” (p. 396.) That they at length passed a most stringent ordinance in 1648, we have already had occasion to notice (on page 46.) George Gillespie, also, (a man of great ability, and for that reason sent as one of the commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Assembly at Westminster,) inculcates most anxiously the duty of the civil magistrate to promote the true (*i. e.* the Presbyterian) religion, and to punish all gainsayers. In the 41st and 42d of his “One Hundred and Eleven Propositions concerning the Ministry and Government of the Church,” published in 1642, and reprinted at Edinburgh in 1844, he says: “The orthodox churches believe also, and do willingly acknowledge, that every lawful magistrate, being by God himself constituted the keeper and defender of both tables of the law, *may and ought first and chiefly to take care of God’s glory*, and (according to his place, or in his manner and way) to preserve religion when pure, and to restore it when decayed and corrupted: and also to provide a learned and godly ministry, schools also and synods; *as likewise to restrain and punish as well atheists, blasphemers, heresies, and schismatics*, as the violaters of justice and civil peace. Wherefore the opinion of those sectaries of this age is altogether to be disallowed, who, though otherwise insinuating themselves craftily into the magistrate’s favour, do deny unto him *the authority and right of restraining heretics and schismatics*, and do hold and maintain that such persons, how much soever hurtful and pernicious enemies to true religion and to the church, *yet are to be tolerated by the magistrate, if so be he conceive them to be such as no way violate the laws of the commonwealth, and in nowise disturb the civil peace.*”—(P. 12.) In his sermon before the House of Lords, August 27, 1645, Gillespie argues (in his own opinion unanswerably), that since liberty of conscience, by general acknowledgment, ought not to be granted in matters civil and military, therefore neither ought it to be granted in matters of religion. “I am sure,” says he, “there can be no answer given to this argument which will not be resolved into this principle: Men’s consciences may be compelled for the good of the State, but not for the glory of God; we must not suffer the State to sink, but if religion sink we cannot help it. This is the plain English of it.”—(P. 12 of Edin. edit. of 1844. See also his *Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, ch. xiii., p. 69 of reprint of same year.) It had not occurred to Gillespie or any of his friends, that the magistrate is appointed for secular purposes only; that the rights of the Sovereign of the Universe may be perfectly secure without the officious aid of any feeble arm of flesh; that possibly religion is buoyant enough to swim as well without the magistrate’s help as with it; and that the danger of his mistaking false religion for true is one which no precaution can ever guard against.

The National Covenant of Scotland, subscribed in 1580 and renewed in 1639, recites with much satisfaction the Act 24, Parl. II, King James VI., which “ordains all Papists and priests to be punished with manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains, AS ADVERSARIES TO GOD’S TRUE RELIGION, preached, and by law established, within this realm.” And by an Act of the General Assembly of the

systems of religious "truth" are patronised and endowed ! During the seventeenth century, she made in Scotland some vigorous attempts to escape from a position so chargeable with "latitudinarian laxity and licentiousness;" but although, in endeavouring to force her own admired Episcopacy on a Presbyterian people, she followed most strictly the principle advocated by Dr Hetherington, there is actually no

Church, prefixed to Gillespie's *Propositions*, it is declared that "the civil magistrate may and ought to suppress, by corporal or civil punishments, such as, by spreading error or heresy, or by fomenting schism, greatly dishonour God, dangerously hurt religion, and disturb the peace of the Kirk."

Yet the Shorter Catechism, which Baillie, Gillespie, and Rutherford helped to frame, and so highly approved of, declares that "the moral law is summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments;" and that "the sum of the Ten Commandments is, To love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our strength, and with all our mind; and our neighbour as ourselves."

It is in vain to say that the sectaries, whose liberty of conscience was thus opposed, sometimes claimed a toleration of immoralities, crimes, and sedition, as well as of religious teaching and worship; and that it was the former which excited the alarm of the Presbyterians. It doubtless did excite their alarm—and with reason; but what chiefly inspired them with horror and fierceness, was "the blasphemies, heresies, and errors," which they took upon themselves the popish power of determining to be such, and prohibiting the teaching of. As for immoralities, crimes, and sedition, the civil power was quite ready to suppress them (as far as any earthly power could), without being urged to the work by the Presbyterian members of the Westminster Assembly.

In an article by Sir Walter Scott on Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland, in the Quarterly Review, vol. xviii., p. 526, the blindness of the Scottish Covenanters of the seventeenth century to the religious rights of anybody but themselves is strongly exemplified; and we have seen (p. 135) in what vigorous language it was reproved as rank Popery by Cromwell.

It may be worth while to add, that, even in this nineteenth century, Dr Hetherington, who so heartily vituperates Charles I. for ordering the English clergy to read a Declaration that the old Sunday-recreations were permitted to those who pleased to indulge in them, is nevertheless, with a vast multitude of other so-called Protestants, decidedly averse to the magistrate's regarding (in his official capacity) "all religious creeds and forms with equal indifference;" and will by no means allow, that, "because it is wrong to suppress truth," it is wrong "to discountenance error." Why, then, is he indignant at Charles for discountenancing what the King himself regarded as "error?" Ought Charles to have acted according to Puritanical opinions which he repudiated? Dr Hetherington dismisses with reprobation the plea of those who urge, that, as truth cannot be ascertained infallibly, it is best to give equal toleration to all opinions, lest a grievous mistake should be committed, and truth be suppressed instead of error. "This," says he, "is the language of scepticism; and the principle which it promulgates is not toleration, but latitudinarian laxity and licentiousness."—(Hetherington's *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, p. 547, and *Hist. of the Westminster Assembly*, p. 353.) Yet the ground of his own complaint against Charles for opposing the Puritans can be no other than this same latitudinarian principle; unless we may suppose that so good a Protestant as Dr Hetherington can take up any ground implying his belief in the infallibility of himself and his party, but the fallibility, nay, *certain error*, of the Head of the English Church. All success, say I, to the "scepticism" which leads a man to doubt of his own infallibility, or at least whether it may be fairly assumed in dealing with the rights of others who deny it! And may it never be the lot of Dr Hetherington to have his own principle applied to himself in a country governed by Roman Catholics, Mahomedans, or Buddhists!

With respect to the intolerance of the Presbyterians, see, farther, in Neal, iv., 27, an abstract of the ordinance of Parliament, passed on 9th August 1649, for punishing blasphemous and execrable opinions. Some striking illustrations are given by Mr Tayler, in his *Retrospect of the Religious Life of England*, p. 519. See also Hetherington's *Hist. of the Westm. Assem.*, pp. 298, 299.

proceeding of hers for which he and his friends more violently abuse her !* Had she applied his principle in the opposite direction, by compelling, or at least bribing by exclusive endowment, the English Episcopalians to adopt his beloved Presbyterianism, he doubtless would have applauded *this* mode of "suppressing error," and giving to "truth" the countenance which he claims for it.

The piety of those who demand that public property shall be applied to the endowment of *their* truth (under the name of God's), but not a farthing of it to the dissemination of opposite opinions to which their fellow-citizens with equal sincerity give the same designation, is precisely that of the devout Pharisee who thanked God from the bottom of his heart that he was not as other men were. It is only on the assumption of *their own* truth being unquestionably *God's*, that any section of the community can logically and honestly claim the exclusive use of public money ; and this assumption accordingly lies at the bottom of all the honest clamours which have been raised by the advocates of state-endowed Churches against the paltry grant to the College of Maynooth, out of a fund to which Roman Catholics and Protestants alike contribute, and which annually supplies large sums to the dominant sect, for the propagation of opinions which the Romanist regards as damnable heresies.

In Scotland, the orthodox clergy demand that money belonging to all sects, shall be applied in teaching the religious dogmas of *one only*—*i. e.*, their own ; and some would rather be left to their private resources than partake of a grant with every other denomination of Christians. The late Dr P. Macfarlane, for instance, in his closing address as Moderator of the Free Church Assembly of 1845, in reference to the question, whether that Church could consistently ask aid from the Government for purposes of education, said—"I am strongly inclined to think, that, holding it as a great Scriptural principle that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to give encouragement and support *to the true religion alone*, it would not be consistent to ask or accept of aid from the British Government for educational purposes, after it has polluted and repudiated that sacred principle by *the endowment of Popish errors.*" And in the report of a speech by the Rev. Mr Wilson in the Free Presbytery of Dundee, on 13th March 1850, we read as follows :—"If it were asked, What security would he demand for the teaching of religion in national schools ? he would answer that it was the duty of the state *to defend and encourage God's truth* ; and that the only way in which they could secure religion as an element in national schools would be *to put them into the hands or under the effective superintendence of the Churches who held God's truth.*" In other words, the Government ought to give to one sect the management of schools belonging to, and paid for by all !

Men who thus confidently deal with the rights of their fellow-citizens on the assumption that they are the sole possessors of God's truth, are bound to shew that they, and they alone, have sure means of knowing it : at the very least, we might expect that they should be consis-

* As little did the old Presbyterians relish the application of this principle, which was also *theirs* ; for, as Welwood says truly, "Archbishop Laud's zeal for an uniformity between the two nations in point of Liturgy, proved the fatal torch that put the two kingdoms into a flame."—(*Dr Welwood's Memoir of the most Material Transactions in England for the last Hundred Years, &c.* 4th ed., London, 1702, p. 46.)

tent enough to *claim*, in word as well as deed, the possession of such means. The Pharisee in the parable was evidently well assured of the soundness of his own understanding, which pronounced him to be better than other men; and if he had been questioned on the subject, he doubtless would have readily avowed this belief. But what shall we say of our modern Calvinists, who, proclaiming in one sentence the extreme fallibility of the human understanding *in general*, proceed in the next to assume the entire trustworthiness of their own understandings *in particular*? Well has Samuel Johnson observed, that “though the fallibility of man’s reason, and the narrowness of his knowledge, are very liberally confessed, yet the conduct of those who so willingly admit the weakness of human nature, seems to discover that this acknowledgment is not altogether sincere; at least, that most make it with a tacit reserve in favour of themselves, and that *with whatever ease they give up the claim of their neighbours, they are desirous of being thought exempt from faults in their own conduct, and from error in their opinions.*”—(*Rambler*, No. 31.)

What would be thought of a man who should proclaim, with an air of the utmost humility and lamentation, that *everybody’s* legs are so weak that they can hardly, if at all, support the weight of the body—and *for that reason* insist, with a self-complacent and benevolent smile, on being allowed to carry his tottering neighbours on his back?

“O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel’s as other see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion:
What airs in dress an’ gait wad lea’e us,
And ev’n devotion!”

If, then, there be any soundness in what we have supposed to be urged for King Charles, the true remedy for all such grievances (whether the thing imposed be a Book of Sports, a Confession of Faith, or a Liturgy) must be sought in freeing the Church of Christ, in which no man on earth is entitled to be called Master, from the usurpations of Popes, Councils, Royal Heads, Convocations, Assemblies, and every other body of men pretending to declare with authority the will of God, and visiting with penalties, disabilities, or contumely, those who refuse to submit. Whether genuine Christian freedom is compatible with membership of Church Establishments (by which I mean not only Churches in alliance with the State, but all ecclesiastical associations where belief in a prescribed set of theological dogmas is required), is a question that has been widely discussed—that will engage more and more the attention of thinking men—and the decision of which, if it shall be answered in the negative, will evidently lead to most important results.

But however this may be, it must be admitted by all, that after the reasonable, but, to the Puritans, unpalatable proceeding of James, and the much more offensive, as well as unquestionably tyrannical proceedings of his son, nothing could be more likely to happen, than that the Puritans in general, and the Assembly of Divines in particular, should outrun the warrant of Scripture in their doctrine of Sabbath-observance. Whether they actually did so, will be considered in the subsequent pages.*

* See particularly note R. —It may be observed that Dr Twisse, the prolocutor

There is in Milton's *Areopagitica* a noble passage, in which the Westminster Assembly is introduced in a manner becoming a Christian freeman. "God," says he, "raises to his own work men of rare abilities, and more than common industry, not only to look back and revive what hath been taught heretofore, but to gain further, and to go on some new enlightened steps in the discovery of truth. For such is the order of God's enlightening his Church, to dispense and deal out by degrees his beam, so as our earthly eyes may best sustain it. *Neither is God appointed and confined, where and out of what place these his chosen shall be first heard to speak; for he sees not as man sees, chooses not as man chooses, lest we should devote ourselves again to set places and assemblies, and outward callings of men; planting our faith one while in the old convocation house, AND ANOTHER WHILE IN THE CHAPEL AT WESTMINSTER; when all the faith and religion that shall be there canonised, is not sufficient without plain convincement, and the charity of patient instruction, to supple the least bruise of conscience, to edify the meanest Christian, who desires to walk in the spirit, and not in the letter of human trust, for all the number of voices that can be there made; NO, THOUGH HARRY THE SEVENTH HIMSELF THERE, WITH ALL HIS LIEGE TOMBS ABOUT HIM, SHOULD LEND THEM VOICES FROM THE DEAD TO SWELL THEIR NUMBER.*"*

If this lofty protest against the authority of the Westminster Assembly was well founded in the time of Milton, much more than sufficient reason have we, after the lapse of two hundred busy years, to withhold our homage from their "standard of scriptural truth." For admirable though the Confession is, as a clear, precise, and methodical statement of the theological opinions of its framers, yet no well-informed thinker can fail to see that a greatly enlarged knowledge of Jewish antiquities, of oriental literature, of true critical principles, of the physical and moral sciences, and, though last not least, of the bodily and mental constitution of man, gives the modern student of Scripture a much better chance of understanding its meaning, than even the most able and learned of our ancestors in the seventeenth century could possibly have. As rational searchers for truth, we ought eagerly to avail ourselves of every new help, instead of dreading whatever tends to unsettle old notions, and clinging with the grasp of conscientious obstinacy to the opinions of men not only fallible like ourselves (as they, indeed, were the foremost to avow), but peculiarly liable to be misled by the violent party-feelings of the times, and far more ignorant than we are of much that interpreters

of the Assembly, was one of the divines who, upon the republication of the Book of Sports in 1633, refused to read it, and ventured to declare his opinion decidedly against it: "he nevertheless," says Brook, "escaped better than many of his brethren, who for so doing were suspended from their ministry, driven out of the kingdom, or cast into prison."—(*Lives of the Puritans*, by Benjamin Brook, vol. iii., p. 14. Lond. 1813.) Dr Gouge, another member of the Assembly, "when the Book of Sports came out, absolutely refused to read it. He was determined to suffer, rather than sin by encouraging profane sports on the Lord's day."—(*Ib.*, vol. iii., p. 167.) But the biographer does not inform us whether any trouble on this account actually overtook him.

* Milton's *Prose Works*, vol. ii., p. 98. "Truth and understanding," he says in the same treatise, "are not such wares as to be monopolised and traded in by tickets, and statutes, and standards. We must not think to make a staple commodity of all the knowledge in the land, to mark and license it like our broad cloth and our wool-packs."—(*Ib.* vol. ii., p. 81.)

of Scripture are concerned to know. Let us remember that the Westminster Confession was framed by men who lived before the deep thoughts of Bacon had begun to yield their fruit—before the Newtonian philosophy had yet dawned upon the world—before Locke had defined the limits within which truth is attainable by man, or contributed his aid to elucidate the most successful manner of pursuing it—before a single association of learned men had been formed in England for the pursuit of science or literature—before Poccocke and Niebuhr had made their researches in the East—before Calmet, or Cave, or Prideaux, or Lardner, had begun to labour in the wide field of Biblical learning—before Owen, or Simon, or Tillotson, or Locke, or Michaelis, had accustomed the Christian world to that rational way of studying the Scriptures which every scholar now follows—before Kenicott had gone through his ten years' task of collating the manuscripts from which the biblical text is ascertained (a labour, as Bishop Watson observes, "the great utility of which will be best known when the present English translation of the Old Testament shall be *amended* by authority; an event which many good men anxiously expect"*)—before

* Catalogue of Books in Divinity, appended to vol. vi. of his Collection of Theological Tracts. "When the modern languages," says, Mr Kenrick, "assumed a regular form, after the chaos into which speech was thrown by the invasion of the Barbarians, versions of the Scriptures into them began to be made. Being derived, however, from the Latin, they represented all the errors of their original, and it was not till learning revived, and the authority of the Church of Rome in Western Europe began to be shaken, that translations were made immediately from the Greek and Hebrew. Our own, in its present form, was the work of the most learned men whom England could furnish in the reign of James I. They understood the resources of their own language, and the qualities which belong to a popular version; and time has enhanced its beauty, and in some measure concealed its imperfections, by spreading over it that venerable hue which no recent work can possess. Its forms of expression have become hallowed by association with our deepest feelings and loftiest emotions. The substitution of another, in the current language of the day, is no more to be desired, if it were practicable, than the destruction of our ancient religious edifices, that the land might be covered with buildings of modern architecture. The occurrence of a few words of obsolete meaning is easily remedied by instruction. But as a guide to the meaning of Scripture it has glaring defects. Every reader must be aware, that there are many passages, in the Old Testament particularly, which convey no meaning to him; and the Biblical scholar knows, that where a sense does appear, it is often a false sense. How should it be otherwise? The learned men of the age in which it was made were, indeed, more profoundly learned than the present generation, but learning itself was imperfect. No one now ventures to quote as an authority an English translation of a profane author, of the same time as that in which the translation of the Bible was produced. The texts from which translations were then made had been hastily and uncritically settled; and the manuscripts which have since been discovered or examined, have led to many corrections in them. The principles of criticism have been established by the researches of several generations of scholars; the knowledge of ancient languages generally has been greatly improved and enlarged. Hebrew philology, in particular, has assumed a new character from the cultivation of other Eastern languages which are closely allied to it, and a vast mass of information has been collected tending to illustrate the meaning of Scripture. Could the venerable authors of our common translation return to the world, and after comparing the present state of sacred learning with its condition in their own day, find that no use had been made of these treasures, to give the English people a more correct representation of the word of God, they would wonder and grieve at the supineness of their successors. It would seem to them as if the Lord had poured out the

Butler, or Harmer, or Jortin, or Macknight, or Campbell, or Newcome, or Lowth, or Griesbach, or Wakefield, or Whately, had contributed a syllable to the theological instruction of their fellow-Christians.*

spirit of deep sleep upon them, and closed the eyes of the prophets, and the rulers and the seers. For certainly it was far from their thought, 'that their own was so absolute a translation, as that hereafter none might follow, who might see that which was not yet understood.'—(*Preface to the Bible.*)

"This supineness appears the more wonderful, since the Church which has indulged it professes to justify its separate existence exclusively on scriptural grounds. In words, at least, it claims no authority as a spiritual institution, but through the Scripture. Might it not have been expected, then, to consider it a most sacred duty to present those who cannot read the original, with the truest representation of it which the best learning of the age can supply? Would it not have been a worthy employment of the leisure in which the wealth of the Church allows a large body of her dignitaries to live, to watch over the purity of the sacred text, to remove all notorious errors from the translation, and thus to present the 'Law and the Testimony' in their simple integrity to the unlearned people? It is vain to say that the present version is a safe guide in all essential matters, and that no one can be led astray by following it. For the subtle dogmas, belief in which is made a condition of communion here and salvation hereafter, often depend on fine shades of language, which cannot be apprehended without minute accuracy of translation; and there are important questions of doctrine, dependent on the purity of the text from which the translation is made.

"The truth is, that the spirit of the Church is changed since the commencement of the seventeenth century. She was then proud of the character of Protestant, which was her title to a separate existence, and to the possession of the wealth and dignities of the old religion. She dreaded a change in the public feeling which should bring back Popery, and therefore endeavoured to make the line of separation between herself and her rival as broad and marked as possible. That danger appearing to be past, and another to be more threatening,—the danger lest further changes in religious opinion should result from scriptural investigation,—she has discountenanced such studies, and by keeping her articles, liturgy, and version unaltered, endeavoured to give herself that character of antiquity and infallibility, which is the source of her rival's influence over the unreflecting."—(*The Value of the Holy Scriptures, and the Right Mode of Using them.* By John Kenrick, M.A. London, 1851. Pp. 62-65.)

See also Archbishop Newcome's *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, the Expediency of Revising by Authority our Present Translation, and the Means of Executing such a Revision* (1792); Bishop Marsh's *Lectures on the several Branches of Divinity*, Lect. 14, p. 35; Bishop Watson's *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii., p. 147; Archbishop Seeker's *Works*, vol. i., p. 478, (Edin. 1792), Sermon 41; and Bishop Hinds's *Sermons on Scripture and the Authorized Version of Scripture* (1845).

* See Dr Credner's remarks in the Preface to Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, vol. i., p. xv., and his articles on INTERPRETATION and INTRODUCTION, in vol. ii. of the same invaluable work, pp. 20-30; the article RICHARD SIMON, in Aikin's *General Biography*, vol. ix., p. 152; Watts on the Improvement of the Mind, Part I., ch. viii., "Of Inquiring into the Sense and Meaning of any Writer or Speaker, and especially the Sense of the Sacred Writings;" Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. i., p. 180, of Bishop Marsh's Translation, 2d ed.; Dr Alex. Smith's Preface to his Translation of Michaelis's Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, p. x.; Dr Gerard's *Institutes of Biblical Criticism*, pp. 124-127; Bishop Marsh's *Lectures*, Lect. 13, 14, and 15; Carpenter's *Lectures on Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, pp. 7, 35, 41, 189, 237, and the first Chapter of the same writer's *Biblical Companion*; Harmer's *Observations on Divers Passages of Scripture*; the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. xxi., p. 203; Tayler's *Retrospect of the Religious Life of England*, p. 359; Dr John Brown on the Law of Christ respecting Civil Obedience, p. 235, Note VI., on "the True Principle of Biblical Interpretation," and Supp. p. 15; the Hon. R. Boyle's *Considerations touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures*, in his *Works*, vol. ii., p. 94, (quoted in Chambers's *Cyclopædia of*

“The true way to understand the Scripture,” says Ostervald, “is to know the scope of it, and never to swerve from that. Good sense and piety, joined with the study of languages, history, and antiquity, are here very serviceable. A commentator ought, in a manner, to transport himself into those places and times in which the sacred authors lived. He should fancy himself in their circumstances, and consider what their design was, when they spoke or writ; what persons they had to deal with, and what notions, knowledge, or customs, did then obtain. But those who, being ignorant of these things, set about expounding the Scripture, can hardly do it with success. It is a wonder if they do not miss the true mark, and if they do not obtrude forced, and very often false, glosses upon their readers.

“On the other hand, many authors apply themselves to the examining of Scripture with a mind full of prejudices. They explain it by the present notions of the world. Nothing is more usual with commentators than to make the faithful under the Old Testament speak as if they had been as well acquainted with the truths of the Gospel as Christians are; and as if those questions and disputes, which are treated in commonplaces of divinity, had been agitated at that time. When those expositors, for instance, meet with the word *righteous* or *righteousness* in the Psalms, they fancy that David had in his thoughts all that divines have vented concerning justification; and upon this supposal, what do they not say, or what do they not make preachers say? It has been observed, that almost all commentators are partial, and endeavour to put upon the Scripture a sense that favours the opinions of their respective sects. This spirit of a party is chiefly remarkable in some of those commentators which these last centuries have produced.”*

Now the first of these paragraphs describes what was seldom if ever done by divines in the earlier half of the seventeenth century; and the second describes with the strictest accuracy what they usually did. To Dr Owen (as far as I know) belongs the honour of discovering and proclaiming the objectionable character of the prevalent practice. In the Preface to his Preliminary Exercitations to the Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he mentions, as a circumstance that greatly encouraged him to enter the field as an expounder of this Epistle, that all his learned predecessors, “being intent on the sense of the words, as absolutely considered, and the use of them to the present church, had much overlooked the direct regard that the author had in the writing of this Epistle to the then past, and to the present and the future condition of the Hebrews, or church of the Jews. Looking at these things as dead and buried, and of no use in the present state

English Literature, vol. i., p. 519); Dr Campbell’s Preliminary Dissertations to his Translation of the Gospels; Dr John Cook’s Inquiry into the Books of the New Testament, ch. ii.; Archbishop Secker’s Works, vol. i., p. 495, Sermon 42, entitled “Directions for Reading the Scripture Profitably;” James Foster’s Sermons, vol. i., p. 257; Dr Sykes on the Principles and Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion, ch. x., entitled “How we are to judge of the Sense of Revelation;” Life of Dr Arnold, vol. i., p. 220; Wakefield on the language of the New Testament (*ante*, p. 90–91); the Westminster Review, July 1852, p. 175; and Seiler’s Biblical Hermeneutics, quoted in the Penny Cyclopædia, vol. iv., p. 366.

* Ostervald on the Causes of the Present Corruption of Christians, in Bishop Watson’s Theological Tracts, vol. vi., p. 294.

of the church, they did either wholly neglect them, or pass them over in a light and perfunctory manner. Nor, indeed, had many of them, though otherwise excellently qualified, a competency of skill for the due consideration of things of that nature. But yet, those that shall, seriously and with judgment, consider the design of the writer of this Epistle, the time wherein he wrote it, the proper end for which it was composed, the subject-matter treated of in it, the principles he proceeds upon, and his manner of arguing, will easily perceive, that without a serious consideration of these, it is not possible in many things to come to a right understanding of the mind of the Holy Ghost. Many principles of truth he takes for granted, as acknowledged amongst the Hebrews during their former church state, and makes them a foundation for his own superstructure; many customs, usages, ordinances, institutions, and received sense of places of Scripture amongst the Jews, he either produceth or reflects upon, and one way or the other makes use of the whole Mosaical economy, or system of Divine worship under the law, unto his own purpose. The common neglect of these things, or slight attention to them, by most Expositors, was that which principally relieved me from the forementioned discouragement."

At Oxford, Dr Owen presided over the College where Locke became a student; and he appears to have fostered in the congenial mind of the young philosopher a disposition to follow out this improved mode of scriptural exegesis with consistency and intelligence. For it was not only adopted, but extended with signal success, by Locke, as his theological writings abundantly shew. "It was," says Mr Tayler, "a mode of exegesis quite different from that which had prevailed among the Puritan divines of the preceding century, who looked immediately to edification, and neglected the principles of rational criticism and exposition. With them every text of Scripture was as a voice from Heaven, speaking directly to the soul; and they interpreted it by the feelings which it spontaneously awakened. The requirements of the context, the purpose and circumstances of the writer, and the influences of age and country—entered little into their judgment of the signification of a passage, and were absorbed by far deeper considerations of their own spiritual state. If they threw open their Bibles with as little care or selection as if they were consulting the *Sortes sacrae*, their eye could not alight amiss; for wherever it fell, it met with some expression, literal or symbolical, of the eternal verities of the Christian faith. The clear and simple reason of Locke, at once perceived the source of endless error that was opened by this mode of proceeding, especially in a writer so broken and irregular in his trains of reasoning—so full of hidden meanings, only to be detected by a thoughtful survey of the general scope of his discourse—and so fraught with allusions to his age, and country, and situation,—as Paul: and, therefore, he constructed his own Commentary on the principle which he has fully explained in his Essay—of endeavouring to throw himself back into the circumstances and feelings of the writer, apprehending from this point of view his particular line of argumentation, and bringing all separate phrases and detached observations into connection, by their common relation to it. This was rationalising the Bible, by putting the interpretation of it on the same footing with that of other ancient books. It was employing the aids of

history, and the ordinary rules of grammar and logic, to find out what the Bible said—where mere feeling and imagination, and notions already in the mind, had been allowed to decide. These principles were taken up and applied by the most eminent English divines of the eighteenth century, and, borrowed in the first instance from them, gave birth to that system of historical exegesis, which has been cultivated with such immense learning, and carried out to such bold results, by the great theologians of Germany.*

To this may fitly be added what Locke himself says of the mode of interpretation which was generally followed in the seventeenth century. "I know," he observes in the Preface to his Essay on St Paul's Epistles, "it is not unusual to find a multitude of texts heaped up for the maintaining of an espoused proposition, but in a sense often so remote from their true meaning, that one can hardly avoid thinking that those who so used them, either sought not or valued not the sense, and were satisfied with the sound, where they could but get that to favour them."† How far this remark is applicable to the Westminster Confession, may be left to the judgment of any intelligent, candid, and well-educated man, who will take the trouble to consider not merely the sentences and even smaller fragments torn out of the Bible and called "proofs," but the entire passages from which they are taken, and the persons to whom, and circumstances in which, the words were written. Should astonishment be excited in the mind of such an investigator by the irrelevance and flagrant partiality of many of the "proofs," let him regard with charity the compilers of them, and with shame ourselves in the middle of the nineteenth century, while he considers how much more *we* deserve reproach for *ad-*

* Tayler's Retrospect of the Religious Life of England, pp. 359-361. Mr Tayler has overlooked what Owen did before Locke in this department of learning.

† Locke's Works, ed. 1823, vol. viii., p. 19.—"I crave leave," says he, p. 9, "to set down a saying of the learned and judicious Mr Selden: 'In interpreting the Scripture,' says he, 'many do as if a man should see one have ten pounds, which he reckoned by 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, meaning four was but four units, and five five units, &c., and that he had in all but ten pounds: the other that sees him, takes not the figures together as he doth, but picks here and there, and thereupon reports that he had five pounds in one bag, and six pounds in another bag, and nine pounds in another bag, &c., when as, in truth, he has but ten pounds in all. So we pick out a text here and there, to make it serve our turn; whereas, if we take it altogether, and consider what went before, and what followed after, we should find it meant no such thing.'"

The Sabbatarians are greatly addicted to picking out the phrase "Lord of the Sabbath" from the Gospels, and using it as a *title* of Jesus Christ, whom they thus contrive to represent as the patron and establisher of the Sabbath. "We return thanks," says the *Record* of June 8, 1837, "to Him who ruleth in the kingdom of men—to Him who is emphatically the Lord of the Sabbath—to Him who governs the unruly wills of sinful mortals—that it has pleased Him so to order events that the second reading of Sir Andrew Agnew's Lord's Day Bill has passed by a majority of 110 to 66."—(Quoted in M'Crie's *Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew*, p. 303). "Thousands," says the biographer himself, "who had never given a thought to the question, were led to consider the *claims* of the 'Lord of the Sabbath Day,'" (Ib., p. 179); and again, he speaks of the stoppage of the mails on Sunday, which Sir Andrew endeavoured to bring about, as a measure that would be a "*national tribute to the Lord of the Sabbath*," (p. 351). Yet one would think it must be plain to any attentive reader of Matt. xii. 1-8, Mark ii. 23-28, and Luke vi. 1-5, that the claim which Jesus made, in vindicating himself to the Pharisees, to be lord (*i. e.* master) of the Sabbath, has pre-

hering to the errors of our ancestors, than *they*, who in comparative ignorance committed them—and what mongrel Protestants we shew

cisely the opposite meaning to what the phrase implies when used in the ordinary fashion: it is the assertion of his authority or dominion over the Sabbath, and his title to act as he had done, notwithstanding the letter of the Jewish law.

Another glaring instance of misapplication of a scriptural fragment deserves to be noticed. In Rom. xiv. 23, St Paul says that " whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" which words, considered by themselves, have been thought by many to signify that even acts of justice, mercy, and piety, done by any but a believer in Jesus Christ, are positively sinful—a monstrous interpretation, which only the most stupid blindness to the context could have rendered possible. For to every intelligent reader of the chapter it must be plain, that the Apostle is considering the lawfulness of eating certain meats which some declared to be forbidden; and that the words above quoted can be rightly understood only as part of the discussion. As "faith" means "belief" in general, the particular belief spoken of is of course always to be learnt from the connection in which the word is found. Now, the question "Hast thou faith?" put by the Apostle, verse 22, refers (as Dr Chalmers has very well pointed out in his lecture on this chapter), "not to the faith that is unto salvation—but to clearness in the matter on hand—Art thou clear and confident as to the lawfulness of eating what by the law of Moses was forbidden? They who are not clear, but stand in doubt, have not faith in this matter, though they may have the faith which is unto salvation. He who has the faith, who is fully persuaded in his own mind that to eat is allowable—let him have it to himself before God." And of the words, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," he says: "This here is not the universal proposition which some would make of it. It does not mean that every action of an unbeliever is sinful, because he wants that justifying faith without which there can be no acceptance either for his person or his services. This may be true, but it is not the truth contained in this passage. As we said before, the faith here spoken of is a faith limited to a particular point. The man has not the belief that to eat certain kinds of food is lawful; and if he eat of them notwithstanding, to him it is unlawful."—(*Lectures on the Romans*, vol. iv., pp. 368, 369.)

Coleridge, in reference to Bunyan, exclaims—"What genuine superstition is exemplified in that bandying of texts, and half texts, and demi-semi texts, just as memory happened to suggest them, or chance brought them before Bunyan's mind."—(*Table Talk*, vol. i., p. 175.) "Bibliolatry" is the name applied by Coleridge to this sort of superstition. Even now, it largely abounds among the ignorant and fanatical. "When men," says Bishop Watson, "are desirous of forming systems, they are apt to collect together a number of texts, which, being taken as abstract propositions, seem to establish the point; but which, when interpreted by the context, appear to have no relation to it. There is no greater source of error than this practice; it has prevailed in the Christian Church from the earliest ages, and it still prevails. We owe to it the corruptions of Popery, and that infinity of heresies which have so much debased the simplicity of gospel truth, and driven so many men of sense from embracing Christianity."—(*Charge delivered in 1795*; *Miscell. Tracts*, vol. i., p. 113.) About twenty years ago this practice was vigorously and effectively assailed by the late Dr Andrew Thomson, in his work entitled "The Doctrine of Universal Pardon Considered and Refuted;" Edinburgh, 1830. The following remarks apply so admirably to Bishop Horsley and the series of Glasgow ministers already mentioned (*ante*, pp. 56-58), that I must yield to the temptation to quote them. "If a passage makes against them, they pass it by as if it were no part of God's word. They see it not, though it is staring them in the face. Point out the statements in it which contradict their doctrine, they just wink the harder, and will not look at them. Dwell upon these with whatever force and solemnity you can employ; it is all in vain, for they will recognise nothing, and will attend to nothing, and will be influenced by nothing, that would rob them of their theory, or disconcert them in their attempts to build

ourselves to be, while bowing down before the work of men's hands, and bitterly discouraging all who have the sense and spirit to pursue a worthier course. But whether or not any *astonishment* be excited by the examination recommended, assuredly the result will be at least a disposition to sympathise with Dr Chalmers in the "*fear*, that the effect of controversy and system in theology has been to work a mal-adjustment between our minds and the representations of Scripture, which will not be compelled into an accommodation with the artificial compends or creeds of any denomination."*

Some of the effects of the erroneous practices of the old theological

it up. They pick and choose from the Bible at their own discretion and for their own ends; of course they conveniently exclude from their regard and from their expositions all that would overthrow or shake the fabric of error which they have so industriously reared, and which they so fondly and doatingly contemplate."—(P. 345: See also pp. 351, 354.)

The Catechism of the Unitarian Churches of Poland, published in 1684, is distinguished by this uncommon feature, "that not only the different topics are explained, and the peculiar sentiments of it defended by proper arguments and texts of Scripture; but the texts that are alleged by the opposers of the Socinian scheme, and appear to be repugnant to it, are fairly quoted and particularly examined, and their meaning carefully investigated. There is a fairness and equity in this method of advancing and supporting their sentiments, which must recommend it to the candid inquirer after truth; and in consequence of it, an acquaintance with this Catechism is not merely an employment of memory, but an exercise of the understanding and judgment."—(*Toulmin's Memoirs of Socinus*, p. 268.)

"Perhaps," says Locke, "if it were well examined, it would be no very extravagant paradox to say, that there are fewer that bring their opinions to the sacred Scripture to be tried by that infallible rule, than bring the sacred Scripture to their opinions, to bend it to them, to make it, as they can, a cover and guard to them. And to this purpose," he truly adds, "its being divided into verses, and brought, as much as may be, into loose and general aphorisms, makes it most useful and serviceable."—(*Works*, vol. viii., p. 10.) In fact, many readers of Scripture,—even, says Archbishop Whately, "of what are called the educated classes,"—are ignorant that the division of it into chapters and verses is an arbitrary and unskilfully executed modern arrangement for the sake of convenient reference; although "the most moderate degree of attention will shew, that verses, and even chapters, often conclude in the midst of a discourse,—of an argument,—or even of a sentence."—(*Essays on Some of the Dangers to the Christian Faith, &c.*, 2d ed. p. 239.) This learned divine states that one of the "educated" persons in whom he had found such ignorance, "on being informed how the fact stands, deprecated the undeceiving of the people at large, for fear of unsettling their minds!" He elsewhere tells of a disputant who quoted to him authoritatively *the summary prefixed to a chapter*, as part of God's inspired word !!

* Chalmers's Daily Scripture Readings, p. 38.—See also a remarkable pamphlet (already referred to), entitled "Dogmatic and Systematic Standards considered in an Address to the Office-Bearers and Members of the Church of Scotland, by Joseph Taylor Goodsir, lately Minister of Largo" (Edin. 1851). This conscientious clergyman, who resigned a living which he could no longer hold except as a hypocritical professor of opinions he had abandoned, in speaking of the earnest study of the Bible by young clergymen who have been crammed with systematic theology in divinity-halls, describes such a course of study as "wise and laudable, indeed, but not a less perilous one, in some respects, because right. For it is not always that Scripture appears in itself as it does when seen in a system; AND THE NOVELTY OF SCRIPTURE, IN THIS RESPECT, IS OFTEN A THING VERY STRIKING, NOT ONLY TO YOUNG BUT EVEN TO OLD THEOLOGIAN."—(P. 58.)

school, have been excellently pointed out by Mr Baden Powell in his *Tradition Unveiled*. "Among Protestants of nearly all denominations," says he, "there have prevailed, and do prevail, certain views, not merely on particular points of doctrine and practice, but referring to the general grounds of belief, and sources of religious truth, which, to say the least, appear, when critically examined, of a very dubious character: founded for the most part on narrow and ill-informed principles, and tending directly to very confused and unworthy views of Christianity. Opinions of the kind alluded to, may probably be traced to the ultra zeal which actuated a portion of the Reformers, and which descended to their successors, with even increased bitterness. It was said, 'The Bible, and the Bible only,' was the watchword of the Reformation; hence, the mere *letter* of the sacred volume became elevated in the eyes of the followers of the Reformation as much into an object of worship, as the saints and apostles had been in those of the Romanists. Thus, from regarding Scripture as their sole appeal, they advanced to extravagant distortions of its use and authority. And the most prominent feature in several Protestant systems has been an overstrained and unwarranted view of the peculiar nature and character of divine inspiration; in accordance with which, the Bible came to be regarded, not merely as the sole authentic record of the Divine dispensations, but as possessing an inherent divine character and universal application, impressed upon every syllable and every letter. From this principle, various inferences have followed, which naturally terminated in an unhappy spirit of fanaticism and bigotry, not inferior in its way to anything exhibited in the worst days of papal darkness.

"Now, in opposing these ultra-protestant errors and views of so unworthy a cast, a school of confessedly high attainments in philology and ecclesiastical learning, have been easily able to assume a position of superiority in the eyes of the more enlightened, and to gain credit for successfully combating doctrines which, however cherished among the more ignorant portions of various religious communities, could not fail to disgust those of better information and more cultivated minds. Thus, they find a numerous party of supporters who will so far go along with them; and they are not slow to perceive the influence they can exert in the appeal to superior illumination, and more rational views of the grounds of religious belief, and of the general nature of Christian doctrine as purified from the repulsive tenets of a vulgar fanaticism.

"In this respect, indeed, they concur closely, in some points, with those most widely opposed to them on others. They are far too well versed in the learned views of Christian theology to fall into the errors of illiterate expositors, and the blind adoption of the mere letter of the Bible, without distinction of times, persons, and dispensations, which has led to such melancholy perversions of Christianity among Protestants. Thus they are superior to that unhappy literalism which gives rise to the Calvinistic views in their various modifications; as well as those kindred doctrines which distinguish the puritanical school, as, *e. g.*, the confusion between the Jewish Decalogue and the moral law; and the notion that the obligation of the Sabbath was transferred to the Lord's day. On such points (especially the last) it would be, of

course, impossible for any versed in Christian antiquities to fall into the vulgar errors which so widely prevail; and, accordingly, on these points, the traditionists (as far as they speak plainly) can claim the assent and approval of the enlightened inquirer.”*

These observations naturally suggest one of the most important differences which exist between *our* position as interpreters of Scripture, and that of the Westminster divines. It is this: *Biblical scholars are now, for the most part, emancipated from the notion that the Jewish law is in some degree binding on the Gentiles.* Such, at least, if I mistake not, is the case with all men of comprehensive scholarship in the present day; and although it must be confessed that our popular theological literature, and the sermons of many preachers, are still deeply imbued with Judaism, there is certainly, even in the popular modes of thinking on religious subjects, a far less prominent display of the *practical recognition* of the authority of the Mosaic law than among the Puritans of the seventeenth century. At all events, there can be no doubt that the notion in question, prevailing, as it assuredly did, not as a barren dogma implicitly but coldly assented to, but *as a living principle*, among the framers of our Confession of Faith, could not fail to affect, and, if erroneous, to distort most materially, their intellectual vision, when directed to the pages of Scripture; nor will it be surprising if, among the subjects on which it has misled them, we should find the foundation and manner of the observance of the Lord's Day, or, as the Puritans delighted to style it, the Christian Sabbath.

No law, whether divine or human, is binding on any but those to whom it has been promulgated, *i. e.*, made known as a rule which the legislator requires them to obey. As Bishop Conybeare well observes, “The universality of government doth by no means prove the identity and universality of all God's laws with regard to his creatures. This is apparent even in civil constitutions, in which the same supreme magistrate doth by no means govern all his subjects by the very same laws, but by such different rules as are adapted to their several different circumstances.”† Thus, although the British Legislature has authority to impose laws alike on England, Scotland, and Ireland, it may, and does, oblige Englishmen to pay taxes and perform services with which the inhabitants of Scotland and Ireland have no concern—however well they may know that such and such laws have been imposed upon their neighbours in England, by the power to which they themselves are equally subject.

Every law continues to bind all on whom it has been in this manner imposed, until either the close of its appointed term, or its repeal by adequate authority; but no longer.

With respect to the Jewish law, then, two questions are to be considered:—1. On whom was it imposed? and, 2. Has it terminated or been repealed?

The true reply to the former question is so obvious on the face of the Hebrew record, that we may well wonder how any body can fail to see it. For, in the words of Bishop Sherlock, “The law of Moses is in the very promulgation of it confined to the people of

* Tradition Unveiled, pp. 12–14.

† Defence of Revealed Religion, chap. v., p. 271, 3d edit.

Israel. 'Hear, O Israel!' is the introduction to the promulgation; which it could not have been, had the law been designed for the whole world. And this was known to be the case under the law. Moses, who best understood the extent of his own commission, says thus to the people of Israel: 'What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?' Deut. iv. 8. The holy Psalmist expresses the same sense in these words: 'He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for his judgments, they have not known them.' Psal. cxlvii. 19, 20. From all which it is evident that the law of Moses has no claim to our obedience.* He lays down the self-evident principle, "that no revelation can oblige those to whom it is not given;" and adds, with justifiable strength of language, "If God intends a law *for the use of the world*, he is *obliged*, if I may use the expression, *to publish the law to the world.*"

Locke had previously written to the same purpose in his *Letter concerning Toleration* (p. 53); and still earlier, we find Baxter affirming, not merely of the Jewish law in general, but of the Decalogue in particular, that "it was the law of Moses for the Jews, and bound no other nations, and is done away by the dissolving of their republic, and by Christ. . . . As Moses," he adds, "was ruler, or mediator, to none but the Jews, the words of the Decalogue are appropriate to them as redeemed from Egyptian bondage; so the tables were delivered to no other, and a law cannot bind without any promulgation. All the world was not bound to send to the Jews for revelation, nor to be their proselytes."†

Ostervald, in his excellent work already repeatedly quoted, expresses himself on this subject as follows. "I shall here," says he, "take notice of two errors, which are pretty common. The first is, the applying to Christians at this day, all those things which were spoken of old by the apostles to the converted *Jews*. It is said, 'that we are no more under the law;' and Christians are often exhorted to bless God for being no longer under the curse of the law, and the yoke of Moses. And upon this a great many oppositions are observed betwixt the law and the gospel. For my part, I do not think those exhortations and oppositions so very proper to be insisted on, when we are speaking to men who never were Jews; unless we do it with a design to shew the excellency of the gospel covenant above that of the law, and the advantages of Christians above Jews. *For after all, the law was given only to the Jews*, and the Gentiles were never subjected to the ceremonies or the curse of it, as the Jews were. **WHY SHOULD WE THEN SAY TO PEOPLE WHO NEVER WERE UNDER THE LAW, 'YOU ARE NO MORE UNDER THE LAW'?** The apostles, indeed, spoke in that manner to the converted *Jews*; but as to those who were formerly *Pagans*, it would be more fitting to tell them, 'You have been converted from idols to the living God; remember that ye were in times past Gentiles without hope and without God in the world; and

* Works, ed. 1830, vol. i., p. 178, Discourse IX.

† Baxter's Works, vol. xix., p. 190. See also vol. v., p. 544-7, vol. vi., p. 322, and vol. xv., p. 62.

therefore live no longer like heathens.' (Thess. i. 9. Ephes. ii. 12; iv. 17.) *It is a great fault not to expound the Scripture according to the true scope of it, and to apply all that it contains to all sorts of persons without distinction.*"*

The principle expressed in this concluding remark, is one which it is important to keep in view, when we study both what the apostles addressed to Jewish Christians in the Epistles, and what was spoken by Jesus himself to his countrymen living under the Mosaic law. For it is plain that "The Jewish confession of faith, depending upon the law and the prophets, our Lord acknowledged in common with the Jews themselves; and it was from these common principles espoused on all sides, that Jesus argued against the prejudices and tempers of the people, and against the traditions of the scribes and pharisees, by which they had corrupted the religion delivered by Moses, both as to forms of worship and points of doctrine."†

If the foregoing quotations afford, as I cannot doubt they do, a conclusive reply to the question, "On whom was the Jewish law imposed?" the remaining question, Whether it is still in force? concerns not us, but only the Jews. Nevertheless it may be observed, that except when some doctrine, for which no reasonable grounds can be discovered, must be supported *per fas aut nefas*, almost all Christians profess and act upon the principle expressed in the following extracts from three eminent theologians:—

"They which honour the law as an image of the wisdom of God himself, are notwithstanding to know that the same had an end in Christ."‡

"On the introduction of the gospel, or new covenant through faith in Christ, the whole of the preceding covenant—in other words, the entire Mosaic law—was abolished."§

It was designed "that the Jewish institution should last for a certain period, and should at length give way to another institution more

* Causes of the Present Corruption of Christians, Part I. Cause iv.; in Watson's Theol. Tracts, vol. vi. p. 165. See to the same effect, Dr James Foster's Sermons, vol. iv. p. 260, London, 1744; Michaelis's Commentaries on the Law of Moses, Book I., Art. 1 and 2; Dr Doddridge's Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity, Prop. 156, vol. ii., p. 410, *et seq.*, ed. 1799; Dr Jortin's Works, vol. viii., p. 397, Sermon 31; Dr Credner in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, vol. i., p. xvi.; and the other theologians formerly referred to (pp. 119-121.)

Mrs Chapone, in her excellent Letters on the Improvement of the Mind, expresses the popular notion, in saying of the Ten Commandments, that, "*as they were designed for universal laws, they are worded in the most concise and simple manner, yet with a majesty which commands our utmost reverence.*"—(Letter I.) After what has been said in the text, it is hardly necessary to observe on this, that what the Ten Commandments were "designed for," can be known only from what the Designer has chosen, either by express declaration or by his acts, to indicate concerning his design; that as the Ten Commandments *were* imposed only on the Jews, they cannot have been *designed* for any but the Jews; and that the conciseness, simplicity, and majesty of their language were quite as suitable in the most important part of the Jewish code, as if the precepts thus expressed had been imposed upon all mankind.

† Archdeacon Blackburne's Works, vol. v., p. 471.

‡ Hooker's Eecl. Polity, B. iv., § 11.

§ Milton's Christian Doctrine, p. 412.

perfect, and better accommodated to the then state and condition of things.*

With respect to *the Fourth Commandment in particular*, there is this farther and irresistible (though unnecessary) proof of its exclusively Jewish character; that the Sabbath is expressly declared in Scripture to be one of those distinctive institutions which were appointed for the purpose of keeping the Jews apart from the idolatrous nations around them, and to be at the same time a token and memorial of the covenant between Jehovah and his people. In Exodus xxxi. 12–14, 16, 17, we read:—“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: *for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the*

* Bishop Conybeare’s Defence of Revealed Religion, p. 172.—That Christianity did *not* abolish Judaism is however ably maintained by Dr John Taylor of Norwich, in ch. 14 and 15 of his Key to the Apostolic Writings, reprinted in Bishop Watson’s Collection of Theological Tracts, vol. iii.; but it is as far as possible from his intention to argue that *we* have any concern with Judaism. Bishop Watson says of his work, that it “is greatly admired by the learned, as containing the best introduction to the Epistles, and the clearest account of the whole gospel scheme, which was ever written.” The fact mentioned by Hooker is certainly a significant one, that “As long as the glory of the temple continued, until the time of that final desolation was accomplished, the very Christian Jews did continue with their sacrifices and other parts of legal service.”—*Eccles. Polity*, B. iv. § 11.) According to Dr Jortin, this practice was persisted in even “much longer.”—(*Works*, vol. ix., p. 118.)—And although, as Dr Taylor observes, “Paul indeed taught the Gentile converts that it was inconsistent with their Christian profession to embrace Judaism, or to put their necks under the yoke of the Law of Moses; he never taught the Jews to forsake Moses:” but, on the contrary, on a well-known occasion, Acts xxi. 24–27, joined in a rite purely Mosaical, and at another time conformed to a chief ordinance of Judaism by circumcising Timothy, the son of a Jewish woman, as we read in Acts xvi. 1–3. “And in general,” says Dr Taylor, “to the Jews he became as a Jew (that is, by conforming to Mosaical rites and ceremonies), that he might gain the Jews,” 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21. Which he would never have done, had it not been consistent with his profession of the gospel. On the other hand; ‘To them that were without the law, (that is, to the Gentiles,) he became as without law;’ or, as one that did not observe Mosaical ceremonies. Which shews, that he did not think the observance of them necessary, even to himself, in reference to his interest in the gospel-covenant; otherwise, he could upon no consideration have suspended the observance of them.—The truth seems to be this. The rites and ceremonies of the Law of Moses were incorporated into the civil state of the Jews, and so might be considered as national and political usages. Now, as the gospel did not interfere with, or subvert any national polity upon earth, but left all men, in all the several countries of the globe, to live, in all things not sinful, according to the civil constitution under which it found them; so it left the Jews also at liberty to observe all the rites and injunctions of the Law of Moses, considered as a part of the civil and political usages of the nation. And in this respect, they remained in force so long as the Jews were a nation, having the temple, the token of God’s presence and residence among them. But when the temple was destroyed, and they were expelled the land of Canaan, their polity was dissolved, and the Mosaic rites were quite laid aside. And, as the time in which this happened was near when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, therefore the Apostle saith, The first covenant, or Mosaical dispensation, was ‘then decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away.’ Heb. viii. 13.” According to this view, it would appear that if the temple should ever be rebuilt, Christians of the Jewish race might consistently with their Christian duty re-establish all the Mosaical ceremonies.

Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore ; for it is holy unto you. . . . Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. *It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever.*" So also in Ezekiel xx. 12, 19, 20 : "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, *to be a sign between me and them*, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them. . . . I am the Lord your God ; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them : And hallow my Sabbaths ; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."

Now it is evident, as a late writer has observed, that "the Sabbath could not be a sign between God and the people of Israel, 'unless' (as Dr Paley remarks*) 'the observance of it was peculiar to that people, and designed to be so.' It may, indeed, be contended, that as the covenant, of which the Sabbath was the sign, came in its appointed time to an end, the sign might then cease to be peculiar to the Jewish people : but the language in which the promise of the sign is given is too pointedly applicable to that people only, for it to become applicable to any other ; so that, if ever the Sabbath ceased to be a sign to the Jews, it ceased altogether as a sign ; and, in consequence, the obligation to observe the Sabbath ceased also.

"But further : the language in which the promise of the sign of the Sabbath is given, remarkable as it is for its strictly exclusive applicability to the Jewish race, is rendered still more remarkable by the irresistible proof to which it leads, that the Sabbath of the Jews was never to become the Sabbath of the Christians. The language used in regard to the Sabbath is similar to that which is used in regard to other Jewish festivals. The covenant of which the Sabbath was to be the sign is spoken of as a perpetual covenant with the children of Israel throughout their generations—a sign between God and the children of Israel for ever. In like manner, it is said of the Feast of Unleavened Bread : 'Ye shall observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread ; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt : therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for ever'† (Exod. xii., 17). Yet no Christian doubts but that, upon the promulgation of the gospel, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, although directed to be observed as an ordinance for ever, ceased to be obligatory upon the Jews, and never became obligatory upon Christians. By parity of reasoning, the duty of observing the Feast of the Sabbath,‡ which was to be a sign between God and the children of Israel for ever, was, upon the promulgation of the gospel, no longer obligatory upon that people, and could not become obligatory upon Christians, unless revived by a new command, which it never was."§

* "Moral Phil., ii., 81."

† "So, also, it is said in the same chapter as to the day of the Passover : 'This day shall be unto you for a memorial ; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations ; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever.' (v. 14.)"

‡ "Levit. xxiii. 2, 3."

§ The Mosaic Sabbath ; or, An Inquiry into the supposed Present Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By a Layman. London, 1850, Pp. 15, 16.

Bishop Warburton justly observes, that “nothing but a rite by institution of a *positive law* could serve for a *sign* or *token* of a covenant between God and a particular selected people; for besides its use for a *remembrance* of the covenant, it was to serve them as a *partition-wall* to separate them from other nations: and this a rite by positive institution might well do, though used before by some other people, or even borrowed from them. But a natural duty has no capacity of being thus employed: because a practice observed by *all* nations would obliterate every trace of a sign or a token of a covenant made with *one*.” Accordingly, he is clear that the Sabbath was a *positive* institution, which the Sabbatarians were misled to think *moral*, partly by the fact that it and the natural duty of worship hold something in common, namely, “the setting apart a certain portion of our time for the service of religion;” and partly by the statement generally supposed to be made in Genesis, and respecting which he raises no doubt, that the Sabbath was imposed upon mankind at the creation. “But these Sabbatarians,” says he, “do not consider that it is not the time when a command was given, nor even the author who gave it, that discovers the class to which it belongs, but its *nature* as discoverable by human reason. And the Sabbath is as much a positive institution, when given by God to Adam and his posterity, as when given by Moses, the messenger of God, to the Israelites and to their posterity. To judge otherwise, is reducing all God’s commands to one and the same species.”*

All the attempts which I have seen made by Sabbatarians, to explain away the difficulty occasioned by the appointment of the Sabbath as a sign between God and the Jews, have proceeded on the confusion of a *sign in general*, *i. e.*, something employed to mean, represent, or suggest another thing; and a *sign of a covenant between two parties*, which is a *particular kind of sign*. What is true of the latter is not necessarily true of the former, as the Sabbatarians are prone to assume. The command of Moses that a copy of his injunction, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart,” &c., should be bound by the Israelites “for a sign” upon their hands, and be as frontlets between their eyes, and be written on the posts of their houses, and on their gates (Deut. vi. 5-9), has plainly no bearing whatever upon the question before us: there was nothing incompatible with the peculiar circumstances of the Jews, in their being commanded to wear upon their hands, and between their eyes, “a sign” which should remind them of their duty to God. Besides, the *law itself* (and a moral law it unquestionably was) was here not *the sign*, but *the thing signified*, or intended to be called to mind. The purpose of ordering the sign to be worn is evident from the whole passage, but especially the 12th verse: “Beware lest thou forget the Lord which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage.”

* Divine Legation of Moses, B. iv., note RRRR.—“Moral duties,” says Bishop Butler, “arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command: *Positive* duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for such command received from Him whose creatures and subjects we are.” He mentions the external worship of God as an instance of a moral duty, “though no particular mode of it be so.”—(*Analogy*, Part ii., ch. 1.)

That Sabbath-observance was prescribed at the creation, is an idea which has never been generally accepted by theologians, even in former times. To many it seemed unjustifiable to set against the *plain statement* that the Sabbath was a sign between God and the Israelites, a *mere inference* from the statement that God sanctified the seventh day, because he then rested from the work of creation.* But now that astronomy and geology have upset the cosmogony of the Hebrews, the opinion that Sabbath-observance was prescribed at the beginning to the whole human race, has lost even the semblance of plausibility.

So little, however, are these considerations perceived by the Sabbatarians to be a stumbling-block, that they actually find in the texts referred to a confirmation of their own views—thus shewing themselves worthy allies of the critics who rejoice in the Hebrew narrative of the creation as conclusive evidence of the miraculous knowledge of its writer. In short, from the declaration that the Sabbath was appointed as a sign between Jehovah and the descendants of Jacob, the Sabbatarians infer that it is “a sign” between Him *and themselves*, who are consequently bound to observe it (and not only they, but, it would seem, all other Christians, whether Sabbatarians or not): and this conclusion they reach by the short and easy method of *assuming the title* of “the true Israel” or “people of God;”†—phrases signifying in the Mosaic law the descendants of Jacob alone; the *race* or “*people*” who, for certain purposes, were separated by God from all the other peoples of the earth. Accordingly, it is proclaimed by the Sabbatarians to the people of Scotland, that the Sabbath is “the badge of our homage to God, and the secret of our superiority over other lands, in point of freedom with order, and of progress with tranquillity.”‡ And it is magniloquently recorded of Sir Andrew Agnew, that he “regarded the Sabbath as ‘a sign between God and his people for ever;’ and that every step towards its sanctification was sublimed in his eyes as the harbinger of that universal reign of right-

* Milton, for instance, in considering “on what they ground their opinion, who maintain that the Lord’s day is to be observed as set apart for public worship by divine institution in the nature of a new Sabbath,” says:—“It is urged, first, that God rested on the seventh day. This is true; and with reason, inasmuch as he had finished a great work, the creation of heaven and earth: if then we are bound to imitate him in his rest, without any command to that effect, (and none has yet been produced,) we are equally bound to imitate his work, according to the fable of Prometheus of old; for rest implies previous labour. They rejoin, that God hallowed that day. Doubtless he hallowed it, as touching himself, for ‘on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed,’ Exod. xxxi. 17; but not as touching us, unless he had added an express commandment to that effect; for it is by the precepts, not by the example, even of God himself, that we are bound. They affirm again, that the Sabbath was observed previously to the Mosaic law. This is asserted with more confidence than probability; even if it were so, however, (a point as to which we are altogether ignorant,) it is equally certain that sacrificial rites, and distinctions between things clean and unclean, and other similar observances, were in force during the same period, which nevertheless are not classed among moral duties.”—(*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 605-6.)

† See Dr Lorimer on “The Protestant and Popish Sabbath,” p. 4.

‡ Appeal to the Electors of Scotland from the Committee of the Sabbath Alliance; in the North British Advertiser, 8th May 1852.

eousness and peace, the glory of which shall be dimmed by no cloud, and bounded by no horizon.”*

It will be said, however, that by “the true Israel” and “God’s people” are meant, not those true *descendants of Jacob*, and that chosen race, which the words express in the Pentateuch, but a *figurative* “Israel,” the saints of *every race* under heaven. So be it: but if a new *Israel* may be thus arbitrarily substituted for an old one, surely we are at liberty (nay, are we not bound in common sense?) to substitute also a new for the old *sign*; and if so, the sign which I venture to propose is no other than *that declared by Jesus himself to be the “badge” of his people*—“BY THIS SHALL ALL MEN KNOW THAT YE ARE MY DISCIPLES, IF YE HAVE LOVE ONE TO ANOTHER.”† This is the badge which the Apostle Paul (who declared to the literally “true Israel” that they were at liberty to “*esteem every day alike*,”) has so eloquently extolled in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says that without it all other “signs” of the Christian character are in vain:—“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.”‡ In like manner he says to the Colossians—“Put on therefore, *as the elect of God, holy and beloved*, [*i. e.* as the Israel of God; as his chosen, separate, and favoured people,] bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above

* Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew, by Dr M’Crie, p. 350.

Sir Andrew Agnew, it may be hoped, was too well acquainted with Scripture phraseology to lay any stress upon the words “for ever” in the passage above quoted from Exodus xxxi. 17—and which, by the way, *is here dexterously adapted to Sabbatarian purposes by the substitution of “God’s people” for “the children of Israel.”* But should any of his followers think the phrase important, I refer them to the articles ETERNAL and FOR EVER in Cruden’s *Concordance*, where the truth of the following remarks which there occur will be found amply demonstrated by the passages collected under the titles mentioned. “The words *eternal, everlasting, for ever*,” says this laborious writer, “are sometimes taken for a long time, and are not always to be understood strictly; for example, it is said, Gen. xvii. 8, ‘I will give to thee and to thy seed the land of Canaan for an *everlasting* possession.’ And in xiii. 15, ‘I will give it to thee and to thy seed *for ever*,’ that is, for a long space of time. And in Gen. xlix. 26, we find ‘*everlasting hills*,’ so called to denote their antiquity, stability, and duration; and this expression is used to shew the long continuance and durability of Joseph’s blessing. God promises a throne to David, an eternal kingdom, a posterity that will never be extinguished; that is, that his and his son’s empire will be of a very long duration, 2 Sam. vii. 16; 1 Chron. xvii. 14; that it will be even eternal, if hereby the kingdom of the Messiah be understood. Thus, ‘Thou shalt be our guide from this time forth even for ever;’ that is, during our whole life. And in many other places of Scripture, *and in particular, when the word ‘for ever’ is applied to the Jewish rites and privileges, it commonly signifies no more than during the standing of that commonwealth, or until the coming of the Messiah*, Exod. xii. 14, 17; Numb. x. 8.”

† John xiii. 35.

‡ 1 Cor. xiii. 1–3.

all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.”* And to Titus he writes of the Saviour “who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself A PECULIAR PEOPLE, ZEALOUS OF GOOD WORKS.”† How, in the face of these noble passages, the Committee of the Sabbath Alliance have been able to satisfy themselves that obedience to the Fourth Commandment of the Jewish Decalogue is “the badge of *our* homage to God,” would be a mystery most inexplicable, if the blindness of men of one idea to everything that clashes with their notion were not so familiar a fact. Eyes have the Sabbatarians but they see not, and ears but they hear not, when Christianity attempts to find an entrance into the Judaical corner of their minds.

The reason why some of the Jewish institutions were tolerated, and even, in the case of abstinence from idol-offerings, things strangled, and blood,‡ actually enjoined by the apostles upon the Gentile converts, was evidently the expediency of lessening, as much as possible, the risk of offence to Jewish prejudices, and, by thus conciliating the “weaker brethren,” removing what was found to be a source of disunion in the Christian churches.§ When the necessity for such conciliation ceased, the apostolic injunction became of no effect; and few Christians now think it their duty to abstain from things strangled or from blood.||

* Col. iii. 12-14. † Titus ii. 14. ‡ Acts xv. 28. § See Rom. xiv.

|| “The Christian Jews,” says Hooker, “did think at the first, not only themselves, but the Christian Gentiles also, bound, and that necessarily, to observe the whole law. There went forth certain of the sect of Pharisees which did believe; and they coming unto Antioch taught, that it was necessary for the Gentiles to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses.—(Acts xv.) Whereupon there grew dissension, Paul and Barnabas disputing against them. The determination of the council held at Jerusalem concerning this matter, was finally this: ‘Touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and determined, that they observe no such thing.’—(Acts xxi. 25.) Their protestation by letters is, ‘Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which departed from us, have troubled you with words, and cumbered your minds, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law; know, that we gave them no such commandment.’—(Acts xv. 24.) Paul therefore continued still teaching the Gentiles, not only that they were not bound to observe the laws of Moses, but that the observation of those laws, which were necessarily to be abrogated, was in them altogether unlawful. In which point, his doctrine was misrepresented, as though he had everywhere preached this not only concerning the Gentiles but also touching the Jews. Wherefore coming unto James and the rest of the clergy at Jerusalem, they told him plainly of it, saying, ‘Thou seest, brother, how many thousand Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law. Now they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are amongst the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, and sayest, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to live after the customs.’—(Acts xxi. 20.) And hereupon they give him counsel to make it apparent in the eyes of all men, that those flying reports were untrue, and that himself being a Jew kept the law, even as they did. In some things therefore we see the apostles did teach, that there ought not to be conformity between the Christian Jews and Gentiles. How many things this law of unconformity did comprehend, there is no need we should stand to examine. This general is true, that the Gentiles were not made conformable unto the Jews, in that which was necessarily to cease at the coming of Christ. Touching things positive, which might either cease or continue as occasion should require, the apostles, tendering the zeal of the Jews, thought it necessary to bind even the Gentiles for a time to abstain as the Jews did from things offered unto idols, from blood, from things strangled.—(Acts xv. 28.)

Accordingly, the Sabbath (which Gentile Christians at no time observed) at length ceased to be kept by the Christians of the Jewish race ; and the Lord's Day—a festival which it was reserved for the ingenuity of modern times to identify with the Sabbath, and call by its name*—gradually, and without any known command of Jesus or his apostles, came to be observed as a day of worship, thanksgiving, and rejoicing, by all races of Christians alike.

Till the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Christian Church appears to have been but little if at all annoyed by Judaizing members ; but “ as early as 1516 (says a late biographer of Calvin), Erasmus had observed with regret the tendency towards Judaism excited by the revival of Hebrew literature under the auspices of Reuchlin ; and had strongly characterised it as a pest the most dangerous to Christianity.† This preference for the Old Testament became a marked characteristic of Calvin and his followers. It was signally displayed by Knox and the Covenanters in Scotland, and subsequently by the English Puritans.‡ Calvin made his civil legislation subservient to his scheme of church polity. The object of both was to found a theocratic state resembling that of the Israelites under Moses, of which he himself was to be the high priest and prophet. He avows and justifies the adoption of the rigorous precepts of the Mosaic law in a letter to the Duchess of Ferrara, written in 1564.§ But though his legislation was modelled on that of the Jewish lawgiver, it was conceived in a spirit of still greater severity. The following parallel is extracted from the work of Calvin's recent biographer, who will not be suspected of a design to give an unfavourable view of his legis-

These decrees were everywhere delivered unto the Gentiles to be straitly observed and kept.—(Acts xvi. 4.) In the other matters the Gentiles were free, and the Jews in their own opinion still tied : the apostles' doctrine unto the Jews was, ‘ Condemn not the Gentile ;’ unto the Gentile, ‘ Despise not the Jews.’ —(Rom. xiv. 10.) The one sort, they warned to take heed that scrupulosity did not make them rigorous in giving unadvised sentence against their brethren which were free ; the other, that they did not become scandalous by abusing their liberty and freedom to the offence of their weak brethren which were scrupulous. From hence, therefore, two conclusions there are which may evidently be drawn ; the first, that whatsoever conformity of positive laws the apostles did bring in between the churches of Jews and Gentiles, it was in those things only which might either cease or continue a shorter or longer time, as occasion did most require ; the second, *that they did not impose upon the churches of the Gentiles any part of the Jews' ordinances with bond of necessary and perpetual observation (as we all, both by doctrine and practice, acknowledge), but only in respect of the conveniency and fitness for the present state of the church, as then it stood.* The words of the council's decree, concerning the Gentiles, are, ‘ It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no more burden, saving only these things of necessity ; abstinence from idol-offerings, from things strangled, and blood, and from fornication.’ So that in other things positive, which the coming of Christ did not necessarily extinguish, the Gentiles were left altogether free.—(Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, B. iv., § 11.)

* See Note F., on the History of Modern Sabbatarianism.

† “ Erasmus, Ep. 207.”

‡ “ So Ananias, in Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* : ‘ All's heathen but the Hebrew.’”

§ “ ‘ C'est que sur ce que je vous avois allégué que David nous instruit par son exemple de haïr les ennemys de Dieu, vous respondes qu' c'estoit pour ce temps là du quel sous la loy de rigueur il estoit parmi de haïr les ennemys. Or, Madame, ceste glose seroit pour renverser toute l'écriture, et partant il la faut fuir comme peste mortelle.’ Quoted by Dr Henry, *Leben Calvins*, i. 452.”

lation: 'The rigour of the Old Testament, which, in announcing God's anger and justice, stepped forth on all occasions with the punishment of death against a stiffnecked people, manifestly prevails with Calvin. With him, as with Moses, the spiritual members of the state are judges. Both are jealous for God's honour, and therefore Calvin, like Moses, punishes idolatry and blasphemy with death. Though the Mosaic laws do not mention high treason, properly so called—which, however, nevertheless occurs in the history of the Jewish state—Calvin places it in the same category with treason against God. To strike or curse a parent is in both codes a capital offence. In both, theft is only followed by loss of freedom. Both rigorously punish unchastity, and adultery even with death. Moses does not mention suicide; by Calvin it is branded with infamy. With Moses the severest punishment is stoning; with Calvin death by fire. Moses burnt only the corpse of the criminal. Both use degradation as a means of punishment; but infamy, or exclusion from the community, does not appear in the Mosaic law.'*

"But although Calvin adopted all the rigorous precepts of the Jewish dispensation, and indeed went so far in many instances as to make the code of Moses paramount to the law of Christ, yet it is remarkable that he was utterly averse to that grandeur and ceremony of worship which distinguished the Mosaic ritual. The source of both these characteristics of his system must perhaps be sought in his determination to oppose the practice of Rome at every point; for they cannot be reconciled with a consistent study of the Old Testament."†

Here, then, we see the origin of one of the most striking characteristics of the Scottish and English Calvinists. Slowly and reluctantly have they by degrees disengaged themselves from the prolific error into which they were originally led; and although, like the author of *The Divine Origin and Perpetual Obligation of Tithes, by a Clergyman of the Church of Scotland*,‡ many ministers of that Church may be willing even now to argue, on Jewish grounds, for "the duty of a State countenancing and supporting *the true religion*, and taking cognisance of breaches of the first as well as of the second table of the law" (p. xiii.); comparatively few, perhaps, are prepared to embrace in all its latitude his fundamental proposition, "that whatever was once prescribed relative to the general worship of God, or the duty which man owes to his brother man, was designed to be, not only of universal use at the time, but, unless modified or repealed by subsequent communications of the Divine will, of perpetual obligation."—(Page 42.) "This proposition," says he, "we hold to be equally applicable to the institutions of the Levitical as to the enactments of the Patriarchal dispensation. In regard to both, we are only at liberty to say that 'such and such institutions or enactments were designed to be only of temporary obligation, for it is expressly so declared, or obviously follows from principles developed in subsequent revelations.' But without some such warrant we are not at liberty to dispense with any part of the

* "P. Henry, *Leben Calvins*, ii. 68."

† *Life of Calvin*, by Thomas H. Dyer, p. 150–1. London, 1850.—The effects of the Judaical notions were dreadful in Germany: See the *Westminster Review*, Jan. 1852, p. 216.

‡ Edinburgh, 1841. The volume is dedicated to Dr Chalmers, and its reputed author is now a Free Church minister near Edinburgh.

revelation which was at any time given for the regulation of the conduct of man.”—(*Ibid.*) Now, however startling this proposition may be when so clearly enunciated, it actually falls short of the principle which is tacitly assumed by the less considerate Sabbatarians, who are continually quoting this declaration of Christ to the Jews—“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.”* And *in reference to every Sabbatarian*, it appears to be an unanswerable argument of the “Clergyman of the Church of Scotland,” that “the obligation to consecrate to God *the tenth of one’s income*, is as binding as the obligation to consecrate to him *the seventh of one’s time*.”—(Page xvi.) Those who believe that *no part* of the Jewish law is binding upon them, can assent without inconvenience; for, on their principle, to be “*as binding*” as a law which does not bind, is to be not binding at all. But no upholder of the perpetual and universal authority of the Fourth Commandment can consistently deny the obligation which the Scottish “Clergyman” has written a large and learned treatise to demonstrate. And those who found their Sabbatarianism not on the Jewish but on the *patriarchal* law, will find that he can give them as good reasons as their own, for a patriarchal law of tithes.†

* Matt. v., 17, 18.—Whether the purposes of the Jewish law *have not* “all been fulfilled,” is a question which does not seem to occur to the quoters of this passage in support of Puritanical opinions.

† One of the arguments for such a law is thus ridiculed by Selden: “Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedeck; what then? It was very well done of him: It does not follow therefore that I must pay tithes, no more than I am bound to imitate any other action of Abraham’s.”—(*Table-Talk; Works*, vol. iii., part ii., p. 2072.)

He observes, also—“It is ridiculous to say the tithes are God’s part, and therefore the clergy must have them: why, so they are if the layman has them. It is as if one of my Lady Kent’s maids should be sweeping this room, and another of them should come and take away the broom, and tell for a reason why she should part with it, It is my lady’s broom: as if it were not my lady’s broom, which of them soever had it.”—(*Ibid.*)

This tempting subject has not escaped the keen eye of Cobbett, who treats it with his usual pungency. Referring to a tract published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and written by “a Minister in the Country for the use of his Parishioners,” he asks this Minister “On what authority he calls the tithe ‘God’s portion;’ in what part of his word God has commanded any portion at all of the produce of the earth to be given to a Christian Priest? Does he appeal to the Mosaic Law? Why, then, does he not keep the *Sabbath* and not the Lord’s day? why does he not kill the Paschal Lamb, and offer up burnt offerings? Why does he eat blood, bacon, and hares? And, particularly, why does he not content himself with a tenth of the ‘*increase*,’ and not take a tenth of the *crop*; and, further, why does he not divide his tithe with ‘the poor, the widow, and the stranger,’ and not keep it all to himself? And, besides this, why does he not, as the LEVITES did, *renounce*, for himself and his children, *all other worldly possessions*? ‘And the Levite that is within thy gates, thou shalt not forsake him; for he has *no part nor inheritance with thee*.’—Deut. xiv. 27.”—(*Twelve Sermons*, by William Cobbett. Serm. xii., On the Duties of Parsons, and on the Institution and Object of Tithes.)

Benjamin Franklin, in his *Memoirs*, tells of a companion of his, named Keimer, who wore his beard at full length, because in the Mosaic law it is said, “Thou shalt not mar the corners of thy beard.” Keimer likewise kept the

By this grand error of supposing the Jewish law to be obligatory on Christians, was John Knox, in the sixteenth century, led to pro-

seventh-day Sabbath; agreeing in this with an entire sect of Christians, who continue to hold a place in *Evans's Sketch of the Various Denominations of the Christian World*. These Judaisers, who are so much more consistent than usual, take the title of Sabbatarians, which they have a better right to than the Lord's Day Sabbatarians, to whom it is commonly applied. But though Keimer thought himself bound by the Fourth Commandment and the law against marring the beard, it does not appear whether he looked upon all parts of the Mosaic code as equally obligatory. Perhaps, if questioned on the subject, he would rather have sacrificed consistency than have maintained that he who smites or curses his father or mother should be put to death (Exod. xxi. 15, 17; Lev. xx. 9); that stubborn and rebellious sons should be stoned (Deut. xxi. 18-21); that the corners of fields should be left unreaped and the gleanings of the harvest ungathered by the husbandman, and some of the grapes and olives left unpulled, for the use of the poor and the stranger (Lev. xix. 10; Deut. xxiv. 19, 20); that fields and vineyards should not be sown with mingled seed, or a garment mingled of linen and woollen be worn (Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 9-11); or the corners of the head be rounded, as well as the corners of the beard marred (Lev. xix. 27); that an ox and an ass should not be put together in the plough (Deut. xxii. 10); and that the ox should not be muzzled when he treadeth out the corn (Deut. xxv. 4.)

Some of these regulations, and others which no sane man would desire to see enforced among us, are attributed by Michaelis to the necessity which Moses saw of adapting his institutions to the character of the people he had to deal with.

"To the authority of those more ancient usages and laws," says he, "which Moses found already in force, we must ascribe his finding it necessary, on civil grounds, to permit certain things which he could hardly have approved, or could only have considered as expedient in a political view. For laws run the risk of being disrespected and disobeyed when they oppose deep-rooted customs, and would deprive the people of long-established and favourite rights. A legislator who attempts to introduce a system of morality too strict for his subjects, will, by aiming at too much, gain nothing, and only pave the way for their more audacious and extensive transgression of his laws; and what they have successfully tried as to one, they will soon put in practice as to others.

"The expression of Christ concerning such inveterate customs is, that 'Moses suffered them' in the Israelites, 'because of the hardness of their hearts' (Matth. xix. 8); and here will occur to every one, that which forms the greatest example of this, the case of Divorce. To the same class belong Polygamy, and the marriage of a childless brother's widow, and the right of the blood-avenger to attack and kill with impunity, in any other than a sacred place, the person who had slain one of his relations. This right will hardly be reckoned among the laudable institutions of any government. It was, however, a right which the legislator was here forced to tolerate, because it was connected with an imaginary sense of honour which he could not eradicate from the minds of the people. We see, from the experience of our own times, of how little avail the severest laws have proved in repressing an evil of the like nature. The greatest and wisest legislators have laboured to extirpate the foolish and fatal practice of duelling; but they have only shewn the world how impotent laws are, when they attack an inveterate *point of honour*. Whoever understands the rights of the blood-avenger in all their extent, will certainly not regard them as less mischievous and sanguinary than the custom of duelling.

"This leads me to a very important observation. Moses himself extols the wisdom of the laws which, by God's command, he had given to the Israelites; and he does so justly. But the ideas of some people on this point have been carried to such an unfortunate length, as to contradict Scripture itself. Because these laws proceeded from God, it has been inferred that they must be absolutely the best possible laws; and one writer on Dogmatics has thence copied this conclusion from another, that, although Christian sovereigns are not absolutely obliged to abide by the civil laws of Moses, yet, since they undoubt-

claim it as God's truth that the civil government lay under a sacred obligation to extirpate unsparingly the opinions and worship of the

edly are the best and wisest of laws, every prince, as in duty bound to choose what is best for his subjects, ought, in reason, to imitate them as far as possible, and always adopt them in preference to heathen laws.

"Now, what is this, in fact, but to insist that the civil law of Moses, which our theology has expelled, should be again privately introduced, as by a back door? The Apostle Paul declares, without any exception, that the Mosaic laws do not bind us; but how can we, with a good conscience, have other laws, if they are the best, and we are bound to follow this best of models? They may not, it is true, *immediately* bind us, but they do so *mediately*, through the intervention of the moral precept, 'Choose what is best.'

"But can, then, those divines who have this precept in their creed, understand it rightly, and hold it for true in all its extent? Certainly not. For can they believe that a Christian ruler is bound to follow the example of Moses, in allowing polygamy and divorce without all restraint? Put this question to them, and the probability is, that they will go too far to the other extreme, and maintain that a ruler were guilty of a sin in even tolerating such things, although God, by Moses, allowed them; just as if, among Christian subjects, no example of Israelitish hardness of heart could ever be found.

"From this example, we clearly perceive that the Mosaic laws are *not* always the best in *this* sense, that laws more holy, and more consonant to morality, could never be introduced among any people. But, it will be said, how will I obviate the difficulty, that, as the laws of God, they must still be the best? The answer is easy. They are not absolutely so, but only the best suited to the then circumstances of the people; not the best for a Platonic, but for an Israelitish republic."—(*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. i. p. 15-19.)

Michaelis goes on in the next two sections to shew that "Moses was often obliged to abide by former usage, though not the best; because the alteration of laws is dangerous;" so that his laws being "necessarily regulated by the circumstances of the Israelites, are not to be introduced among a people in different circumstances." Among the circumstances of the Israelites, he treats first of climate; and in regard to the law of the Sabbath observes, "Moses prohibited the kindling of fire on that day, which might do very well in Palestine; but how unsuitable would it be in Norway! On that day, also, there durst be no work done, not even in harvest. This again answered quite well in that country, where the weather at that season is always settled; but with us, and still more towards the north, where the harvest is later and more precarious, such a law would be intolerable. For the Sabbath might, amidst a course of rainy weather, be perhaps the only dry day on which it would be possible to save the fruits of the earth. It was on that day forbidden also to prepare and dress victuals, which, with us, were equivalent to ordaining a half fast-day every week. But in a warm country, where supper is the principal meal, the Sabbath might and would be, by this law, a day of feasting; for it began at sun-set, and the meat was dressed just before, in the afternoon of Friday."—(Pp. 21, 22). He concludes by reiterating the opinion, "That our legislators are not obliged to adopt the laws of Moses as universally the best. If they would wisely imitate his example, let them regulate their laws by the circumstances of the country where they are meant to operate, and depart the farther from *his* laws, the more the situation of their subjects differs from that of the Israelites."—(P. 28.)

From the same learned writer I extract the following illustrations of another branch of the subject.

"In giving," says he, "a *theological* answer to the question, what right Christian parents have in regard to the marriage of their children, some appeal to Biblical examples, and thence endeavour to shew that children ought not to marry without the approbation of their parents; nay, I remember to have met with the same *ratio decidendi*, even in *juridical* responses, where an appeal was made to *laws Divine as well as human*. But the law of the Hebrews is not our

Roman Catholics, and even to massacre the members of that communion, man, woman, and child; and that this was a duty so incumbent, that in case of remissness of the magistrate, it devolved upon the people at large.* The same religious "truth" continued in repute until the

rule, and their example would prove more than they who quote it desire, viz., that parents have a right to marry their children to persons whom they know not, without their consent, and even to sell their daughters."—(Vol. i., p. 445-6).

* For proof of this, see the Edinburgh Review, vol. xxvii., p. 166; and Mc'Crie's Life of Knox, Period viii., p. 278 of the 6th edition.

Dr Chalmers, in his Sermon on the Respect due to Antiquity, laments in eloquent language the stern severity with which Knox and his brother Reformers thought it their duty to treat their Roman Catholic countrymen. "After having wrested from Popery its armour of intolerance, was it right," he asks, "to wield that very armour against the enemy that had fallen? After having laid it prostrate by the use alone of a spiritual weapon, was it right or necessary, in order to keep it prostrate, to make use of a carnal one?—thus reversing the characters of that warfare which Truth had sustained, and with such triumph, against Falsehood; and vilifying the noble cause by an associate so unseemly as that which the power of the State can make to bear on the now disarmed and subjugated minority. Surely the very strength which won for Protestantism its ascendancy in these realms is competent of itself to preserve it; and if argument and Scripture alone have achieved the victory over falsehood, why not confide to argument and Scripture alone the maintenance of the truth? It is truly instructive to mark, how, on the moment that the forces of the statute-book were enlisted on the side of Protestantism, from that moment Popery, armed with a generous indignancy against its oppressors, put on that moral strength which persecution always gives to every cause that is at once honoured and sustained by it. O, if the friends of religious liberty had but kept by their own spiritual weapons, when the cause was moving onward in such prosperity, and with such triumph! But when they threw aside argument, and brandished the ensigns of authority, then it was that Truth felt the virtue go out of her; and Falsehood, inspired with an energy before unknown, planted the unyielding footstep, and put on the resolute defiance. And now that centuries have rolled on, all the influences, whether of persuasion or of power, have been idly thrown away on the firm, the impracticable countenance of an aggrieved population."—(*Sermons on Public Occasions*, p. 152.)

The allusion here is, of course, to the people of Ireland; and assuredly the reproof is not less needed now by Protestants than it was in 1827, when the sermon was preached. We *still* need to be reminded, that, by oppressive or insulting legislation, the glories of martyrdom are transferred to the holders of the opinions we desire to extirpate,—“and superstition, which, in a land of perfect light and perfect liberty, would hide her head as ashamed, gathers a title to respect, and stands forth in a character of moral heroism, because of the injustice which has been brought to bear upon her.”—(*Ibid.* p. 184; Sermon on the Effect of Men's Wrath in Religious Controversies.) The hint may *still* be useful, that “When there is proud or angry intolerance on the side of truth, it must call forth the reaction of a sullen and determined obstinacy on the side of error. Men will submit to be reasoned out of an opinion, and more especially when treated with respect and kindness. But they will not submit to be cavalierly driven out of it. There is a revolt in the human spirit against contempt and contumely, insomuch that the soundest cause is sure to suffer from the help of such auxiliaries.”—(*Ibid.* p. 179.) These are truths which, says Dr Chalmers, “it can require no very deep insight into our nature to perceive;” and if so, shallow indeed is the insight of those noisy agitators who take the lead in “Protestant Associations,” and make our pulpits ring with their impassioned denunciations of the followers of the Man of Sin! To their zeal on behalf of what they regard as God's truth, I am as far as possible from objecting; on the contrary, I cordially assent to the proposition of Dr Chalmers, that “it is the part of man, both to adopt and to advocate the truth, lifting ‘his zealous testimony in its favour.’” But with him I add—“Yet there is surely

time of Locke, who actually found it necessary to prove that the injunctions given to the Jews in early times to slay the Canaanitish idolaters, are not to be considered as rules of conduct for the Gentiles.* Samuel Rutherford, it is true, in his elaborate work against religious liberty, is so relenting as to concede that the example of Joshua "will not warrant us to make war, and destroy with the sword, all the Indians and idolaters on earth, and to compel them to worship the true God in the mediator Christ, without preaching first the gospel to them: nor can it warrant us to kill every ignorant blinded Papist with the sword; nor can we deny but what Elias and Paul did against false teachers was by extraordinary impulsions, because the ordinary magistrate would not, as Ahab and Jezebel, and could not, through ignorance of the gospel, punish perverters of the truth: *but sure,*" he adds, "*these examples prove corporal and sometimes capital punishment ought by the magistrate to be inflicted on all blasphemers, on all ringleaders of idolatry and false worship, as Exod. 32, and Levit. 25.*"† What was so clear to Knox and Rutherford is not now found to be God's truth even by the most violent enemies of Popery among sane educated men; nor do we now conceive it to be a duty, as our forefathers did, either to burn witches, or to abstain from taking

a way of doing this in the spirit of charity; and while strenuous, while even uncompromising in the argument, it is possible surely to observe all the amenities of gentleness and good-will, in these battles of the faith."—(P. 180.)

* See his Letter concerning Toleration, pp. 51–53.

† A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience. By Samuel Rutherford, Professor of Divinity in the University of St Andrews. London, 1651. P. 183.

Bishop Heber, in maintaining that idolatry, being a crime against God and not against man, is not punishable by human authority, observes that "the precedent of the Jewish law cannot avail to lead us to a different conclusion; since, that which might be expedient and necessary under the peculiar circumstances of their theocracy, is no example for us who live under dispensations entirely different; and since, though God may be conceived, as He did in this instance, to delegate a part of his power to a particular magistrate, yet other magistrates, who have no such express commission or direct command, would be guilty of usurpation no less than cruelty, if they presumed to determine on the conduct of another man's servant."—(*Life of Jeremy Taylor*, p. 216.)

This is a very different doctrine from that of Knox and Rutherford. Gillespie, who, it will be remembered, was a colleague of Rutherford in the Westminster Assembly, expresses the Presbyterian notion of those days as follows:—"I do heartily acknowledge that what we find to have been an ordinance or an approved practice in the Jewish church, ought to be a rule and pattern to us, such things only excepted as were typical or temporal, that is, for which there were special reasons proper to that infancy of the church, and not common to us."—(*Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, b. i., ch. 1; in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. ii., p. 1. Edinburgh, 1846.) Here is the grand Puritanical mistake of assuming that the Mosaic law was imposed, not on *the Jewish nation*, but on *a permanent spiritual body* called the Visible Church, which then happened to include only the Jews and their proselytes, but now consists of all true disciples of Jesus Christ. Even if we grant this assumption however, still, who shall decide *what* things were typical or temporal, and *what* ordinances had special reasons proper to the infancy of the church? For, as Baxter well observes, "*most lieth upon the proof of a parity of reason, which puts us upon trying cases hardly tried, unless we knew more of the reasons of all those laws.*"—(*Works*, vol. xv., p. 62.)

interest for money.* Many years, however, will probably elapse before the effects of the mistake here exposed will disappear from the theological literature and traditional notions of the Scottish people.

Dr Chalmers, in a letter to Sir Andrew Agnew in 1839, thus

* "Usury"—by which was formerly meant *any* rate of interest of money—is specified in the Larger Westminster Catechism as one of the sins forbidden in the Eighth Commandment (see *Question 142*); although Calvin, in a passage quoted by Professor Playfair in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. i., p. 233, and which that excellent writer characterises as "a close and logical argument, not unworthy of Mr Bentham" (p. 16), had strongly opposed what in his day and long afterwards was the prevalent opinion on the subject. "How many fathers of the church," exclaims Michaelis, "in their zeal for the Mosaic law, condemned the taking of interest, which is also reprobated by the Canon law!"—(*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, translated by Alex. Smith, D.D., vol. i., p. 27.) Even so acute and liberal a thinker as Hales of Eton failed to emancipate himself from the ancient prejudice; as appears from a "Letter to a Lady," in which, at her request, he delivers his opinion on the question. "I am much disquieted," says he, "that your ladyship should demand my judgment in a case wherein it can do you so little service: for to speak the truth at first, the matter about which you please to make enquiry, I could never yet incline to favour. It is true, that traffic, and merchandise, and all dealings in stock of money, will utterly fail, if way be not given to usury: and therefore, in commonwealths, and so in ours, the moderate use of it by law is to be rated. *But what shall we say to God himself, who everywhere decries it? What unto all good men, both Ethnic and Christians, who, for many hundred years, have still protested against it?* For let all records be looked into, and it will appear that John Calvin was the first good man that ever pleaded the lawfulness of it. Indeed when he had once broken the ice, many good men, at least they seem so, ventured to wade after him; but with what success God knows; for man cannot, till it be too late; since none can discover what account they have or shall make at that day. To think it safe to walk in these men's steps is more than I dare advise you to; since we live not by example, but by precept."—(*Works of John Hales*, vol. i., p. 201; ed. 1765.)

Selden says in his *Table Talk*: "Would it not look oddly to a stranger that should come into this land, and hear in our pulpits usury preached against; and yet the law allow it? Many men use it, perhaps some churchmen themselves. No bishop nor ecclesiastical judge, that pretends power to punish other faults, dares punish, or at least does punish, any man for doing it."—(*Works*, vol. iii., Part ii., p. 2075.) Baxter discusses the question at some length in his *Christian Directory*, and determines that in certain cases, "some such gain or usury is lawful and commendable;" *i. e.*, when it is not "against either justice or charity."—(*Works*, vol. vi., pp. 319, 325.) Can it be doubted that for teaching thus, he was denounced by many of his contemporaries as one who sanctioned a most flagrant violation of God's law? Milton, in like manner, restricts his condemnation of usury to that "which is taken from the poor, or of which the sole object is gain, and which is exacted without a regard to charity and justice; even as any other species of lucrative commerce carried on in the same spirit would be equally reprehensible."—(*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 676.) By Milton, indeed, as we formerly saw, the authority of the Jewish code is utterly repudiated; although it must be confessed that he often (under the influence probably of early habit) departs in practice from the principle which in the abstract he so decidedly maintains. Thus, it is by quotations from *the Old Testament exclusively* that he supports the assertion, that "the lawfulness of oaths is evident from the express commandment as well as example of God."—(*Ib.*, p. 579.)

As the taking of a fair rate of interest for money is now as universally admitted to be agreeable to the will of God, as formerly it was held to be sinful, the foregoing extracts afford us, I think, as impressive a warning as could be found, against the besetting sin of assuming it as certain that our notions are identical with God's truth.

maintains the universal and perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment: "That the Sabbath law is not of temporary obligation, like the rites and ceremonies of the older economy, *is obvious from the place which it holds in the Decalogue*—that unrepealed code of religion and morality—where it stands enshrined among those duties to God upon the one side, and those duties to man upon the other, which are all of them of immutable and everlasting obligation."*

Now, if to hold a place in an abrogated code of laws which were imposed upon a single nation and its voluntary adherents, in a little corner of Asia; if to hold in such a code a place between two sets of precepts, enjoining the performance of natural and eternal duties, be enough to give the character of a natural duty to what was no natural duty before, then does the place which the Sabbath-law holds in the Decalogue prove both its *everlasting* obligation, which Dr Chalmers here asserts, and its *universal* obligation, which he tacitly assumes. This argument, however, is plainly inadmissible in itself, and, if good for its purpose, would lead to the very inconvenient conclusion that every positive Jewish law which is delivered along with laws ordaining the performance of natural duties must be obligatory on us. Of this sort are the laws for the observance of the Sabbatical year and three annual feasts, in Exodus xxiii., where, after sundry moral precepts, we read as follows: "Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger; for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. And six years thou shalt sow thy land, and shalt gather in the fruits thereof: But the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie still; that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat. In like manner thou shalt deal with thy vineyard, and with thy oliveyard. Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed." Then follow injunctions to make no mention of the names of other gods, and to keep a feast unto the Lord three times in the year.—Besides, it might as justly be argued, from this proximity of the Sabbath-law to laws confessedly *positive*, that it has *nothing* natural in it, as, from its being flanked in the Decalogue by moral precepts, that it *is* natural, and consequently of everlasting obligation; which conclusion against its morality would be strengthened by the fact already noticed, that in Lev. xxiii. 2, the Sabbath is mentioned indiscriminately among "the feasts of the Lord." Must we conclude from the repeated injunction, "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary" (Lev. xix. 30; xxvi. 2), that the duty of reverencing the temple at Jerusalem was incumbent on the Gentiles, as the duty of keeping holy the Sabbath is said to have been and to be?

Another eminent writer, Dr Graves, in his elaborate *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, has stated further grounds, on which, though with evident hesitation, he at last brings himself to assert the universal obligation of the Ten Commandments. After commenting on them he proceeds as follows: "Such is the substance, and such the importance of the Decalogue. Shall we then censure and despise the Jewish law, as a system of mere external and useless ceremonies,

* Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew, p. 347.

when it evidently places this great summary of moral duty at the head of all its institutions; and, in the very mode of its promulgation, stamps it with a sacredness and authority, suited to its natural pre-eminence? For, let it be remembered, that the Decalogue alone was promulgated to the Jews not by the intermediate ministry of their legislator, but directly to the assembled nation, by the voice of God, issuing from the glory on the top of Sinai. Thus does the Jewish legislator appeal to his nation in attestation of this fact: ‘Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day. The Lord our God made a covenant in Horeb: the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us alive unto this day. The Lord talked with you face to face, out of the midst of the fire,* saying, I am the Lord your

* Dr Graves here omits a parenthetical sentence forming verse 5, viz., “I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount.” By thus garbling the passage, he seems to betray a consciousness that these words would have contradicted his assertion that the Decalogue was spoken *directly* by God from the top of the mount to the Israelites at the foot of it. Not only spontaneous fear, but a most imperative command and solemn warning which they had received, prevented them from going up with Moses (see Exod. xix. 12, 13, 21, 23, 24); nor does it appear from the rest of that narrative, any more than from Deuteronomy v., that the Ten Commandments were spoken *directly* to the people. On the contrary, they are preceded in Exodus by the following words: “So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them. And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.”—(xix. 25; xx. 1, 2.) This appears to mean that Moses repeated to the Israelites what God had spoken to him; as if the passage had run thus—“So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them as follows: ‘And God spake all these words, saying, &c.’” Dr Graves has garbled also verse 6.

It is remarkable that Dr Chalmers, who, in his *Evidences of the Christian Revelation*, B. iv., ch. 1. (vol. ii. p. 236-7 of the last edition), has collected from the Pentateuch a history of the tables of stone upon which the Decalogue was written, omits the 27th and 28th verses of Exodus xxxiv., and takes a leap from verse 1st of that chapter to verse 4th of Deut. x. By comparing Exod. xxxiv. 27, 28, with Deut. x. 4 (as I have done on p. 96), a reason may be discovered for thus abruptly quitting the narrative in Exodus at the end of the 1st verse, and completing the history of the tables from another book. The inconsistency between the omitted passage and those which he has quoted, must have perplexed Dr Chalmers not a little. It is one which I do not remember to have seen anywhere mentioned in the course of my reading. Neither it nor the discrepancy between the two editions of the Fourth Commandment is noticed in the collection made by Dr Graves (*Lectures on the Pentateuch*, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 332, *et seq.*, App. sect. i.) of the “Texts which have occasioned doubts whether the Pentateuch was written by Moses himself, or compiled at some later period.” Le Clerc, who at first drew the latter conclusion from the passages evidently posterior to the time of Moses, subsequently abandoned it as unwarranted, and gave explanations like those of Bishop Marsh, quoted in a former page (see p. 94.) In reference to the passages which he says are plainly added by another hand, he observes that “yet they are not such as to prevent us from acknowledging these books to be the work of Moses; just as no one would deny that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were the works of Homer, because, as the old grammarians allege, there are various verses interpolated in different parts of these poems. We are not to imagine,” he adds, “that in the most ancient times there was as great a variety of books, or as many copies of the same book, as at present; therefore it might easily come to pass, that anything added to the writings of Moses by any later prophet, might afterwards appear in all copies of a subsequent date.”—

God.' (Deut. v. 1, &c.) Moses then repeats the Ten Commandments, and adds, 'These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me.' Thus awful was the promulgation of the Divine law, *enjoining these great principles of duty both towards God and man; first to the Jews, AND THROUGH THEM, WE MAY TRULY ASSERT, TO ALL THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH.*"* For this "true assertion," that the Decalogue was *imposed* upon the Gentiles through the medium of the Jews, it would have been satisfactory to learn from Dr Graves some more cogent reasons than any that he has stated in his work. For in the lecture where he particularly treats of the "Effects of Judaism on the Gentiles," nothing is maintained beyond the vague proposition, "that the Jewish scheme was never intended merely *for the benefit* of the Jews alone, but by their instrumentality for the benefit of all mankind, *whose instruction and reformation it had the clearest tendency to promote, by exhibiting the most striking proofs of the existence and power of the true God, not only to the Jews themselves, but to all the nations placed in their vicinity or affected by their fortunes*; amongst whom were the Egyptians the wisest, the Canaanites the most warlike, and the Phœnicians the most commercial nations of remote antiquity; and afterwards the four great empires of Assyria and Persia, Greece and Rome, which successively swayed the sceptre of the civilized world; so that whatever *knowledge of true religion* was preserved amongst mankind, was in all probability principally derived from this source, or at least was from thence materially extended and improved."†

Now, supposing the Jewish system to have possessed even more of this tendency to promote amongst other nations the knowledge of the true God than Dr Graves has claimed for it, or than the amount which there actually was of such knowledge among the ancient Gentiles warrants us in admitting,—how, I repeat, can this lead to the conclusion, that a law which the true God imposed upon his peculiar people the Jews, was intended by him to oblige such of the Gentiles as might happen to come to the knowledge of it, and to the belief of its Divine authority? And even if this conclusion were warranted, what right should we have *to restrict it to the Ten Commandments*, instead of extending it to many other parts of that Jewish scheme "which was never intended merely for the benefit of the Jews alone,

(*Prolegomena in Vet. Testam., Dissertatio Tertia de Scriptore Pentateuchi*, quoted by Graves, vol. i., p. 351.) On this subject see Watson's *Apology for the Bible*, Letters ii. and iii.; and Brett's *Dissertation on the Ancient Versions of the Bible*, in vol. iii. of Watson's *Coll. of Theol. Tracts*. Bishop Marsh attributes some of the alterations to "a false opinion in the transcribers that they were supplying defects, or correcting mistakes. They chiefly arose," says he, "from the custom of writing notes in the margin of Hebrew manuscripts, which notes were in subsequent copies transferred into the text."—(*Lectures on the Several Branches of Divinity*, Part ii., Lect. 10, p. 77.) This theory is favoured by Sumner, in his *Records of the Creation*, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 399, App. No. iii.

* Lectures on the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch. By the Rev. Richard Graves, D.D., Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin. &c. &c. Second edition, vol. i., p. 234-5. London, 1815.

† Vol. ii., p. 284.

but by their instrumentality for the benefit of all mankind?" Lastly, is it not plain, that whatever authority the Jewish law may have had with respect to the Gentiles *before* the introduction of Christianity, it has none with respect to them *now*?—unless, indeed, we repudiate what Dr Graves calls "that great feature of the Jewish scheme," which he expresses by the proposition, coincident with those quoted above (p. 166) from Hooker, Milton, and Conybeare, "that the Jewish Law was from the first intended not to be of eternal obligation, but declared to be subservient to, and introductory of, the Gospel" (p. 354). This, in fact, is the ground on which he combats an objection that has often been stated to the Divine origin of the Jewish system, as indicating a capricious mutability on the part of God, who, say the objectors, first promulgated the Mosaic Law as of eternal obligation, and yet afterwards is supposed to have abrogated it, and introduced the different and even opposite system of Christianity.

Bishop Conybeare, who, in the reign of George II., defended the Christian revelation with consummate ability from the objections of Tindal (including the one just stated), is found hovering fondly on the brink of the proposition which, in Dr Graves's opinion, "may be truly asserted;" but, unlike the Irish professor, he refrains from taking the plunge. "The revelation made to Moses," says he, "was intended for the more especial service of the Jews; . . . yet still, it was not so entirely restrained to them *as to be unknown to others*." "The Jews, especially when dispersed at the Captivity, had great opportunities "of spreading the knowledge of the true God, . . . and therefore may be supposed to have given the ignorant world *some better notions of things than they had before*." In most countries of any considerable figure, there was "a competent number of Jews residing, by whom the several particulars of their religion might be, and probably were, communicated to the world." Hence "we may conclude that the Jewish law, though made originally to a particular people, and, in several branches of it, proper to that people, *was not confined to them alone*. It might be, and probably was, *known* in a good degree almost everywhere. Those amongst whom the Jews lived, might *profit much* by their instructions. Many parts, of what hath been reckoned the most excellent philosophy, might be derived from them, or corrected by them," &c.*—The law of Moses "*was not confined to the Jews alone*;" this, say you when you come to it, is surely the identical assertion of Dr Graves? But the next sentence puts this not unnatural idea to flight, by revealing, that what the Bishop is speaking of is not the *obligation*, but only the *knowledge*, of the Jewish law!

That the ancient Jews imparted some knowledge of their religion to many among the Gentiles, is highly probable; but with respect to the degree in which the Gentiles were likely to believe in its truth and Divine authority, and in the reality of the miraculous events by which that authority was attested, there seems to be a tendency among theologians to indulge in exaggeration. Not only would the strong prejudices of the heathen in favour of their own religion be difficult to overcome; but, unless the teaching Jew could, like Daniel in

* Conybeare's Defence of Revealed Religion, 3d edition, pp. 405-6.

Babylon, support by miracles the credibility of his doctrine, the learners might often hear him with no greater conviction than what we receive from the sacred books of the Hindoos or Mahommedans, and from the miraculous events recorded therein.*

The peculiarly solemn manner in which the Decalogue was promulgated at Mount Sinai, is adduced, we have seen, by Dr Graves, in proof of his assertion that this part of the Mosaic law was given to "all the nations of the earth" as well as to the Jews. The peculiarity referred to is much insisted on by Dr Dwight, in his *System of Theology*, Sermon cv., where the moral character of the Fourth Commandment is very strenuously maintained. "This command," says he, "together with the remaining nine, was spoken with an awful and audible voice, from the midst of the thunders and lightnings which enveloped Mount Sinai;" like the others, it was distinguished by being "written by the finger of God on one of the two tables of stone;" and, as tables and pillars of stone "were in ancient times direct symbols of the perpetuity of whatever was engraved on them, this very natural symbol God was pleased to adopt in the present case, to shew the perpetual obligation of these commands. . . . This also forms a peculiar article of distinction between the Decalogue and the rest of the Jewish law." Moreover, when Moses had broken the original tables of stone, God "was pleased to write the same commands a second time" on two other tables—thus "teaching us, that he was pleased to become a second time the recorder of these precepts with his own hand, rather than that the entire distinction between these precepts, and others, should be obliterated." Now, proceeds Dr Dwight, "every part of this solemn transaction, it is to be remembered, was the result of contrivance and design; of contrivance and design on the part of God himself. Every part of it, therefore, speaks a language which is to be examined and interpreted by us. Now, let me ask, whether this language is not perfectly intelligible, and perfectly unambiguous? Is it not clear, beyond every rational debate, that God designed to distinguish these precepts from every other part of the Mosaic law, both as to their superior importance, and their perpetuity? Is it not incredible that God should mark, in so solemn a manner, this command, together with the remaining nine, unless he intended that all to whom these precepts should come, that is, all Jews and Christians, or all who should afterward read the Scriptures, should regard these commands as possessing that very importance which he thus significantly gave them; should consider them as being,

*The Rev. Dr Duff, in his pamphlet entitled *The Church of Scotland's India Mission*, p. 3, (Edinburgh, 1835,) says of the Hindoos, that with them the argument for Christianity from miracles is utterly powerless. "They retort, that they themselves have miracles far more stupendous. And doubtless if mere *gross magnitude* is considered, they say what is true: for, in this respect, *their* miracles set all comparison at defiance. Besides, with them the *original* miracles form an *inherent* part of their *theology*; and they have no notion of what is meant by an appeal to them, in order to authenticate a *doctrine*. And *modern* miracles they have in such abundance, that they are exhibited on the most trivial occasions, and become matters of daily occurrence." See also the remarks of that distinguished Hindoo, Rammohun Roy, in his *Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus*, p. 225, quoted in the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. viii., p. 599.

in a peculiar sense, his law ; and hold them as being perpetually and universally obligatory ?”

To these questions I reply—

1st, That as far as we may presume to judge of God’s purposes where none are expressly revealed, he *did* design “to distinguish the Decalogue from every other part of the Mosaic law as to *its superior importance.*” For it seems to have been meant as a summary of the whole Jewish law, and, as such, might very fitly be impressed in a peculiar manner upon the minds of the people ; nor was it less likely that an important *positive* precept should be thus distinguished, than nine important *moral* precepts. The idea that the Decalogue is an “abridgment not only of the moral but also of the ceremonial law,” is by no means new ; it is adduced, in the terms here quoted, by Beausobre and L’Eufant in their *Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures*, published above a century ago ;* and it accords with the dictum of Philo, that “the Fourth Commandment is only an abridgment of whatever is prescribed concerning the festivals, vows, sacrifices, and all religious worship.”†

But, 2dly, to me it is as far as possible from being “clear, beyond every rational debate,” that God designed to distinguish the Decalogue “as to its *perpetuity* ;” for, although Dr Dwight says that stones were anciently symbols of perpetuity of whatever was engraved on them, he makes, in saying so, what is as pure an assumption as his conjecture (stated, nevertheless, as dogmatically as if it were something *known* to him to be true), that “God *was pleased to adopt* this very natural symbol in the present case, *to show the perpetual obligation of these commands.*”

3dly, Be the Decalogue, however, as “perpetual” as you please, still, perpetuity, I must repeat, is quite a different thing from universality, and does not imply it in the least. So far from being “incredible” is it that God should act as he did, unless he intended that all Christian readers of the Scriptures should look upon the Ten Commandments as being “universally obligatory”—so far, I say, is this from being “incredible,” that (as the preceding pages shew) multitudes of learned men, nay, whole Christian churches, *have actually believed it* ; and to my mind the *really* “incredible” proposition is,

* An Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, intended chiefly for young Students in Divinity ; reprinted in Bishop Watson’s Collection of Theological Tracts, vol. iii., p. 231. This is characterised by the Bishop as “a work of extraordinary merit.”

The authors cite another reason which has been assigned why “the law concerning the Sabbath, though merely ceremonial, should be ranked among the Ten Commandments ;” and it is this : “The observation of the Sabbath being then a part of the divine worship, and a fence against idolatry, as God was therein acknowledged the Creator of the world, it was very expedient that this law should be placed in the first table, which contained the duty of the Israelites towards God. It is moreover to be observed that this commandment is the last in that table, because by observing it the children of Israel could therein discover the grounds of the three first.” Assuming the current edition of the Commandment to be genuine, we must acknowledge great force in this representation. But if my conclusion be sound (*ante*, p. 97), that the reason originally annexed to the Fourth Commandment was the one recorded, not in Exodus, but in Deuteronomy, then what has just been quoted is altogether inapplicable.

† *De Decal.*, quoted by Beausobre and L’Eufant.

that God intended all Christians to consider themselves bound by the Decalogue, and yet refrained from making this intention known to them.

Suppose that William the Conqueror, after establishing his dominion in England, had signalized by an unparalleled blast of trumpets, and by huge bonfires on fifty hills, the promulgation of his first and (let us say) most important edict to the English people; and had, moreover, distinguished it from all his future ordinances by engraving it with his royal hand upon brass; would it be "clear beyond every rational debate," that this edict, because of such distinction, must have been more *permanently* or *extensively* binding than his other English laws, written on parchment by a scribe, and promulgated in the usual way? Would his subjects in Normandy have thought it "incredible" that he "should mark in so solemn a manner this command, unless he intended that all to whom it should come, that is, *all*" his subjects "who should afterward read" this law, "should hold it as being *universally obligatory*" throughout his dominions, and consequently binding on the Normans, to whom it was *not* promulgated, equally with the English, to whom it *was*? And if any one had told them that the trumpet-blowing, fire-kindling, and engraving on brass, must be "the result of contrivance and design," which design *could be no other* than that Normandy as well as England should be subject to this law, would they not have laughed in the face of their instructor, and told him that although doubtless the king had *some* design in these proceedings, yet, if he had really intended to impose his law upon Normandy as well as England, he would unquestionably have proclaimed it to his Norman subjects, as a law to be obeyed by them; and as for the uncommon solemnity of the English promulgation, *that* was sufficiently accounted for by the obvious utility of arresting, in some such forcible manner, the attention of the English at the commencement of his legislative proceedings, and of fixing as firmly as possible in their memory, what was not only the earliest, but the most important ordinance of his reign?

One other argument which has been stated to prove the universal obligation of the Fourth Commandment, deserves to be briefly examined. The Rev. David C. A. Agnew, (son of Sir Andrew, and minister of the Free Church at Wigtown,) in his *Occasional Papers on Sabbath Observance*, No. I., p. 3, observes, that, "in connection with the household, the Commandment takes into account 'the stranger that is within thy gates.' *This*," says he, "*completes a brief description of THE WHOLE POPULATION of a country. The ancient division of our race into Jew and Gentile is also taken into account; AND THUS THE SABBATH LAW IS ADDRESSED TO GENTILES AS WELL AS JEWS.*"

Here, apparently, it is intended to say, that the Sabbath law was addressed not only to all those Gentiles who formed a part of "the whole population" of Canaan, but to *the* Gentiles everywhere, and consequently to us; for if not, of what practical importance is the law of the whole population of ancient Canaan to the people of Scotland? But whether or not this be his meaning, Mr Agnew has here grievously misinterpreted "strangers within thy gates," which signifies neither the Gentiles at large, nor even the whole Gentile inhabitants of Canaan, but a certain class of them only, styled *proselytes*. "Pro-

selyte (*προσήλυτος*),” says Dr W. L. Alexander, “is the name applied in the New Testament and the Septuagint to converts from heathenism to Judaism. In the Old Testament such persons are called גֵּוֹיִם, *strangers, advenæ*, and יְשֻׁבֵי־אֶרֶץ, *settlers, incolæ*. For the reception and treatment of these, provision was made in the law of Moses (Exod. xii. 48; Lev. xvii. 8; Num. xv. 15, &c.); and the whole Jewish state was considered as composed of the two classes—Jews, and strangers within their gates, or proselytes.”*

Accordingly, “The law itself was not wholly confined to the Jews, but given to strangers (Deut. xxix. 11; xxxi. 12; Josh. viii. 33, 35; Exod. xii. 19, 49), and those that accompanied them from Egypt; the covenant was made with all the Gentiles that should hereafter become proselytes to their religion (Deut. xxix. 14, 15; Lev. xxiv. 22); and sufficient care was taken to communicate it to them.”†

After this exposition, what shall we say of the scriptural knowledge of Richard Winter Hamilton, LL.D., D.D., displayed in the following passage of his *Horæ et Vindicæ Sabbaticæ*?—“An application is enforced [in the Fourth Commandment] which recognises its universal authority. It is enjoined upon ‘the stranger.’ *If only national, this extension would be unmeaning, if not exacting.* Now we learn that this was required even of the alien. Thus Nehemiah forbade, by force, the men of Tyre dwelling in Jerusalem, who ‘brought all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah.’ The gates of the city were first shut against them during the Sabbath. When ‘once or twice’ they endeavoured to evade the restriction, and ‘the merchants and sellers of all kinds lodged without Jerusalem,’ then did the holy patriot ‘testify against them,’ threatened decisive measures against them, and ‘from that time forth came they no more on the Sabbath.’ The spirit of the history is, not only that they were punishable in tempting the Jew, *but that it was equally a breach of their own duty.*”—(P. 41.) If these men of Tyre were proselytes, it was a breach of their duty, but the fact is nothing to Dr Hamilton’s purpose. If, however (as is evident), they were *not* proselytes, then his conclusion is utterly baseless that they were bound to keep the Sabbath. For my part, I can see nothing in the passage referred to (Neh. xiii. 15–21), except that Nehemiah—who was *not* the lawgiver of the Jews, but the governor or pasha of Jerusalem, commissioned by the Persian king—proclaimed that the foreign dealers should abstain from tempting the *citizens* to break the law of Moses: When they evaded his order, he threatened to lay hands on them; thenceforward they absented themselves from Jerusalem on the holy day; and Nehemiah, whose sole care was the observance of the law *within Jerusalem*, gave himself no concern about their doings on the Sabbath while they spent it beyond his jurisdiction.

In Germany, about a century ago, Michaelis wrote as follows:—“All orthodox and sound divines maintain, that the *civil* laws of Moses, at least, are not binding on us. Yet how oft has superstition

* Kitto’s Cyclop. of Biblical Literature, vol. ii., p. 368, art. PROSELYTE. See also Lardner’s Credibility, vol. iii., p. 395, ed. 1815; and Bishop Law’s Considerations of the Theory of Religion, 5th ed., p. 98.

† Bishop Law’s Considerations, p. 89.

pressed upon Christians the adoption of particular parts of them ! How many passages do we not find even in our best writers on Dogmatics, inculcating it as a duty on our lawgivers to abide as closely as possible by the Mosaic laws, as the wisest that can be framed ! And how many an anxious and tender conscience may not thus be led to doubt whether the civil law of Moses be really and truly abrogated, and not the constitution of the Jewish church only ? and whether, of course, it may not be sinful to live according to other laws, and, for example, to take interest for money, which Moses prohibited ? Now, all such mistakes and scruples can only be satisfactorily prevented by surveying the Mosaic laws in connexion, and with their causes : we shall then be soon convinced, that God never meant them to bind any other nation but the Israelites ; and that it would be quite foolish to detach particular parts from their connexion with the rest, and to attempt engrafting them on other systems to which they must prove incongruous. Of this we shall have occasion to speak more largely in Article VI. In the mean time, let it be observed, that, from a connected view of them, the real theologian must see that they can never serve as a model, or rule of direction, to other legislators ; and he will, of course, refrain from blaming our rulers when their laws are contradictory to those of Moses ; as, for instance, in the punishments of theft and adultery ; and from thus exalting himself from a preacher to a legislator : *a thing which happens more frequently than we are apt to imagine.*”*

The opposition which continues to be made, even in our own day, upon Jewish grounds, to the abolition of the capital punishment of murder, is a proof that these observations have not yet become unnecessary ; † and, as if to add absurdity to exegetical unskilfulness,

* Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. i., p. 5, 6.

† The expediency or in expediency of capital punishment is not the question here ; I refer merely to *one of the grounds* on which many still argue in its favour.

Moreover, I am aware that the text usually quoted from Scripture on this subject occurs in the history of Noah, long before the giving of the Mosaic law : “ Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed ; for in the image of God made he man.”—(Gen. ix. 6.) But as modern science has dismissed the narrative of the Flood, along with that of the Creation, from the domain of history, what we read of Noah himself has ceased to deserve attention as a ground of theological argument : nor, in any circumstances, could the *reason* which this text assigns for slaying the murderer, be consistently accepted as good, by believers in a *spiritual* God. It may be added that the most able defenders of the Christian Revelation in the last century, took care not to stake their cause on the possibility of maintaining the historical truth of the Hebrew representation of primitive events. When Tindal (in his *Christianity as Old as the Creation*, pp. 251 *et seq.*, 385 *et seq.*), assailed certain portions of the Mosaic narrative, including the story of the Fall, neither Conybeare nor Foster, who were leading champions against him, and assuredly did their work in a masterly style, attempted to vindicate the historical truth of the transactions in Paradise.—(See Bishop Conybeare’s *Defence of Revealed Religion against the Exceptions of a late Writer, &c.* London, 1732, 3d ed. ; and *The Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation defended against the Objections, &c.*, by James Foster ; London, 1734. 3d ed.) On the contrary, Dr Foster, in the following passage, broadly hints that in his opinion Christians are nowise bound to maintain the correctness of all that is recorded in the Hebrew Scriptures :—“ But because he (Tindal) has endeavoured particularly to expose several passages in the histori-

our Judaisers have lately been exclaiming with the utmost vehemence against a proposal to give legal sanction to marriage with a deceased

cal books of the Old Testament, I would, before I conclude this chapter, add one remark more, namely, that though these passages may be vindicated, as far as 'tis reasonable to expect we should be able to account for all the things contained in books written at so great a distance, when the customs and ways of writing were so different from what they are at present; yet before we allow ourselves to be obliged to undertake the defence of them, there is a previous question proper to be considered, viz., how far we are bound, by the quotations and references in the New Testament, to acknowledge the divine authority of the Old, and especially of every historical account that is given in it. And I mention this the rather, because 'tis most certain, that, in the nature of the thing itself, there is no connection between the two ideas, for instance, of Moses being assisted by God, in an extraordinary manner, in bringing the Israelites out of Egypt, and forming their religion and polity; and his infallibility as an historian. Nay, he may be a credible and unexceptionable witness to all the facts which he relates upon his own knowledge, or of whose truth and certainty he had himself opportunities of being fully informed; even though he should not be exactly right in every circumstance of his history of the world, and the state of religion, before his own times; in compiling which, if he had no other helps than from the best records and traditions he could meet with, there may be some defects, and yet the account upon the whole be authentic, and highly valuable. And if upon stating and examining this question fairly it appears, that we are not obliged, in order to support the Christian revelation, to defend all the historical passages of the Old Testament, we are eased of an unnecessary trouble; if the contrary, we shall, at least, have the satisfaction to know that we proceed in a just and regular method, and do not reason in the dark."—(P. 258-9.)

Paley, in his *Evidences of Christianity*, Part iii., ch. iii., takes up unreservedly the position which Foster but indicates a liking to. "Undoubtedly," says he, "our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution: and, independently of his authority, I conceive it to be very difficult to assign any other cause for the commencement or existence of that institution; especially for the singular circumstance of the Jews' adhering to the unity, when every other people slid into polytheism; for their being men in religion, children in everything else; behind other nations in the arts of peace and war, superior to the most improved in their sentiments and doctrines relating to the Deity. Undoubtedly, also, our Saviour recognises the prophetic character of many of their ancient writers. So far, therefore, we are bound as Christians to go. But to make Christianity answerable with its life, for the circumstantial truth of each separate passage of the Old Testament, the genuineness of every book, the information, fidelity, and judgment of every writer in it, is to bring, I will not say great, but unnecessary difficulties, into the whole system. These books were universally read and received by the Jews of our Saviour's time. He and his apostles, in common with all other Jews, referred to them, alluded to them, used them. Yet, except where he expressly ascribes a divine authority to particular predictions, I do not know that we can strictly draw any conclusion from the books being so used and applied, beside the proof, which it unquestionably is, of their notoriety, and reception at that time. In this view, our Scriptures afford a valuable testimony to those of the Jews. But the nature of this testimony ought to be understood. It is surely very different from, what it is sometimes represented to be, a specific ratification of each particular fact and opinion; and not only of each particular fact, but of the motives assigned for every action, together with the judgment of praise or dispraise bestowed upon them. St James, in his Epistle (chap. v. 11,) says, 'Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord.' Notwithstanding this text, the reality of Job's history, and even the existence of such a person, has been always deemed a fair subject of inquiry and discussion amongst Christian divines. St James's authority is considered as good evidence of the existence of the Book of Job at that time, and of its reception by the Jews; and of no-

wife's sister—their agitation being grounded, not upon any *real* enactment of Moses, but on a flagrant and palpable misrepresentation of

thing more. St Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy (chap. iii. 8,) has this similitude: 'Now, as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth.' These names are not found in the Old Testament. And it is uncertain, whether St Paul took them from some apocryphal writing then extant, or from tradition. But no one ever imagined, that St Paul is here asserting the authority of the writing, if it was a written account which he quoted, or making himself answerable for the authenticity of the tradition; much less, that he so involves himself with either of these questions, as that the credit of his own history and mission should depend upon the fact, whether Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, or not. For what reason a more rigorous interpretation should be put upon other references, it is difficult to know. I do not mean, that other passages of the Jewish history stand upon no better evidence than the history of Job, or of Jannes and Jambres, (I think much otherwise); but I mean, that a reference in the New Testament to a passage in the Old, does not so fix its authority, as to exclude all inquiry into its credibility, or into the separate reasons upon which that credibility is founded: and that it is an unwarrantable, as well as unsafe rule to lay down concerning the Jewish history, what was never laid down concerning any other, that either every particular of it must be true, or the whole false.

"I have thought it necessary to state this point explicitly, because a fashion, revived by Voltaire, and pursued by the disciples of his school, seems to have much prevailed of late, of attacking Christianity through the sides of Judaism. Some objections of this class are founded in misconstruction, some in exaggeration: but all proceed upon a supposition, which has not been made out by argument, *viz.*, that the attestation which the Author and first teachers of Christianity gave to the divine mission of Moses and the prophets, extends to every point and portion of the Jewish history; and so extends as to make Christianity responsible in its own credibility, for the circumstantial truth (I had almost said for the critical exactness) of every narrative contained in the Old Testament."

If the Evangelical disciples of Professor Gaussen, who, in the title-page of a book mentioned on p. 100, professes to prove "every word and expression in the Scriptures to be from God," should be surprised at such language from two of the ablest defenders of the Christian revelation, they would stand aghast were I to quote what Soame Jenyns, another famous Christian advocate, has written on the same subject, in the concluding section of his *View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion* (*Works*, 2d ed., vol. iv., p. 79, *et seq.*) The passage, however, is too long to be inserted here. But I cannot help saying, that in my opinion he lays far greater stress on the internal, in comparison with the external, evidence of revelation, than it is able to bear. Bishop Conybeare seems to write more soundly in saying, that, "strictly speaking, there can be no *internal evidence* of a revelation at all. For, I would desire to know, what can be concluded from the nature of any doctrines or precepts delivered? Why, this only, that they are either true or false; and if true, that it must be the will of God they should be received as such. Be it so; yet doth it follow from hence, they must therefore be revealed? No, certainly: several of the same points which are inculcated in the gospels, are contained likewise in the writings of the philosophers. The internal evidence of their truth must be the same in both: but were they equally revealed to both kinds of writers? No; the one learned them from Divine revelation; the other from principles of human reason: the one produce full proof of a Divine commission; the other allege nothing of that kind at all. Upon this I must affirm, that external proof is the only direct evidence of a revelation; and that all conclusions drawn from the nature of the several doctrines or precepts amount to nothing more than a condition, or *causa sine quâ non*, as being that without which no external evidence should be admitted." Again: "The nature of the doctrines which miracles are alleged to confirm, must be considered; because, if these are inconsistent with any certain and known truths, they are incapable of proof: no miracles

his law : For any impartial man of sense may very soon satisfy himself, by considering Lev. xviii. 18,* along with Deut. xxi. 15,† of the truth of Dr Chalmers's remark (so disagreeable to certain of the petitioners against Mr Wortley's Marriage Bill), "that, while there is an express interdict on the marriage of a man with his brother's wife, there is no such prohibition against his marriage with his wife's sister. In verse 18, the prohibition is only against marrying a wife's sister during the life of the first wife, which of itself implies a liberty to marry the sister after her death, beside implying a connivance at polygamy."‡ So unavoidable is this deduction from the words in the English Bible, that recourse has been had by the Scottish opponents of Mr Wortley's measure, to the weak and even puerile theory, long since rejected by scholars, that the word which every body translates "*sister*" in the previous verses of the chapter—which the Jews have always believed to mean "*sister*" in verse 18 likewise—and which the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic, and Chaldean versions of the Pentateuch are confessedly unanimous in rendering "*sister*" in this important verse—ought *there* to be translated, not "*sister*," but "*another*;" because in divers parts of Scripture the word is figuratively used where it *cannot* mean "*sister*," but *must* of necessity mean "*another*!" Accordingly, the advocates of this theory would have us read the passage thus : "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other, in her lifetime."§ This barefaced proposal of a rendering which not merely sets every principle of rational criticism at defiance, but brings with it the necessity of maintaining, at whatever sacrifice of candour and common

can, in such a case, be of any force ; and therefore, if such are really wrought, we must conclude that they did not proceed from the God of truth, but the author of lies.

"But if, upon such a consideration, everything shall appear clear ; *i. e.*, if there be no contradiction in the doctrines themselves, nor inconsistency with any certain truth, then, (for anything we know to the contrary,) they may be true ; and if so, then they may be capable of sufficient evidence from proof external. There is no manner of occasion (as our author [Tindal] contends there is), that these matters should be proved by the internal evidence of the thing, or that they should shew themselves to be parts of natural religion by marks of wisdom and goodness, of which every one is not capable of judging. If this were necessary, then external proofs could carry us no farther than internal proofs do ; then miracles could have no force, but where such force is useless ; and consequently, the working them for this purpose must be unaccountable."—(*Defence of Revealed Religion*, pp. 431-2, 463-4.)

* "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, *beside the other in her lifetime.*"

† "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated ; and if the firstborn son be hers that was hated ; then shall it be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved, firstborn, before the son of the hated, which is indeed the firstborn."

‡ Daily Scripture Readings, at Lev. xviii. 18.

§ Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister or Niece, considered in Reference to the Law of God and the Interests of Society. By the Rev. John Montgomery, A.M., Innerleithen. Edinburgh, 1850. P. 9.—Mr Montgomery follows Mr S. E. Dwight, an American lawyer, whose work is entitled, *The Hebrew Wife* ; or, *The Law of Marriage examined in Relation to the Lawfulness of Polygamy, &c.* It was reprinted at Glasgow in 1837.

sense, that polygamy was unlawful among the Jews,* has met with so little favour from Hebrew scholars, that even the Lords Spiritual who spoke against Mr Wortley's bill in Parliament refrained from making any use of it. By the Bishop of Exeter, however, there was propounded, on the authority of Dr Mill, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, the following as the true translation and punctuation of the verse: "And a woman unto her sister thou shalt not

* Mr Montgomery, who professes to regard it "as a bad sign of any cause when its advocates have recourse to disingenuous shifts and artifices in its behalf" (p. 21), nevertheless, in an elaborate argument against the common opinion that polygamy was lawful among the Jews, ignores Deut. xxi. 15, where the practice is so distinctly connived at, that every reader of the law there written must have felt himself blameless in having two wives. Accordingly, it is well known that polygamy prevailed unrebuked among even the most holy men of the race of Abraham. For an ample and scholarlike discussion of the Mosaic law of marriage, see the Commentaries of Michaelis, vol. ii., pp. 1-122. The proposition he sets out with is this: "How much soever some may have denied it, nothing is more certain than that by the civil laws of Moses, a man was allowed to have more wives than one."—(P. 1.) With respect to the other question he observes: "Marriage with a deceased wife's sister Moses permits; but prohibits, on the other hand, the marrying two sisters at once. The words of the law, Lev. xviii. 18, are very clear, 'Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, to be her rival, and to uncover her nakedness along with *hers*, in her lifetime.' After so distinct a definition of his meaning, and the three limitations added, (1.) as to the one being the other's rival (to express which, we may observe, by the way, that the same word is used, as in Sam. i. 6, where two wives have but one husband; and in Arabic it is found in the same sense); (2.) as to the man's uncovering the nakedness of both; and (3.) as to his doing so in the lifetime of the first,—*I cannot comprehend how it should ever have been imagined that Moses also prohibited marriage with a deceased wife's sister*—that very connection which we so often find a dying wife intreating her husband to form, because she can entertain the best hope of her children's welfare from it."—(P. 112, 113.) He adds: "The reason why marriage with a deceased wife's sister has been so generally understood to be forbidden is, that Moses has prohibited marriage with a brother's widow; and expositors, in order to have it in their power to draw inferences from other prohibitions, have maintained, that he not only prohibits the particular marriages specified in his law, but also those equally near in point of relationship. Now because it was an insurmountable objection to this doctrine of degrees, that Moses permitted marriage with a wife's sister, and prohibited it with a brother's widow, they found it necessary to pervert entirely, notwithstanding its perfect clearness, the meaning of this precept, to convert it into a general prohibition of polygamy, and, in contradiction to the style of all the marriage-laws, to understand the word *sister*, not of the relation properly so called, but of any woman whatever, not at all related to the wife. . . . What Moses prohibited, was merely *simultaneous polygamy* with two sisters; that sort of marriage in which Jacob lived, when he married Rachel as well as her sister Leah. The reason of this prohibition it is not difficult to discover. Sisters, in whom nature has implanted a principle of the strongest affection, are not to be made enemies to each other by polygamy. That two wives of the same husband should love each other, is inconceivable. The man, therefore, who wishes to live in polygamy, and make *two* wives hate each other from jealousy, should make use of strangers, and not of sisters. The history of Jacob, who, contrary to his inclination, was brought into this predicament, furnishes a very animated representation of the reasons on which this law is founded. Enmities between sister-wives will, besides, always be more violent, and, from their having known each other too intimately all their lives, more unmannerly than where they are strangers to each other, and cannot so freely venture to outrage decency in their mutual hatred."—(P. 113, 114.)

take: to annoyance; to uncover her nakedness upon her in her life:"* which odd version, though sufficiently adverse to Mr Montgomery's theory, is with much reason laughed at by Mr Denison as nonsense.†

An Elder of the Free Church of Scotland has lately published a pamphlet, entitled *Reasons for Declining to Sign a Petition to Parliament against a Bill for Legalising Marriage with the Sister of a Deceased Wife* (Glasgow, 1852.) It is a calm and modest exposition, untainted by party-spirit; and so deeply does its writer disapprove of the conduct of his Church in violently opposing Mr Wortley's bill, that he has felt it incumbent on him to resign his ecclesiastical office.

"Much," he observes, "has been said, and very justly, about the arrogance and intolerance of the Church of Rome; but has not the conduct of the Free Church, in this matter, fully equalled any thing that the Church of Rome ever did?"

"By adding to the prohibitions of God's Word, has the Free Church not acted like the Man of Sin, who, 'sitting in the temple of God, sheweth forth himself to be a God' (2 Thess. ii. 4); that is, assumes authority that belongs only to God? Has she not gone to the Canon Law of that Man of Sin, and taken this prohibition from it?"

"There are in England about six thousand families formed by these marriages. Many of those who have contracted these marriages are people of the highest Christian character. Amongst them are clergymen of the Church of England, Dissenting ministers, lawyers, medical practitioners, merchants, &c., of the highest respectability. They, their friends and neighbours, petition that they may be relieved from the position they have been placed in by Lord Lyndhurst's Act, and the Free Church agitates, and her ministers, from the pulpit, exhort people to sign the petitions which have been prepared, and send them from door to door for signatures. In all this she has, however, not been very successful.

"Immediately after the Disruption, the Free Church sent a deputation to the English Dissenters, to collect money amongst them for building churches, and were very kindly received. These same Dissenting ministers, and their people, now petition the Government that they may be relieved from Lord Lyndhurst's cruel and Popish Act; and the Free Church, professing to be wiser and more learned than these Dissenters, tells them that, if she can help it, their petitions shall not be listened to. A little more modesty, and less intolerance, would become her better.

"*To force her own interpretations on other Christian communions—on those who, in the opinion of many, are better qualified to explain the Word of God than the ministers of the Free Church are, appears to me to equal all that the Church of Rome ever attempted.*"—(P. 27.)

It is agreeable to see the principles of religious liberty so manfully asserted by a member of a Church which, while proclaiming her love of "freedom" in the very name she bears, is yet so prone to for-

* See the Bishop of Exeter's authorised edition of his Speech on the Marriage Bill.

† See A Short Letter on the Bishop of Exeter's Speech on the Marriage Bill. By Edmund Beckett Denison. London, 1851. P. 5.

get that those who differ from her are as well entitled to freedom as herself.

To petition Parliament against any measure on the ground that it would legalize *a sin*, is to assume that the petitioners or the legislature, instead of God Almighty, are the judges of sin. The only principle on which the British Parliament can rightly deal with the Marriage Bill, is the tendency of the proposed law to injure or promote the interests of society.

On this ground let its merits be freely discussed ; and if the rejection of the bill be thought more conducive, on the whole, to the general welfare, than the passing of it into a law, then by all means let it be sternly rejected. But to secure a dispassionate consideration of the evidence on both sides of *this* question, we must dismiss from our minds the notion that Mr Wortley's proposal is at variance with the revealed law of God ; nor should it be forgotten, that on those who would prohibit such marriages rests *the burden of proving* that they are socially or politically inexpedient. Again, let the advocates of prohibition beware of attributing to the legality of such marriages, evils proceeding rather from the bad dispositions of individuals who might be expected to act viciously under *any* state of the law,—or attributable to the demoralising influence, under which some who have infringed the present law may have suffered, of a state of public opinion that brands the transgressors with infamy. Finally, since perfection is not to be looked for in human institutions, and evil cannot be wholly excluded by the best of them, let it be remembered that *that* state of the law should be condemned, not in which *evil exists*, but in which evil is most abundant *in proportion* to the good. If, after careful investigation, Mr Wortley's bill be found worthy of acceptance, its effects, we may reasonably hope, will not be so unfavourable to domestic virtue and happiness as its opponents apprehend. People will adapt their conduct to the circumstances ; and public opinion, the grand enforcer of prudence and decorum in social usages, will lend its powerful sanction to the dictates of that morality and good sense which happily abound among the British people.

Precisely as the opponents of the Marriage Bill have brought against it an alleged Jewish law, existing only in their own imaginations, did the advocates of the divine right of sovereigns uphold their principles by misinterpreting the Bible. It is stated by Michaelis, that “ during the violent controversy carried on in the seventeenth century concerning the rights of kings, the party which maintained the divine right of the sovereign, and the servile submission of the subject, appealed very confidently to the Israelitish law, believing that it ought to serve as a pattern to us.” He, however, shews that those who entertained this idea were quite mistaken in supposing the Israelitish law to give any countenance to their principles ; and that, on the contrary, if inquiry be made into the extent to which the power of an Israelitish monarch reached, and the source from which it was derived, the discoveries made will turn out to be very much in favour of the nobler side of freedom. “ The kings of the Israelites,” he continues, “ were by no means so unlimited as from 1 Sam. chap. viii. we are apt to represent them : and Moses was so far from appointing a king over them, that he merely gave a permission for this purpose at a future

period; leaving it entirely at the pleasure of the Israelites to choose one when they should find it expedient; so that the king among them was, with all his power, only the creature of the people.”*

But although the Mosaic law has never been *binding* upon any but the Jews, it is certainly well fitted to *enforce*, and very probably has *suggested*, some excellent rules of conduct to the Gentiles. Among its admirable moral precepts, we find, besides those in the Decalogue, commandments ordering the Jews to shew kindness to strangers (Lev. xix. 33); to use just balances, weights, and measures (Lev. xix. 35, 36; Deut. xxv. 13-16); to relieve the poor, even if strangers or sojourners in the land (Lev. xxv. 35); not to wrest judgment, or respect persons, or take gifts (“for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous”), but to follow that which is altogether just, and have one manner of law for stranger and Jew alike (Deut. xvi. 19, 20; xxv. 1; Lev. xxiv. 22); not to remove a neighbour’s landmark (Deut. xix. 14); to decide against no man upon the testimony of a single witness (Deut. xix. 15); to punish false witnesses (Deut. xix. 16); to treat captive women with humanity (Deut. xxi. 10-14); to take care of stray animals for the owner’s benefit (Deut. xxii. 1-4); to erect parapets on house-tops for the prevention of accidents (Deut. xxii. 8); and, lastly, to remove filth out of sight and smell (Deut. xxiii. 12-14)—*a precept which there is very great need for inculcating in Scotland*, but on which, notwithstanding the reverence of our clergy for the Jewish law, I do not remember to have heard or seen a single sermon! As for the law which ordains the curser of his father or mother to be punished with death, and that other law which dooms to the same fate the obstinate rebel against parental restraint in a career of debauchery and drunkenness, † I am not prepared to concur with Dr Graves in the opinion, that these laws were in the abstract “just and moderate,” and that in the abstract the latter offence “surely merited infamy and death.” ‡ If this opinion be sound, why not enact the same laws now?

According to the Sabbath Alliance, to disclaim the universal and perpetual obligation of the Decalogue is a most fatal proceeding; being in fact to undermine the very foundations of religion and morality, and to absolve the world from obedience to the law of God. “The divine law of right and wrong, and the Sabbath, must now,” they warn us, “stand or fall together. If the Fourth Commandment goes, all the others go with it; henceforth the love of God and the love of man cease to be commanded duties, and are left merely to the impulse of feeling. The Sabbath, in the Fourth Commandment, is the great safeguard of both tables of the law.” § And in the Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew we find a statement of his opinion to the same effect:—“To deny the continued authority of the Decalogue, the only infallible test of eternal right and wrong, would be to unsettle the very foundations of morality; and such is the indissoluble connection between all the parts of this heavenly system, that to pluck a single orb from its

* Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. i., pp. 7, 8.

† Lev. xx. 9; Deut. xxi. 18-21.

‡ Lectures on the Pentateuch, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 264.

§ Tract No. I. of the Sabbath Alliance.

firmament must endanger all the rest, and lead to the ultimate subversion of the whole."*

The conclusion is indeed undeniable, that "if the Fourth Commandment goes," as a law binding upon the Gentiles, all the other nine "go with it;" but that, *therefore*, "the love of God and the love of man cease to be commanded duties," is an inference which will seem passing strange to most believers in the authority of the law of Christ, recorded in the New Testament; and not less preposterous to those who believe, with Bishop Butler, that "the moral law is written upon our hearts, interwoven into our very nature."†

When the Judaising Christians in Milton's time took up the position—a much lower one than that of Sir Andrew Agnew and his followers—that the Mosaic law may be highly useful even to Christians, by leading them to a *more perfect* knowledge of the will of God, he replied, that "the will of God is *best* learnt from the Gospel itself, under the promised guidance of the Spirit of Truth, and from the divine law written in the hearts of believers."‡ This the Sabbatarians, if consistent, must deny.

In one of Chillingworth's sermons the following observations occur:—"If a succeeding covenant establisheth any part of a precedent [preceding], especially if there be any alteration made in the conditions established, all obligation whatsoever is taken from the old covenant, and those conditions are in force only by virtue of the new. When the Norman Conqueror was pleased to establish and confirm to the English some of the ancient Saxon laws, are those laws then become in force as they are *Saxon*? No; for the authority of the Saxons, the authors of those laws, is supposed to be extinguished, and therefore no power remains in them to look to the execution of them; but by the confirmation of the Norman they are become indeed *Norman* laws, and are now in force, not because they were first made by the Saxons, but only by virtue of the succeeding power of the Norman line. So likewise, when the Gospel enjoins the substance of the same duties which the Old Covenant of Works required, are we Christians enforced to the obedience of them because they are duties of the Law? By no means! But only because our Saviour and only Law-maker Jesus Christ commands the same in the Law of Faith."§

Nay, this admirable writer maintains, not only the sufficiency of the New Testament without the Old, but the sufficiency of each of the four Gospels by itself, as a rule of Christian duty. "Of all the four Evangelists," says he, "this is very probable, but of St Luke most apparent, that in every one of their books they have comprehended the whole substance of the Gospel of Christ. For what reason can be imagined that any of them should leave out anything which he knew to be necessary, and yet (as apparently all of them have done) put in many things which they knew to be only profitable and not necessary? What wise and honest man that were now to write the Gospel of Christ, would do so great a work of God after such a negligent fashion? Suppose Xaverius had been to write the Gospel of

* Memoirs, p. 90.

† Analogy, Part II., ch. i.

‡ Treatise on Christian Doctrine, p. 421.

§ Chillingworth's Works, Sermon viii., § 33.

Christ for the Indians, think you he would have left out any fundamental doctrine of it? If not, I must beseech you to conceive as well of St Matthew, and St Mark, and St Luke, and St John, as you do of Xaverius. Besides, if every one of them have not in them all necessary doctrines, how have they complied with their own design, which was, as the titles of their books shew, to write *the Gospel of Christ*, and not a part of it? Or how have they not deceived us, in giving them such titles? By the whole Gospel of Christ, I understand not the whole history of Christ, but all that makes up the covenant between God and man.”*

To a like purpose, Bishop Sherlock intimates his opinion that the controversial parts of the New Testament, *i.e.*, certain portions of the Epistles, are not essential for *our* instruction in Christianity, but, on the contrary, from our ignorance of important circumstances, are apt “to spread confusion over the clearest parts of the Gospel.” “Had there never,” says he, “been any dispute with the Jews or others, had all obeyed without dispute, *the Gospel had been perfect: and is perfect still*, however divines or others may differ in expounding the particulars incident to those debates.”†

Bishop Watson says plainly,—“The Christian religion is wholly comprised in the New Testament.”‡

If it be foolish in the Sabbatarians to ignore the New Testament in the formal statement of their principles, equally foolish and even impious are they in treating with contempt, as merely “the impulse of feeling,” the dictates of the divine laws written in our hearts, and made known by our reason and conscience. For surely, as Bishop Butler has remarked, “light and knowledge, in what manner soever afforded us, is equally from God;”§ and if any department of the divine law be more clear and indisputable than another, it is the department known as THE LAW OF NATURE. This is the *really perpetual and universal law*—a law revealed to the consciousness of man through those inborn mental gifts which render him capable of *distinguishing* good from evil ACTIONS, and compel him to regard with *moral approbation or disapprobation* the *intention* (and the conduct and dispositions assumed to imply the intention) of the AGENT performing them. That the faculties here spoken of do in truth form a part of human nature, is almost universally recognised, in speculation as well as practice, beyond the precincts of the Sabbath Alliance;—whatever differences of opinion may exist in regard to the analysis of the mental phenomena—however true it may be that the power of *distinguishing good from evil* varies with the intellectual capacity, and the degree of knowledge possessed of the nature of man, and of the beings to which he is related—and however unquestionable it is that the world abounds with moral (as with intellectual) weaklings, in whom there is so little sense of the guilt of intentional misdeeds, and so little inclination to perform what the majority hold to be incumbent, as to necessitate the injunctions and restraints of the civil law and pub-

* The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation, ch. iv., sect. 40. See also ch. vi., sect. 20; where he refers to the preface of St Luke, as shewing that his intent was to write all things necessary.

† Works, ed. 1830, vol. i., p. 280, Discourse xv.

‡ Anecdotes of his own Life, vol. ii., p. 226.

§ Analogy, Conclusion.

lic opinion; originating in, and, on the whole, directly or indirectly enforced by, the class enjoying those superior mental endowments and acquirements, which naturally raise their possessors to political and social ascendancy.*

* In the above paragraph I have endeavoured to indicate, in as few words as possible, every essential principle of a true system of ethical philosophy. The task is not an easy one: for upon no subject of inquiry have more opposite opinions prevailed; and nowhere do the inconveniences arising from the ambiguity and mutability of speech exhibit themselves with greater prominence. Yet it will be found that systems reared on what seem at first sight to be different foundations, are sometimes, after all, the same in substance, and merely arrayed in different forms of expression. Although moralists have in all ages disputed about the test or measure by which the goodness and badness of actions in the abstract may be determined, Paley, with characteristic terseness and perspicuity, has, I think, satisfactorily shewn that the variety of opinion on this subject is much more apparent than real. Taking a well-marked case of moral obligation, he considers in the following manner the question,

“Why am I obliged to keep my word?”

“Because it is right, says one.—Because it is agreeable to the fitness of things, says another.—Because it is conformable to reason and nature, says a third.—Because it is conformable to truth, says a fourth.—Because it promotes the public good, says a fifth.—Because it is required by the will of God, concludes a sixth.

“Upon which different accounts, two things are observable:—

“FIRST, that they all ultimately coincide.

“The fitness of things, means their fitness to produce happiness: the nature of things, means that actual constitution of the world, by which some things, as such and such actions, for example, produce happiness, and others misery: reason is the principle by which we discover or judge of this constitution: truth is this judgment expressed or drawn out into propositions. So that it necessarily comes to pass, that what promotes the public happiness, or happiness on the whole, is agreeable to the fitness of things, to nature, to reason, and to truth: and such (as will appear by and by) is the Divine character, that what promotes the general happiness, is required by the will of God; and what has all the above properties, must needs be *right*; for, right means no more than conformity to the rule we go by, whatever that rule be.

“And this is the reason that moralists, from whatever different principles they set out, commonly meet in their conclusions; that is, they enjoin the same conduct, prescribe the same rules of duty, and, with a few exceptions, deliver upon dubious cases the same determinations.

“SECONDLY, it is to be observed, that these answers all leave the matter *short*; for, the inquirer may turn round upon his teacher with a second question, in which he will expect to be satisfied, namely, *Why* am I obliged to do what is right; to act agreeably to the fitness of things; to conform to reason, nature, or truth; to promote the public good, or to obey the will of God?

“The proper method of conducting the inquiry is, FIRST, to examine what we mean, when we say a man is *obliged* to do any thing; and THEN to show *why* he is obliged to do the thing which we have proposed as an example, namely, ‘to keep his word.’”—(*Moral Philosophy*, Book II., ch. i.)

To the *first* question Paley replies, that a man is said to be *obliged*, “when he is urged by a violent motive resulting from the command of another;” and to the *second*, “Because I am obliged to keep my word by a violent motive (namely, the expectation of being after this life rewarded, if I do, or punished for it, if I do not), resulting from the command of another, (namely, of God).”

“This solution,” he adds, “goes to the bottom of the subject, as no further question can reasonably be asked.

“Therefore, private happiness is our motive, and the will of God our rule.”

In Chapter vi. he correctly notes that “ACTIONS in the abstract are right or wrong” [*i. e.* good or evil], “according to their *tendency*; the AGENT is virtuous or vicious, according to his *design* ;”—a distinction, the oversight of which

There is, however, a most wonderful change in the tone of the Sabatarians upon this subject, when their purpose is, not to frighten us

has bred much confusion and misapprehension in ethical discussions. Now, though prudence, having private happiness for its aim, may be rightly classed among the virtues (as it is by Butler in his *Dissertation on the Nature of Virtue*, at the end of the *Analogy*), the common sense of mankind pronounces that there are virtues of a higher class than this, and motives far nobler than deliberate regard to self-interest. Hence, with respect to *motives*, the ethical system of Paley is signally defective, in excluding those innate *moral emotions* which proclaim with a voice of *authority*, impossible to be disregarded by any man of moral sensibility, that actions *judged good* OUGHT TO BE DONE, and actions *judged evil* OUGHT TO BE REFRAINED FROM; emotions which fill us with *self-approval* when we do well, and *self-condemnation* when we do ill; and in which is discovered the source of that *moral taste* which (however liable it may be, like other tastes, to be perverted by education and fashion) explains the unanimity wherewith actions plainly tending to produce happiness have always been regarded by the bulk of mankind as *morally beautiful*, and actions plainly tending to produce misery, as *morally disgusting and detestable*.

Although the *intellectual* judgment of good and evil in actions is the leader of the *virtuous emotions* into courses of conduct which will *effect* the ends they desire, it would be a mistake to conclude from this that they are destitute of influence in urging to, and even aiding in the determination of, the conduct which is fit to be chosen. For it is a law of human nature that the emotions impel the intellect, often with irresistible force, to attend to the objects which are naturally related to them,—invest with a deep interest the study of those objects,—and arouse in the intellect a more intense and lively activity, which makes the good and evil tendencies of actions be more readily and clearly perceived.

To intelligent and unsophisticated believers in the existence of a Divine Creator and Governor of the world, the dictates of reason and conscience appear vested with the authority of God himself, who for wise and beneficent purposes has implanted them in our frame. In the mind of the Theist, therefore, religion enforces and sanctifies the suggestions of his intellectual and moral nature. To the believer in Revelation another powerful influence is added; the precepts of the Gospel increase his disposition to obey the will of God, while the prospect of that blessed immortality which is promised to well-doers on earth convinces him that vicious conduct, besides being, as experience proves, destructive of happiness here, is infinitely more inexpedient still, in relation to the world to come. As for the Atheist, he, it is true, is moved neither by the prospect of a future life nor by reverence for God. But if he is intelligent, and naturally disposed to benevolence and justice, he may be a better man and citizen, a better son, husband, and father, than some Theists and professing Christians are; for, as Lord Bacon observes, "Atheism leaves a man to sense, to philosophy, to natural piety, to laws, to reputation; all which may be guides to an outward moral virtue, though religion were not."—(*Essay of Superstition*. See also Lord Kames's *Sketches of the History of Man*, B. III., Sk. iii., Section ii., on "Morality considered as a Branch of Duty to our Maker.") The few Atheists whom I have met with are evidence of this: notwithstanding their intellectual idiosyncrasy (which to me is unintelligible), they lead useful and peaceable lives, "doing justly, loving mercy," and perhaps even "walking humbly," though not "with God." That many Atheists have been scoundrels, is a fact which goes but a little way to prove that Atheism and morality are incompatible. Scoundrels are too common in every sect; and, for the most part, the causes of moral excellence and depravity lie deeper than speculative belief, even about matters so momentous as the existence of God, and the future destiny of man.

In these remarks I follow neither the selfish system of Paley, nor the scheme of those who regard the moral sense as our only guide to virtue. In Paley's chapter on the Moral Sense (Book I. ch. v.), where a summary is given of the chief arguments for and against the existence of such a faculty, he is suc-

into their opinions by the threat, that if the Fourth Commandment go, the entire moral law goes with it, but to shew how excellent and

cessful in shewing that *by itself* it is inadequate as a rule of conduct. But the greatest-happiness principle *by itself* is just as little adequate; as a recent defender of the ethical opinions of Bentham, in the *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1852, p. 349, has clearly exhibited. According to this writer (who is said to be Mr John Stuart Mill), though Bentham held that the tendency of human conduct to produce happiness or misery is our guide to "the proper objects of the feelings of conscience, duty, rectitude," it is a mistake to suppose that he questioned the existence of those feelings themselves; and the reason assigned for his omission to consider them is, that, in his opinion, an inquiry into their nature and origin is the business not of the moralist but of the metaphysician. "The matter in debate," says the reviewer, "is, what *is* right, not whether what is right ought to be done. . . . There is no great stretch of hypothesis in supposing that in proportion as mankind are aware of the tendencies of actions to produce happiness or misery, they will like and commend the first, abhor and reprobate the second. How these feelings of natural complacency and natural dread and aversion directed towards actions, come to assume the peculiar character of what we term *moral* feelings is not a question of ethics but of metaphysics, and very fit to be discussed in its proper place. Bentham did not concern himself with it; he left it to other thinkers."—(Pp. 355, 368.) In vol. i., p. 231, of the Works of Bentham himself, there is a description of character, in which, brief as it is, his ethical system is clearly indicated: he speaks of a class of men "with intellects incapable of distinguishing right from wrong, and with affections alike indifferent to either."

Whoever will carefully and extensively study the moral dispositions of mankind as displayed in active life, may, I think, find sufficient reason to believe that (as in the case of *external sensation*) our *internal moral nature* is compound; embracing three independent sentiments, which respectively prompt us to *kind, just, and reverential* behaviour. Experience teaches us that a kind man is not always just or respectful; nor a just man always a kind one; nor a devout man always endowed with a disposition to act kindly and justly. Of these differences (which, when strongly marked, are found to be ineffaceable), I know no explanation but, that—as each of the external senses has a special organic apparatus, the greater or less perfection of which is the source of more or less perfect sensibility to a certain class (and that only) of external stimuli,—so has each of the three moral sentiments an organic apparatus in the brain; which apparatus, well developed and in good condition, confers the power of experiencing acute moral emotions of a certain kind, and the disposition to act morally within a certain sphere. When the organic apparatus of the entire moral nature is in high perfection, and the less noble desires are of moderate strength, the man, if competently intelligent, is "a law unto himself" (Rom. ii. 14); "out of the good treasure of his heart he bringeth forth that which is good" (Luke vi. 45); he is one of those who "even of themselves judge what is right" (Luke xii. 57); and he is by nature fit to prescribe to inferior men the moral rules by which they should be guided. Such a person is instinctively revered and followed by the multitude, who, though incapable of discovering the highest principles in morals for themselves, are usually quite able to recognise the excellence of what men of lofty moral genius inculcate. On the other hand, great organic deficiency is attended with moral blindness as complete as that sensational blindness which accompanies want of eyes, or atrophy of the optic nerve; and many a parent, teacher, and prison-chaplain, has found reason to exclaim with Prospero in *The Tempest*,

"A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains,
Humanely taken, are all lost, quite lost!"—Act iv.

That such *moral* idiots exist in abundance, is as certain as that there are *intellectual* idiots in the world; nor need we shrink from attributing the moral defect, as we do the intellectual, to those organic imperfections which Physio-

how obligatory upon all men the law of the Sabbath is. Then, "the mere impulse of feeling" on which erewhile it was so perilous to rely, compels us to recognise as the grand source of evils which it is in vain to think of curing without the aid of a scientific acquaintance with the bodily as well as mental constitution of man.

The following extracts from the works of eminent divines, will serve to illustrate and enforce the preceding observations:—

Hooker says:—"The general and perpetual voice of men is as the sentence of God himself: for that which all men have at all times learned, nature herself must needs have taught; and God being the author of nature, her voice is but his instrument. By her, from him, we receive whatsoever in such sort we learn. Infinite duties there are, the goodness whereof is by this rule sufficiently manifested, although we had no other warrant besides to approve them. The apostle St Paul, having speech concerning the heathen, saith of them, 'They are a law unto themselves.' His meaning is, that by force of the light of reason wherewith God illuminateth every one that cometh into the world, men being enabled to know truth from falsehood, and good from evil, do thereby learn in many things what the will of God is; which will himself not revealing by any extraordinary means unto them, but they, by natural discourse, attaining the knowledge thereof, seem the makers of those laws which indeed are his, and they but only the finders of them out. A law therefore generally taken is a directive rule unto goodness of operation. . . . The rule of voluntary agents on earth is the sentence that reason giveth concerning the goodness of those things which they are to do. . . . In such sort laws of reason are investigable, that the knowledge of them is general, the world hath always been acquainted with them; according to that which one in Sophocles observeth concerning a branch of this law; 'It is no child of to-day's or yesterday's birth, but hath been, no man knoweth how long sithence.' It is not agreed upon by one, or two, or few, but by all. Which we may not so understand as if every particular man in the whole world did know and confess whatsoever the law of reason doth contain: but this law is such, that being proposed, no man can reject it as unreasonable and unjust. Again, there is nothing in it, but any man (having natural perfection of wit, and ripeness of judgment) may, by labour and travail, find out. And, to conclude, the general principles thereof are such, as it is not easy to find men ignorant of them. Law rational, therefore, which men commonly use to call the law of nature, meaning thereby the law which human nature knoweth itself in reason universally bound unto, which also for that cause may be termed, most fitly, the law of reason; this law, I say, comprehendeth all those things which men by the light of their natural understanding evidently know, or at leastwise may know, to be beseeching or unbeseeching, virtuous or vicious, good or evil, for them to do."—(*Ecclesiastical Polity*, B. I. § 8.)

Among the duties of obedience Bishop Wilkins includes—"An acquaintance with the laws of God, whether discovered to us by Revelation (the principles of nature obliging us to observe and submit to all things which we have reason to believe do proceed from God), or by natural light, abstracting from Scripture and Revelation, as the substance of that which we call the moral law is."—(*Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion*, B. I., ch. xvi., p. 199.)

Archbishop Tillotson says:—"All the great duties of piety and justice are written upon our hearts, and every man feels a secret obligation to them in his own conscience, which checks and restrains him from doing contrary to them, and gives him peace and satisfaction in the discharge of his duty; or in case he offend against it, fills him with guilt and terror.

"And certainly it is a thing of very considerable use rightly to understand the natural obligation of moral duties, and how necessarily they flow from the consideration of God and of ourselves. For it is a great mistake to think that the obligation of them doth solely depend upon the revelation of God's will made to us in the Holy Scriptures. It is plain that mankind was always under a law, even before God had made any external and extraordinary revelation; else, how shall God judge the world? How shall they to whom the Word of

attains in a moment the dignity of a clear and abiding law, written upon the tables of the heart. Not only "the love of God and the

God never came, be acquitted or condemned at the Great Day? For where there is no law, there can neither be obedience nor transgression.

"It is indeed an unspeakable advantage which we, who are Christians, do enjoy, both in respect of the more clear and certain knowledge of our duty in all the branches of it, and likewise in regard of the powerful motives and assistance which our Blessed Saviour in his Gospel offers to us, to enable and encourage us to the discharge of our duty. But yet it is nevertheless very useful for us to consider the primary and natural obligation to piety and virtue, which we commonly call the Law of Nature; this being every whit as much the Law of God as the revelation of his will in his Word; and consequently, nothing contained in the Word of God, or in any pretended revelation from him, can be interpreted to dissolve the obligation of moral duties plainly required by the Law of Nature." (*Tillotson's Preface to Bishop Wilkins on the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion.*)

Archbishop Sumner says:—"The great rules of morals, being necessary to the existence of human society, can be in no communities wholly unknown, and in civilized states have been generally well understood."—(*Records of the Creation*, 2d edit., vol. i., p. 206.)

Bishop Butler says:—"That which renders beings capable of moral government, is their having a moral nature, and moral faculties of perception and of action. Brute creatures are impressed and actuated by various instincts and propensions: so also are we. But, additional to this, we have a capacity of reflecting upon actions and characters, and making them an object to our thought; and on our doing this, we naturally and unavoidably approve some actions, under the peculiar view of their being virtuous and of good desert; and disapprove others as vicious and of ill desert. That we have this moral approving and disapproving faculty, is certain from our experiencing it in ourselves, and recognising it in each other. It appears from our exercising it unavoidably, in the approbation and disapprobation even of feigned characters: from the words, right and wrong, odious and amiable, base and worthy, with many others of like signification in all languages; applied to actions and characters: from the many written systems of morals which suppose it; since it cannot be imagined, that all these authors, throughout all these treatises, had absolutely no meaning at all to their words, or a meaning merely chimerical: from our natural sense of gratitude, which implies a distinction between merely being the instrument of good, and intending it: from the like distinction, every one makes, between injury and mere harm, which, Hobbes says, is peculiar to mankind; and between injury and just punishment, a distinction plainly natural, prior to the consideration of human laws. It is manifest, great part of common language, and of common behaviour over the world, is formed upon supposition of such a moral faculty; whether called conscience, moral reason, moral sense, or divine reason; whether considered as a sentiment of the understanding, or as a perception of the heart, or, which seems the truth, as including both. Nor is it at all doubtful in the general, what course of action this faculty, or practical discerning power within us, approves, and what it disapproves. For, as much as it has been disputed wherein virtue consists, or whatever ground for doubt there may be about particulars, yet, in general, there is in reality an universally acknowledged standard of it. It is that, which all ages and all countries have made profession of in public; it is that, which every man you meet, puts on the shew of; it is that, which the primary and fundamental laws of all civil constitutions, over the face of the earth, make it their business and endeavour to enforce the practice of upon mankind; namely, justice, veracity, and regard to common good."—(*Dissertation of the Nature of Virtue.*)

Bishop Hoadly says:—"Man, as a reasonable creature, has a principle in him, interwoven with his very nature, which is plainly designed to direct and advise his practice *before* action, and to judge him *after* it; which calls him back when he is going astray, and reproves and reproaches him when he has acted unreasonably. And this is what we call reason; or, which is the same thing, conscience."—(*Sermon on Acts iii. 26, "The Nature of Christ's Blessing."*)

love of man" assume their proper place as "commanded duties," but the Sabbath itself, which many have ventured to regard as merely a

Archbishop Secker says :—" God hath planted in our hearts a natural love of equity, a natural feeling of kind affection, a natural conscience, applauding us when we act according to these dispositions, condemning us when we violate them : and seldom do we deserve its reproaches, but either at the time, or soon after, we undergo them."—(Sermon 46 ; *Works*, vol. ii., p. 42, Edin. edition, 1792.)

Bishop Sherlock says :—" The religion of the Gospel is the true original religion of reason and nature. It is so in part ; it is all that and more."—(Discourse before Society for Propagation of the Gospel ; *Works*, vol. iii., p. 346, edit. 1830.) By Butler, too, the Gospel is called a " republication of natural religion."—(*Analogy*, Part II., ch. I.) Warburton makes the same assertion with respect to the religion of Moses, which, says he, " was a republication of natural religion to the Jews."—(*Divine Legation of Moses*, Book III., App.) Sherlock, in the sermon just quoted, says also :—" The principles of religion are interwoven in the very frame and make of our minds, and we may as well run from ourselves, as from the sense of the obligations we are under."—(P. 350.)

Bishop Taylor says :—" That providence which governs all the world is nothing else but God present by his providence ; and God is in our hearts by his laws ; he rules in us by his substitute, our conscience. God sits there and gives us laws."—(*Ductor Dubitantium*, B. I., Ch. I., Rule I. ; *Works*, vol. xi., p. 370.)

Dr George Campbell says :—" The voice of conscience is the voice of God."—(*Sermon on the Spirit of the Gospel*.)

Bishop Newton says :—" All mankind have a natural abhorrence of vice, and it discovers itself without much thought and reflection in an instant, at the bare hearing of any flagrant act of wickedness, and much more at seeing it, and still most of all when we ourselves are losers and sufferers by it. It is not only our reason that condemns it, but a sort of instinct riseth in us against it. Our very blood is put into a new motion, our spirits catch the alarm ; and we are not only sensible of the horror of the crime, but we really feel it. Such antipathy to vice hath God wrought into our very frame and constitution, and whoever deviates from virtue degenerates as much from pure and uncorrupted nature."—(*Dissertation on David and Nathan* ; *Works*, vol. ii., p. 332.)

Dean Prideaux says :—" Let what is written in all the Books of the New Testament be tried by that which is the touchstone of all religions ; I mean that religion of nature and reason which God hath written in the hearts of every one of us from the first creation ; and if it varies from it in any one particular, if it prescribes any one thing which may in the minutest circumstance thereof be contrary to its righteousness, I will then acknowledge this to be an argument against us, strong enough to overthrow the whole cause, and make all things else that can be said for it totally ineffectual for its support."—(*Letter to the Deists*, appended to Prideaux's *Life of Mahomet*, 8th ed. p. 169.)

Bishop Butler says :—" If in revelation there be found any passages, the seeming meaning of which is contrary to natural religion, we may most certainly conclude such seeming meaning not to be the real one."—(*Analogy*, Part II., ch. I., at the end.) Again : " Reason can, and it ought, to judge, not only of the meaning, but also of the morality and the evidence, of revelation. It is the province of reason to judge of the morality of the Scripture ; *i. e.* not whether it contains things different from what we should have expected from a wise, just, and good Being ; for objections from hence have been now obviated ; but whether it contains things plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, or goodness ; to what the light of nature teaches us of God."—(*Ib.*, Part II., ch. III.)

Bishop Conybeare says :—" Let us endeavour heartily to discover the will of God, whether by the light of human reason, or from divine revelation. Whatever shall appear to be the divine will from either consideration, we must adhere to it inviolably ; whatever cannot be proved on this foot, is no part of religion. This is the general rule, to which we must add nothing, and from which we must diminish nothing. To do the one is superstition, to do the other is impiety."—(*Defence of Revealed Religion*, 3d ed., p. 193.)

positive institution, is installed most securely among those which it is a natural and universal duty to observe ! Even Sir Andrew Agnew,

Archbishop Whately says :—“ There are two volumes, as it were, both by the same divine Author, spread out before us for our instruction and benefit, from each of which we may learn something of his dealings, so as to apply what we learn to our own practical advantage. One of these may be called the book of Nature—the system of the created universe ; the other, the record of Inspiration.”—(*Essays on some of the Dangers to Christian Faith which may arise from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors*, 2d ed., p. 156.)

And elsewhere the same distinguished prelate says :—“ Other things being equal, you will find that those who have had the best general mental training, are the best prepared for a correct and profitable reception of religious instruction ; and that those who have been taught little or nothing besides what are called the general principles of Religion and Morality, not only do not embrace those principles so well as those of more cultivated understanding, but will be still more deficient in the right *application* of such principles.

“ What I mean by the *application* of these principles—as distinguished from the *comprehending* of them—is, what I may be allowed to express in language familiar, I presume, to most of you,—that the general principles of Religion and Morality supply MAJOR PREMISES: the MINOR PREMISES, which, in each instance, is equally essential to a correct practical conclusion, being supplied from a knowledge of some other kind, relative to the subject matter about which we are, in each case, to decide. *E.g.*, That it is a Christian duty to relieve the distressed, and to promote the general happiness of the community, is beyond dispute. Now different men, acting on that principle, may seek to promote this end, one, by striving to establish a *community* of goods (according to a plan which you must all have heard of) ; another, by despoiling the rich, and introducing *equality* of property ; and, again, another, by securing to each man the fruits of his own and his ancestors' industry, and encouraging the accumulation of capital. Whichever of these persons is practically right, the others must be most mischievously wrong. Yet they differ, not in the general principle they set out from, but in their applications of it ; in other words, in the *minor premises* they assume.

“ Again, justice and civil liberty are good ends which a Christian and a moral man must feel bound to promote ; but whether the maintenance of the existing government, and laws and institutions of any country, or a complete change of them into something quite different, will best promote the cause of justice and liberty,—this is a question, and a most important question, which each man, who comes to any decision upon it, will be likely to decide, in his own mind, according to his own knowledge and judgment, derived from his observations and studies in quite another department.

“ Ill-directed charity, again, frequently produces (as you are doubtless well aware) much more evil than good. And against this no man can be guarded by a mere inculcation of the Christian duty of charity. And other instances, analogous to these I have noticed, will readily present themselves to your own mind.

“ Be not then deterred, my Reverend Brethren, by any fear of being unjustly reproached as indifferent about religion and morality, from using *all* the means which God's Providence has placed within your reach, for promoting and facilitating the most profitable religious and moral instruction. He—that same God—is the maker both of this world and of the world to come ; and is the Author of those *two* great volumes which he has laid open for our perusal,—the Book of Nature and the Book of Revelation. And those who diligently and honestly apply themselves to make the best use of *all* that he has provided for us, will be, by His grace, enabled so to pass through things temporal, that they finally lose not the things eternal.”—(*Charge on the Right Use of National Afflictions*, delivered in Sept. 1848, pp. 30–33.)

Bishop Wilkins says :—“ A consent to God's laws, or approbation of them as being holy, just, and good, will necessarily follow from a true notion of the ground and reason of them, and must necessarily precede a genuine obedience

concurring, says his biographer, with "the great body of our reformed divines," held that Sabbath-observance "*is a moral duty, and conformity to them.* He that looks upon them as fetters and bonds, doth rather endure them out of necessity, than obey them out of choice and love. 'I consent to the law that it is good,' saith the Apostle (Rom. vii. 16); that is, I do in my judgment own the fitness and reasonableness of the things therein enjoined, as being the most proper means to advance the perfection of our natures. . . . There is a congruity betwixt our well-beings, and the nature of the things enjoined; and it is this conviction alone that must beget in us a love of it, and a delight to practise it. He that harbours any prejudice in his mind against the ways of God, as if they were unprofitable, or unequal, can never submit to them willingly, but out of a constraint; he may look upon them as his task and burden, but not as his joy and delight. Our external submission to the law can never be kindly and regular till our minds be cast into the same mould with it, and framed unto a suitableness and conformity to it."—(*Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion*, B. i., ch. 16.)

Bishop Conybeare, in his *Defence of Revealed Religion* against Tindal, not only recognises (as we have seen) the importance of natural religion, on which so much stress is laid in the work of that Deist; but, for the express purpose of supplying an omission of its author concerning what is "necessary and sufficient to discover all that is founded in the reason of things," in relation to human conduct, suggests the study of "the nature and powers of all those several beings by which we are surrounded, and with which we have any manner of concern.

"Here then," says he, "a very large field opens. It takes in a considerable part of nature: For without a deep knowledge in these things, we shall be incapable of discerning, on numberless occasions, what is really fit to be done, either with respect to ourselves or others.

"Be these general rules therefore, in reference to ourselves, however perfectly known, viz., that we ought to do nothing which will destroy life,—prejudice health,—impair the reason,—heighten the passions, and the like; yet still, before they can serve us, we must know what particular kinds of actions or omissions will contribute to these several ends: and, in order to this, we must know what are the natures and powers of those several beings with which we have any manner of concern; because, otherwise, by an undue application of them, we may really produce the evils we would avoid.

"Thus, again, with respect to our neighbours; it may be known with certainty enough, that we ought to perform to them all the offices of justice and humanity;—that we ought neither to do them any unnecessary prejudice, nor to decline any fair opportunities of serving them. These things will arise from considering, that as we are creatures of the same kind, so we are equally the subjects of the same Divine care and providence. Notwithstanding this, many other things must likewise be known in order to discover how it will be fit to act on every emergent occasion. We must know what will prejudice or serve our neighbour; and, for this purpose, what influence, whether good or bad, the use and application of natural things, may, in certain circumstances, have on them.

"It is true, indeed, observation and experience will teach us somewhat here, without much insight into natural science: But then, it should be noted at the same time, that this will carry us no farther than the grosser and more obvious appearances. Things which operate with dispatch, and to a degree immediately perceivable, can scarce escape our notice. But, what if their influences should be remote, and the working slow and gradual? In such cases, experience will do little service: We shall know scarce anything at all; and consequently, be liable, on numberless occasions, to be deceived into a conduct, which upon fuller information we might, and would have avoided."—(Pp. 34–36.) To this important subject the author recurs at pp. 78, 102, 279.

Bishop Law says (*op. cit.* pp. 228, 230):—"The more we still know of human nature, and become better versed in the art of living (and who doubts but we do so daily?), the more enlarged and adequate notions must we have of natural religion; and thereby be better able to judge of, and apply revealed: the more

BASED ON THE ETERNAL AND UNDEBATEABLE LAW OF GOD!"—"Its primary obligation," he believed, "rests not on the revealed law of

acquainted we are with the faculties of our own *soul*, the better qualified must we be to regulate and improve them; to direct the reasoning power, assist the memory, refine the imagination; in each of which points very considerable discoveries have been made of late: the more we know of the *body*, the more able we are to prescribe a regimen, and remedy the several disorders of it. . . . The more we know of the *world*, the more we view its order, beauty, symmetry; the uniform laws which it is governed by; the just arrangement, and mutual subserviency of all its parts; (and I need not observe how much this kind of learning has of late increased;) the more we see the glory and perfection of its Architect; and are more fully satisfied that he designed its several inhabitants for happiness in general; and must approve of every regular, consistent method which they take to promote it." He quotes from Newton's *Optics*, B. iii., the observation that "if *natural philosophy* in all its parts, by pursuing this method, shall at length be perfected, the bounds of *moral philosophy* will also be enlarged;" and from Dr Tunstall's *Academica*, Part i. p. 84, the following passage: "Since things really differ in themselves, in our use of them, and in our conduct about them; the more we know them, the more we may improve both our virtue and our power of converting them to the real advantage both of ourselves and others: and since our own actions, and especially our moral habits, have so mighty an influence to perfect or to debase us; the more we know ourselves and the wonderful economy of our moral frame, the better we shall be enabled to adjust that happy temperament, to maintain that regular subordination of our faculties, appetites, and affections, in which so great a part of our virtue and our happiness consists. Every advance therefore in the observation of nature, carries with it a proportionable improvement of the moral science. And not only the bounds of this science are extended, as we enlarge our prospect of the disposition and events of things; but the certainty of it is most satisfactorily evinced, when we discern an uniform and established analogy between their natural constitution, which our senses perceive, and that moral constitution which religion supposes."

To these extracts from eminent theological writers, on the necessity of scientific knowledge for the efficient *performance*, and even, in many cases, for the *ascertainment*, of religious duties, I add some observations on physiological knowledge in particular, by the late Dr Andrew Combe, who was deeply convinced of the importance of what he here inculcates:—

"It is not merely in preserving health, and improving the physical condition of mankind, that physiology is calculated to be eminently useful. It applies at least as directly, and with still higher results, to the cultivation of the moral and intellectual nature of man; and it is only by adapting the methods and details of education (using that term in its widest sense), to the principles of a sound physiology, that its full advantages can ever be secured. If man were a disembodied spirit, there might be propriety and safety in overlooking the modifying influence and laws of the material organism; but as Omniscient Wisdom has, for the best of purposes, so constituted us that, during life, the mind cannot exercise its powers except through the medium of bodily organs, by every change in the state of which it is directly affected, surely it is incumbent upon us humbly to conduct ourselves in accordance with this divine arrangement, instead of contemptuously denying its reality, on the false and presumptuous plea, that it would be degradation to the dignity of mind to suppose it subjected, in any way, to the laws which preside over the bodily constitution. If the different powers of thought and feeling were wholly independent of the organism, there would be no relation whatever between their development and that of the bodily frame. But how opposite is the fact! In infancy these powers are unsteady and feeble, simply because the brain is as yet imperfectly developed and organised. In youth, they increase in readiness and vigour; because their material instruments have advanced so far towards maturity. In old age they again become feeble and wavering, from the gradual decay of the organism. In disease they are in like manner exalted or im-

Moses, nor the remedial law of Christ, *but on the law of nature*. Hundreds of years before it was graven on the tables of stone, it was

paired by the excitement or oppression of the brain. Under the influence of wine they are roused to energetic activity, while under that of opium they become buried in sleep. At home and at school, the intellect and feelings are equally dependent on the brain for their power of working; and there, as on every other occasion, and at every instant of life, they act always in accordance with the physiological laws of the constitution.

“ But although, as we have seen, a deep sense of the usefulness of physiology is rapidly spreading, there is still an influential class of society, which, from a strange misconception of the nature and tendencies of this branch of science, looks upon it with suspicion, and seeks to repel rather than invite its aid. I allude to those who, under a mistaken sense of religious duty, and an erroneous notion of the entire independence of man’s spiritual nature in this life, manifest a dread of every truth which implies that the mind is in any degree subject to the influence of the bodily organism; and who, under this ill-founded dread, shew a constant desire to depreciate natural science, which they stigmatise as ‘merely human knowledge,’ in opposition to revealed truth, which they consider as alone possessing a just claim to respect and obedience.

“ The natural consequence of this attempt to set in opposition to each other truths derived from different sources is, that while the precepts drawn from Scripture are urged upon our observance with unremitting earnestness, those derived from the Book of Nature, although written by the hand of the Deity himself, are often practically disparaged, if not actually denounced as unworthy of regard. This is not mere fancy on my part; for when pointing out to such persons the duty and advantage of systematically using the means which God had placed within their reach for the preservation or improvement of their health and usefulness, I have been more than once met with the reply, that such petty observances are altogether selfish, and unworthy of a being destined for immortality; and that the means recommended are mere human devices for the welfare of the body, and as such have no claim upon our reverence or submission, except when rendered necessary by the pressure of actual illness. In a greater or less degree this error is extensively prevalent; and, as its influence is most pernicious, I feel it necessary, at the very outset, to endeavour to remove the mistaken view in which it has obviously originated.

“ The assumption that science is a mere human invention, necessarily opposed to and incompatible with divine truth, is happily now much less prevalent than formerly, and is so far from being correct that the very reverse may be truly affirmed. In the strictest sense of the word, *science* is nothing else than a systematic exposition of the works and laws of God, discoverable in the field of nature; and if we reflect for a moment, we shall see that it *can* be nothing else. The mere fact, that *man thinks and says so and so*, does not make that exist which has no existence in nature; but, on the other hand, when a law or object has a real existence, man’s denial or neglect of it does not in the least diminish the sphere of its action, or lighten the penalty of disregarding it. Thus, an ardent student may believe that excessive study and want of sleep are not hurtful to him; but his false opinion will in no degree prevent their deleterious action. In like manner, a person may believe that sitting inactive with cold wet feet will do him no harm; but such belief will be quite unavailing to protect him against the usual consequences of such behaviour. It is God, and not man, who has created the universe and established the relations which subsist among all its constituent parts, animate and inanimate. Every phenomenon which occurs in the natural world, however striking from its magnitude and extent,—as in the case of an earthquake or a storm, or the movements of the heavenly bodies,—or however incomprehensible from its extreme minuteness, like the microscopic animalculæ, has been devised by His wisdom and is regulated by His laws. Every truth, therefore, which science demonstrates, and every principle which it unfolds, are traceable to God as their author, and, in common with the inferences rightly deduced from them, demand our respect for this above all other reasons, and carry with them the sanction of the Deity himself.

WRITTEN ON THE HEART AND GRAFTED ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ADAM"!!—(*Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew*, pp. 89, 90.)

Apart from this, indeed, they would inspire no confidence in their stability, and could present no claim to our obedience. In strictness, it is a pure fallacy to speak of *human science* as contradistinguished from *divine*. Whatever is ascertained to be true in any department of nature, is necessarily divine truth, or, in other words, proceeds from God as its author. One scientific truth may be more or less important to our happiness than another; but all must have the same origin, for harmony and order characterise the whole. It is a matter of notoriety, however, that the sciences are still very imperfect, and that numerous errors are mixed up with their facts and doctrines. If the phrase 'human science' were reserved exclusively to designate such errors, we should then be justified in regarding human and divine science as always opposed to each other, and in turning aside from the former with contempt and dislike. But no such reservation has been made. The fundamental facts and laws of most sciences, although first discovered and explained to us by our fellow-men, and not made known to us by any special revelation, are nevertheless as certain, definite, and unchanging, as the fact of man's own existence; and consequently those facts and laws are as universal in their application, and divine in character, as if they had been the subject of a supernatural revelation to man. All truths, from whatever source our knowledge of them is obtained, proceed from God, are necessarily consistent with each other, and have an equal claim on our acceptance, *and on our obedience to the commands which they imply*. It is indeed one of the highest privileges of science to add to the stock of truths, and to trace the established relations subsisting among them; and one of the greatest pleasures attending its pursuit is the constancy and directness with which every newly discovered fact leads us up to God, as the centre and regulator of creation. Had the facts of science been inaccessible to the scrutiny and reason of man, they would then have been fit objects for a supernatural revelation, seeing that knowledge of them is in so many ways necessary for our guidance to happiness. But, constituted as we are with faculties that delight in observation and in tracing out the relations of all created objects to each other and to ourselves, the revelation of scientific truths without any effort on our part for their discovery, would have deprived man of the noblest field for the exercise of his intellectual powers, and of the strongest stimulus to exertion. As an exposition of the works and laws of God, science has the strongest claim upon the reverent attention of every reflecting and religious mind: because, on our knowledge of these laws, *and the squaring of our conduct by them*, our welfare, progress, and happiness are in no small degree dependent. Till this grand truth shall be fully understood, and kept constantly before our eyes as a guiding principle, science will never occupy its true position, or confer those advantages on the human race which it is capable of affording. *Instead of being opposed to each other, science and religion are identical in nature and origin*; and it is a libel on the God of Truth to disparage the facts of science as unworthy of regard, seeing that it is only through them that the laws which He has appointed for the regulation of both the animate and inanimate world can ever become known, or rendered applicable to our farther improvement as physical, moral, religious, and responsible beings.

"I have entered at some length into this subject at the outset, because the view which the reader entertains concerning it must exercise no small influence on the spirit in which he will receive the information placed within his reach, and on the willingness with which he will be disposed to *act* upon the rules deducible from it. If he shall regard all scientific truths and inferences merely as ingenious speculations, having no higher origin than the imagination of a fallible human creature, and as carrying with them a merely human sanction, he will naturally think it of little practical importance whether his habitual conduct be directed in accordance with their dictates or not: whereas, if he shall regard the laws of physiology and of all other departments of nature as *furnishing plain and unequivocal indications of the divine will*, their study and regular observance will appear no longer a matter of indifference, but a *positive*

The conduct of the Sabbath Alliance in sounding the alarm of *Morality in danger!* has an unfortunate resemblance to the tactics of

duty, ranking among the most important of our moral and religious obligations. Rightly considered, the neglect of health, or its deliberate sacrifice in the pursuit of business, pleasure, or ambition, or even in excessive exertion for the purposes of benevolence, is as clearly a breach of moral duty as suicide itself. The only difference is in degree; and the punishment it entails is frequently of the severest kind—irremediable disease, loss of reason, or death. Proofs and examples of this unfortunately abound in society. For instance, several cases of permanent imbecility from excessive study have come under my own observation, and similar cases are found in almost every asylum for lunatics. The frequency with which naturally strong and well-constituted men are observed to break down from exhaustion in the midst of a prosperous career, furnishes another lamentable confirmation of my doctrine, that many fall victims who might have enjoyed a long life of active and useful exertion, had they paid that reasonable regard to the laws of health which common prudence recommends, and which more enlightened views of religion would even have enforced upon them as a sacred duty.”—(*Principles of Physiology applied to Health and Education*, 14th edit., pp. 19–23. See also *The Life and Correspondence of Andrew Combe, M.D.*, pp. 499–509; *The Constitution of Man considered in Relation to External Objects*, by George Combe; pamphlets by the same, entitled, *Remarks on National Education*,—*The Relation between Religion and Science*,—*What should National Education Embrace?*—*Four Addresses on Secular Unsectarian Education*,—and *Secular Instruction, or Extension of Church Endowments?* being a Letter to the Duke of Argyll. The subject is illustrated likewise in the *Westminster Review* for July 1852, Article I., *On Secular Education*; and in three instructive *Annual Reports of the Williams Secular School*, 1850–1852, published by Maclachlan and Stewart, Edinburgh; and Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., London.)

It is curious that that very study which eminent English theologians so strongly recommended a hundred years ago, and pointed to as something which the Deistical champions of natural religion had improperly overlooked,—I mean the study of nature, with a view to discover the will of God therein abundantly revealed,—should at the present day be denounced by some of the Scottish clergy as irreligious and dangerous! In general, there is among religious people a deplorable absence not merely of the knowledge of God’s natural laws, but even of the knowledge that such laws exist. Many duties are consequently neglected without compunction, or loss of good name; while the suffering which ever attends such neglect, be it consciously or unconsciously committed, is self-complacently regarded as the chastisement administered by the Heavenly Father for the spiritual improvement of his chosen ones.

Even so able and learned a divine as Principal Lee, in giving evidence before Sir Andrew Agnew’s committee of the House of Commons on Sabbath-observance in 1832, expressed himself in the following terms:—“I do not know how mere prudential maxims or rules of morality can be satisfactorily and securely established otherwise than on the basis of Scripture; but I hold it to be the first duty of every man who believes in divine revelation, to impress on all his fellow creatures the momentous principle, which I think sufficiently intelligible by a little child, *that ALL the worth and happiness attainable in time, and all the hopes of eternal life, are gained by the knowledge and belief of the word of God.*”—(*Evidence of Dr John Lee, in Report of the Committee*, p. 279, Q. 4141.)

So also the Rev. Thomas Scott, a writer in high estimation among the Puritans of the present day, tells with the greatest satisfaction that he had “learned to look upon the Bible as my book of instructions, given me along with the ministerial office by my Lord and Master; that from thence I might deduce *all my doctrines, instructions, and admonitions, warnings, examples, encouragements, rules of duty, and motives to duty.*”—(*The Force of Truth*, ed. 1836, p. 107.)

To the same purpose writes a religious layman,—the “Elder of the Free Church,” whose pamphlet on Mr Wortley’s Bill for legalizing marriage with

an order of men with whom it cannot be agreeable to them to be compared; I mean the Jesuits. Tillotson, in his preface to Dr Barrow's *Treatise of the Pop's Supremacy*, remarks, that although this point of supremacy "is not only an indefensible, but an impudent cause, as ever was undertaken by learned pens," yet "Bellarmine hath the confidence to say *the whole of Christianity depends upon it.*" And Pascal tells the Jesuits of his time,—“ But this is just one of the principal tricks of your policy, to make people believe that every thing is at stake, when in reality there is nothing at stake.”* The Jesuits,

a deceased wife's sister was quoted in a former page. “ We have nothing to do,” says he, “ with expediency on the one side or the other,— To the law and to the testimony.” If God has forbidden such marriages, they can never be expedient. If He has not forbidden them [*i. e.* in the Bible], it cannot be expedient in man to forbid them, and he has no right to do so.”—(P. 26.)

Although these opinions are in harmony with the doctrine of the Catechism of the Church of Scotland, that “ the word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the *only* rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy God,” I much prefer the opposite opinions of St Paul, Hooker, Taylor, Wilkins, Tillotson, Hoadly, Sherlock, Law, Conybeare, and Whately. And the time, perhaps, is not far distant, when the Scottish clergy will be compelled, by the growing intelligence of the people, to bestow upon natural religion the attention it demands, and thus enable themselves to adapt their instruction to the requirements of the nineteenth century.

Dr Jortin, in his sermon on Isaiah v. 20 (“ Wo unto them that call evil good, and good evil !”) observes :—

“ There have always been persons, such as those of whom Isaiah complains, who, having given themselves up to iniquity, would fain, for the quiet of their own minds, discard the differences of good and evil in human actions, as if there were no rule to try them by; as if they were nothing but the arbitrary fancies of men, according to the different influences of education and custom; as if doing well were only a fashion of appearing suitable to the country we inhabit, which varies as much as the different dresses and languages of nations, and their different tastes and inclinations; or, as if present pleasures and pain were the only standard of good and evil.

“ Others there are, very different from the former, sober, pious, and well-meaning persons, who out of a mistaken zeal for revealed religion, and for the honour of Christianity, are not contented with preferring the revealed to the natural law, for which we shall not blame them, but are apt to depreciate human reason, which also is the gift of God; to slight natural religion, which also is the law of God; and to resolve all moral good and evil, and all moral duty, into the mere positive will and command of God set forth in the Law and the Gospel, as though without such instruction and assistance we could neither discern nor perform any one good deed.

“ But upon better consideration, and nearer inspection, they will find even by the Scriptures, as well as by the light of reason, that some actions are good and some evil in themselves, and without respect to any revealed law; and that there are some stated rules and measures by which we may judge of good and evil by our sense and reason. And yet at the same time it is very certain that revelation is of the utmost value and importance: that this additional gift of God is highly useful to guide and improve our natural notions of morality, and to enforce the practice of it; so that we must be very ignorant, or very unthankful, if we do not discern its evidence, and receive it with faith and gratitude.”—(*Jortin's Works*, vol. x., pp. 170, 171.)

If these remarks are well-founded, Dr Lee has exhibited himself (I doubt not, incautiously) in the position of a “ sober, pious, and well-meaning person,” actuated by “ a mistaken zeal for revealed religion, and for the honour of Christianity,” if not also of Judaism.

* Provincial Letters, Letter xviii., p. 330 of Dr M'Crie's Translation.

however, when they gainsay themselves, are less apt than the Sabbatarians to do it clumsily. The abruptness with which the asserters of the vital importance of the Fourth Commandment sometimes pass from fear to confidence, is ludicrous; as, for instance, in honest John Younger's prize-essay on the Sabbath, where he expresses great alarm for the safety of "the whole law of life," if the obligation of the Fourth Commandment be denied; since upon other precepts of the Decalogue "are founded," he tells us, "the laws of society, the national security for public conduct." Deny the obligation of the Decalogue, and "the wicked," says he, "would have full scope for mischief, so long as they could personally defend themselves from the consequences of a general libertinism. Yes, the Fourth Commandment is as sacred and as necessary as at least any other on the divine tables—as obligatory to-day as it was in the tabernacle of Israel." Here we are expected to forget that any laws of God save the Decalogue exist: but straightway he gives us the comfortable assurance that the Sabbath has another foundation, which may support it even in the awful event of the obligation of the Decalogue being denied; it is, has been, and will be, "INDISPENSABLE to the temporal as well as to the spiritual advantages of man, in all ages, from the beginning to the end of the world's time." Now surely what is "indispensable" is in little danger of becoming obsolete! This hope is confirmed by what he farther propounds; namely, that "the divine law in regard to the Sabbath lies not alone in the words of the Commandment, nor in our proof that the Commandment was from the date of our creation; but is also imprinted upon the natural constitution of man, in his physical, intellectual, moral, and religious capacities."* What risk is there of such a foundation being weakened by the abandonment of the Jewish precept? and what need has it of being strengthened by a supernatural prop? "O ye of little faith!"

To those who, for such reasons as are set forth in the foregoing Plea for Sunday Trains, look upon the Sabbatarian Directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company as flagrant bargain-breakers, the following averments, in a Sabbatarian prize-essay, which, I am happy to say, contains a great deal of really excellent matter, will seem extravagant and ridiculous. "Slight the Sabbath, and you slight religion; slight religion, and you strike at the roots of society—at truth, *honesty*, and virtue. But let a people honour the Sabbath, and they do reverence to religious principles; they strengthen those foundations upon which the social virtues are based—sobriety, order, REGARD FOR COVENANTS, cheerfulness, temperance, both personal and political, flourish among them, and give stability to their union."†

True; if you believe either Sabbath-observance, or Christmas-observance, or any other observance whatever, to be a religious duty, and yet neglect it, you slight religion, and blunt the moral feelings

* The Light of the Week; or the Temporal Advantages of the Sabbath, considered in Relation to the Working Classes. By John Younger. London, 1849. Pp. 45, 46.

† The Henderson Prize-Essay upon the Advantages of the Sabbath, when rightly observed, to Literary and Professional Men. By Peter Young Black, Writer, Glasgow. 1850. P. 39.

by habitually disregarding their dictates; but if, like the Quakers, you hold no such belief, your "honesty and virtue" will sustain as little damage as theirs do, from the habit of esteeming every day alike. In my opinion, to enjoin as a religious duty the sort of Sabbath-observance prescribed by the standards of the Church of Scotland (but which, it is fair to acknowledge, is by no means recommended by Mr Black), has a tendency to produce the very evils which that gentleman is desirous to ward off; for when a duty is imposed which the reason and healthy instincts of human nature rebel against, it will seldom be strictly performed; it is in opposition to the views of the most enlightened and influential classes of the community; these, if they hypocritically conform, are themselves demoralised by such practice; while, if noneonformists, they set an example which influences others not of their opinions, who, becoming thus habituated to disregard in practice what they believe to be a law of God, soon become accustomed to slight the laws which are *really* divine. Michaelis expresses this view with his usual energy of language, in a passage which, although quoted in a former page (see p. 176), is good enough to be repeated here:—"A legislator who attempts to introduce a system of morality too strict for his subjects, will, by aiming at too much, gain nothing, and only pave the way for their more audacious and extensive transgression of his laws; and what they have successfully tried as to one, they will soon put in practice as to others."* If this is true of duties which are truly *moral*, much more applicable must the observation be to imaginary duties which have no foundation either in the human conscience, in reason, or in the revealed will of God.

Not less to the present purpose is the warning which Baxter gives in the following words:—"Take heed that you do not make yourself more work than God hath made you, by feigning things unlawful, which God hath not forbidden. . . . All overdoing in God's work is undoing; and whoever you meet with that would overdo, suspect him to be either a subtle, destroying enemy, or one deluded by the destroyer."†

Milton also observes:—"He who wisely would restrain the reasonable soul of man within due bounds, must first himself know perfectly how far the territory and dominion extends of just and honest liberty. *As little must he offer to bind that which God hath loosened, as to loosen that which He hath bound.* The ignorance and mistake of this high point hath heaped up one huge half of all the misery that hath been since Adam. . . . The greatest burden in the world is superstition, not only of ceremonies in the Church, but of *imaginary and scare-crow sins* at home. What greater weakening, what more subtle stratagem against our Christian warfare, when, besides the gross body of real transgressions to encounter, we shall be terrified by a *vain and shadowy menacing of faults that are not*?"‡ And elsewhere he says:—"It

* Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. i., p. 16.

† Directions for getting and keeping Spiritual Peace and Comfort; Baxter's Works, vol. ix., pp. 189, 192.

‡ The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, Introd.; Prose Works, vol. iii., p. 175, 176.

is the height of injustice, as well as an example of most dangerous tendency in religion, *to account as sin what is not such in reality.*"*

"*The laws of religion,*" says Montesquieu, "*should never inspire an aversion to anything but vice,* and, above all, they should never estrange man from a love and tenderness for his own species."†

To these extracts (which deserve to be well considered) may be fitly added a true and forcible exposition of the actual state of things from the *Edinburgh Review*:—"In the present state of the world, unity is irreconcilable with freedom; and, in default of unity, the outward simulation of it is plain falsehood. We may agree that sincerity is not everything in religion: but insincerity, even on the right side, must be something worse; and how much of that there is in Old England, we should be sorry to see computed in a question of national character. Religious insincerity, commonly called cant, is one of our special vices; and yet it does not seem natural to us, but results insensibly from our conservative love of old forms of speech which have survived their meaning, and ancient rites that have no life left in them. This is notable in Church and State alike; in our constitutional and legal fictions; in our public testimonials, tributes, toasts, epitaphs, and oaths, no less than in our solemn creeds, confessions, and thanksgivings. Consider, for example, in things sacred, our universal conventional indifference to the vows of sponsors in baptism, although the awful old service is scrupulously retained. So of the Ordination Service. Consider, also, the weekly recitation of the Fourth Commandment, and *the response to it*, without one word of comment or qualification on the part of the Church, notwithstanding that nobody believes a *Jewish Sabbath* to be either binding upon Christians, or possible in modern life; and not the strictest Puritan of us all, not Scotland herself, even thinks of observing it as such. The immense variance between the letter of this law and the most rigid practical interpretation of it, confounds all English ideas of Sabbath-keeping and Sabbath-breaking; creates unnecessarily an awful *malum prohibitum*; and lays snares in the path of innumerable honest and devout men and women. If the Fourth Commandment be, indeed, a law of the Christians, it is too certain that all Christians deliberately break it; but if it be a law of the Jews only, then all the scandal is chargeable upon those who, professing to have divine truth in their keeping, recite this law weekly from the altar, as if it were part of the Sermon on the Mount. In the same way, chapters from the Old Testament, and from the New, are read out to a congregation, with no other distinction than that one is the first, the other the second. Such inconsistencies, to those who will reflect upon them, will appear far more important and more fruitful of evil consequences than most of us are aware of."‡

Speaking of certain fancies about church authority, which are now pretty generally acknowledged to be groundless, Archbishop Whately says:—"In some instances, to my own knowledge, and probably in

* Treatise on Christian Doctrine, p. 231.

† Spirit of Laws, B. xxiv., ch. 22.

‡ Edinburgh Review, vol. xcii., p. 349, 350, Oct. 1850.—See to the same effect, Mr Bailey's Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, &c., p. 230, 2d edit.

many others, such notions as I allude to have been more or less countenanced by persons who are aware—or at least *were* at first aware—of their unsoundness, from their supposed tendency to promote piety and morality. But the good effects resulting (and such often have, apparently at least, resulted) from any false system, *have a continual and rapid tendency towards decay, while the evil fruits are borne in continually increasing profusion, and with more and more of poisonous luxuriance.*”*

So much for the influence of Sabbath-observance upon “truth, honesty, and virtue.” As to the favourable influence on “sobriety” which Mr Black ascribes to it, the Quakers, I imagine, will stand as favourable a comparison with the Sabbatarian citizens of Glasgow, as the Parisian slights of the Sabbath notoriously do with the inhabitants of Scotland at large.† By going to church, and there hear-

* Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c., 2d edit., p. 196.

† On this subject we have the strong and unexceptionable testimony of Dr Guthrie, in his *Plea on behalf of Drunkards, and against Drunkenness*, published at Edinburgh in 1850:—“The writer of this ‘Plea’ spent, as a student, some five or six months in Paris. He resided there during the period of the carnival, and was spectator of a scene on the Boulevards, which would have made a stranger fancy that a large portion of its citizens had gone mad. Yet amid such scenes, and during that extended period, he saw but one case of intoxication. We found few among our French acquaintances who believed the Bible to be the Word of God. We found the temples of worship deserted, save by some women and a few old men. We counted on one occasion thirty-three theatres and places of amusement open on the Sabbath-day. And we met with many other things besides, to make us almost say with Abraham, ‘The fear of God is not in this place.’ Yet, although our avocations led us often through the worst parts of the city, and occasionally late in the evening—in that city, containing then a population six times larger than Edinburgh—we saw but one drunken man, and no drunken woman. Well—we stepped from the steamer upon one of the London quays, and had not gone many paces, when our national pride was humbled, and any Christianity we may have had was put to the blush, by the disgusting spectacle of drunkards reeling along the streets, and filling the air with strange and horrid imprecations. In one hour we saw in London—and in Edinburgh, with all her churches, and schools, and piety, we see every day—more drunkenness than we saw in five long months in guilty Paris. ‘Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon.’ Surely these facts disclose a state of things for which British Christians ought to blush.” To shew that France is by no means a solitary instance of superiority in this respect over Sabbath-keeping Scotland, Dr Guthrie adds:—“Now, our experience in this matter is very much the same as that of others, who have been similarly placed, as we found in the corresponding statement of a book of Travels in the Brazils,—the work of a gentleman who now presides over the Horticultural Gardens in Ceylon. Most people know the low state of morality in the Brazils, that there the marriage tie is almost entirely loosed, and that priests and people are one sweltering mass of corruption. This gentleman, glad to breathe once more the pure air of a religious land, reached Liverpool on a Sabbath morning, but what was the scene which met him on his native shores? On that sacred day, ere he had spent as many hours in Liverpool as he had passed years in the Brazils, he saw more drunkards than he had seen during his whole sojourn in a country where the ordinary decencies of life are laughed to scorn. Whether our nation is or is not the most drunken nation in the world, we leave others to settle; but surely these are facts which ought to fill us with shame.”—(Pp. 27, 28.)

At a meeting of Justices in Glasgow, on 29th November 1852, when the means of recreation for the working classes were discussed, in connection with

ing sobriety and the other virtues recommended, many may, and I doubt not do, receive much benefit. But to expect that ill-lodged and ill-educated people, who have no resources of science, literature, or amusement, wherewith to refresh their spirits and occupy agreeably the afternoon of Sunday in this gloomy northern climate, should generally abstain from using the sole means they have of becoming cheerful—to expect that a temptation which, to a grave and heavy people like the Scotch, is infinitely stronger than it would be to the lively Parisians, even if their climate were as bad as ours and their means of recreation as few—to expect this, I say, is to expect what assuredly will never be realised as long as human nature continues what it is. Above all, the proscription of music on Sundays seems to me to be worthy only of barbarians.

To the statements above quoted from Mr Younger, another Sabbatarian has recently added the equally cheering information, that “the

an application (which was granted) for the license of a respectable minor theatre, one of them, Mr David Bell of Blackhall, said, “He hoped to see the day when five or six steamers would leave the Broomielaw every Sunday.” On this, a Glasgow paper, the *Scotch Reformers' Gazette*, remarks:—“We think he was guilty of a little indiscretion in shocking the religious nerves of the minority. Mr Bell, in short, was a little too fast, and went perhaps a little too far; but what did Mr W. Kidston mean, when ‘he inferred it was that gentleman’s intention to introduce continental immorality?’ *We doubt if there be more immorality in any city on the Continent than just in this sanctified city of Glasgow itself*, where (thanks to the Puritans) the people are excluded on Sunday from even the Botanical Gardens, and shut up, like so many dogs in their kennels, or driven to dens of a far more degrading character, until it is time to recommence their work at six o’clock on Monday morning.”

On the 24th of the same month, there was held a meeting of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, at which Dr Muir declared “his conviction, that if such places of amusement as the Crystal Palace were allowed to be opened during non-canonical hours, as they were called, on Sundays, the result of it would be to bring on this country *the whole of the abominations of the Continent*, where the hours after divine service were given up to amusement, and vain and idle recreation and profligacy.” For my part, I should regard the Continental “abomination” of sobriety as a very good “result;” and, as for *profligacy*, we are so well supplied with that already on Sundays in our large towns (though it shows itself less “before folk” here than on the Continent), that no appreciable increase of it under the baneful influence of the Crystal Palace is likely to take place. If our clergy had the advantage of seeing the Continental nations for themselves, they would learn that wherever the natural character of the people resembles that of the Scotch, (as in Holland and Northern Germany,) they behave at least as virtuously as we do, notwithstanding their non-observance of the Puritanical Sabbath. The author of that beautiful and thoughtful volume, *Companions of my Solitude*, (Mr Helps,) writing of a Sunday evening in Germany, says:—“I wandered amongst the various groups of quiet, decorous, beer-imbibing Germans, who, in family-parties, had come out to these gardens to drink their beer, smoke their pipes, and hear some music. *In those fortunate regions they have not made a ghastly idol of the Sunday.*” (P. 127. See also pp. 27, 37, 102.) My own observations in Germany, as well as the much wider experience of several friends who have resided for considerable periods there, confirm the conclusion to which I think the study of human nature leads, that to make a ghastly idol of Sunday as the Scotch do, is *positively conducive* to drunkenness and profligacy. To this subject I shall return in Note L.; at present, I conclude by transcribing this excellent maxim from Burke’s Letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe:—“LAWFUL ENJOYMENT IS THE SUREST METHOD TO PREVENT UNLAWFUL GRATIFICATION.”—(*Works of Edmund Burke*, vol. vi., p. 312, ed. 1823).

morality of the Sabbath *being incontrovertible*, the keeping of the day holy unto the Lord is as truly and unalterably a part of the moral law, as to honour and obey parents and magistrates,—to abstain from falsehood, theft, and murder. The authority of man may claim to set aside the obligation of any of the other commandments as soon as that of the fourth.”*

This would be extremely well fitted to allay men’s fear for the safety of the Sabbath, if they did not see plainly that the “undebateable” and “incontrovertible” morality of Sabbath-observance is extensively and powerfully “controverted,” even in the Sabbatarian camp. Dr Bound himself, the man who first in England hoisted the Sabbatarian colours, admits that the Fourth Commandment “was given in the beginning not so much by the light of nature as the rest of the nine commandments were, but by express words, when God sanctified it. For though this be the law of nature that some days should be separated to God’s worship, as appears by the practice of the Gentiles; yet that it should be every *seventh day*, the Lord himself set down in express words; *which otherwise by the light of nature they could never have found.*”†

If the duties prescribed in the Fourth Commandment rest upon a law written on the heart and grafted on the constitution of man, how was it possible for the acute and learned Baxter to declare that they are “but of positive institution, and not naturally known to man, as other duties are?”‡ how can Dr M’Crie affirm that “it is only from the law of revelation that we learn Sabbatical duty”?§ and how could the accomplished Dr Barrow conclude, that “seeing in its own nature the Fourth Commandment differeth from the rest of the Ten Laws, the obligation thereto being not, discernibly to natural light, grounded in the reason of the thing, we can nowise be assured that an universal and perpetual obligation thereto was intended, or that its obligation did extend further than to the Jews, to whom it was as a formal law delivered, and upon special considerations severely inculcated; to whose humour, condition, and circumstances, it might also perhaps be particularly suited.”||

According to Bishop Taylor, the rest which the Jews were commanded to observe on the Sabbath, “being only commemorative of their deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, was not moral, nor perpetual; it could be dispensed with at the command of a prophet;

* Sabbath Trading: An Address to the Shareholders of the Caledonian and other Railway Lines, p. 7. Edinburgh, 1852.

† Bound on the Sabbath, 2d. ed. pp. 11, 16; quoted in Heylin’s History of the Sabbath, Part I., p. 16. Dr Bound’s book was first published in 1595.

‡ Works, vol. xix., p. 186.—A few pages farther on he says: “It is of the law of nature (that is, known by natural light without other revelation), 1. That God should be worshipped; 2. That societies should assemble to do it together; 3. That some set time should be separated stately to that use; 4. That it should be done with the whole heart, without worldly diversions or distractions. But I know nothing in nature alone from whence a man can prove that, 1. It must be either just one day in seven; 2. Or, just what day of the seven it must be; 3. Nor just what degree of rest is necessary: though reason may discern that one day in seven is a very convenient proportion.”—(P. 187.)

§ Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew, p. 152.

|| Exposition of the Decalogue; Barrow’s Works, ed. 1847, vol. ii., p. 572.

it was dispensed with at the command of Joshua,—it was broken at the siege of Jericho,—it always yielded when it clashed with the duty of any other commandment ; it was not observed by the priests in the Temple, nor in the stalls by the herdsman, nor in the house by the ‘major-domo ;’ but they did lead the ox to water, and ‘circumcised a son ; that is, it yielded to charity, and to religion, *not only to a moral duty, but to a ceremonial*, and therefore could not oblige us. But that which remained was imitable ; the natural religion which was used upon the Jewish festivals was fit also for the holidays of Christians.”*

A century afterwards we find Dr Jortin writing in a similar strain :—

“ God gave the Jews two sorts of laws.

“ He gave them laws requiring of them actions which were good and right in themselves antecedently to those laws, and which are of perpetual obligation, as piety, purity, mercy, justice, and the like. These are moral laws.

“ He gave them laws commanding or forbidding things which appeared indifferent in their own nature, but were intended, without question, for wise and good purposes. Such were, to offer sacrifices, to observe a strict rest upon the seventh day, not to plough or sow the seventh year, and the like. These are positive, ritual, ceremonial laws.

“ Now, though both are to be observed, as far as is possible, with the utmost care and caution, yet, in case they should ever interfere, the latter in reason ought to give place, as less useful, less weighty and important. So likewise say the prophets, declaring that God will have mercy and not sacrifice,—namely, where both cannot be had ; that he prefers morality to rites and ceremonies, where the one or the other must be left undone.” †

The remark of Bishop Warburton has already been quoted (p. 169), that had the Jewish Sabbath been a *moral* and not a *positive* institution, it could not have been employed as a partition-wall to separate the Jews from other nations. To that remark I see no possibility of a reply.

On the other hand, Bishop Burnet discusses this point as follows :—“ With respect to the morality of the Sabbath,” says he, “ it ought to be observed, that those things are said to be *moral*, and of the law of nature, which are in themselves rational and fit to be done, though there was no express command to enjoin it. So that where there is a great equity in the thing itself, enough to sway a rational and honest man to the doing it ; this is to be esteemed moral, and authorised by the law of nature. That is of *positive* institution which is observed only because it is commanded, and hath no intrinsical goodness or reason in itself to recommend it to our practice, but obligeth only upon the injunction and authority of another : as, for instance, it is naturally good to obey our parents, to abstain from murder, theft, adultery ; and to do unto others as we would like to have done unto us. These things we are obliged unto by the very light of reason and principle of nature, though there had been no written law of God

* *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. ii., ch. 2, Rule 6, § 58 ; Works, vol. xii., p. 425.

† *Dr Jortin's Works*, vol. ix., p. 111.

to impose them.”* The Bishop contends for the moral nature of the duty to keep holy one day in seven, upon the ground that “a convenient portion of our time is due unto the service and worship of God, by natural and moral right,” and that “we ourselves, had it been left to us, could not have set apart less time for his service than God hath done.” To which I reply, that under the Christian law, God is to be served and worshipped every day of our lives; that the Jewish Sabbath was *not* appointed for the service and worship of God, but (besides its use as “a sign”) solely for the refreshment of man and beast;† and that, besides, there is not the slightest ground in reason or history, for affirming that the light of nature would have made known to mankind any such duty as that of consecrating the seventh day of the week, or any particular day whatever, to the religious service of God. If there is really “a great equity in the thing itself, enough to sway a rational and honest man to the doing it,” how comes it to pass that neither Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Luther, Milton, nor Chillingworth, recognised the duty of esteeming one day in seven above the others, or wholly devoting the seventh or any other day to religious exercises?

Even Dr Wardlaw admits (though with the caution of a Glasgow minister, aware of the risk he runs of treading on the toes of Puritanical prejudice), that the Sabbath, “considered as the setting apart of a special day for a special purpose,” is “a positive institute” merely.‡ “For aught we can perceive,” says he, “God might have created the world in seven days, and rested on the eighth; or in nine days, and rested on the tenth. In the latter case, instead of weeks of seven days, we should have had decades. We do not feel, in making such a supposition, any thing at all incongruous—any thing in the least degree revolting to our moral principles. If we do, a moment’s examination of the feeling will satisfy us, that it arises entirely from the association of sacredness with the actually existing arrangement; and that, had this arrangement been one of decades, instead of weeks, the feeling would have been exactly the reverse of what it is; the sacredness being attached to the tenth day, and the uneasy misgiving to the seventh.”§ Yet he thinks it “truly surprising” to find Archbishop Whately saying, “The dogma of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster (in their Confession of Faith), that the observance of the Sabbath is part of the Moral law, is to me utterly unintelligible.” The reasons of his surprise are in their turn “surprising”—assuming as they do, 1st, that “the worship of God, and the cultivation of the principles of piety, or true religion,” are duties enjoined by the Fourth Commandment; and, 2dly, that the obvious utility of “stated seasons” of social worship imposes on us, as a moral duty, the obligation to keep holy a certain day of the week by abstinence from labour

* Sermon on the Fourth Commandment, in Knox’s Family Lectures, p. 257.

† The reasons of this opinion will be given in Note R. At present I merely add, that the duty of public worship is by no means called in question here: all that I affirm is, that the Fourth Commandment never was the foundation of that duty even to the Jews, nor, although it were of universal and perpetual obligation, would be the foundation of the duty to us.

‡ Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 75.

§ Pages 79, 80.

during the whole of its course. But I quite agree with him in holding, that, even supposing the Sabbath-law to be positive and not moral, it would be binding on all men at this day, if it were not a law peculiar to the Mosaic economy, but (as he thinks it is, and I think it is not) an unrepealed law prescribed to the human race at the creation. "Persons are apt to fancy," says he, "that, in order to prove an ancient institution not to be binding, they have nothing to do but to shew it to be of what they call a positive nature. But this is obviously a mistake. An observance which can plead the positive enactments of divine authority, is as really of moral obligation, so long as it continues unrepealed, as if it were one of the eternal and universal principles of right and wrong. Who will presume to interpose his authority, to set aside what the will of Deity has enacted? No will but his own can abrogate his own institutions."* Not a doubt of it. Although, *intrinsically*, the thing imposed by the precept continues unaltered, whoever finds sufficient evidence that a positive law has been given him by the Deity, is morally bound to perform the duty required—"it being as reasonable and fit," says Dr Chandler, "that I should attend to the voice and will of the Supreme Being in external revelation, as that I should submit to the voice and will of God by reason or internal revelation."† If, then, the law that the seventh day of the week shall be sanctified is universal and unrepealed, there is surely great impiety in sanctifying another day in its place.

By Dr Lorimer, the subject of the last few paragraphs is handled in a truly original way. "In regard," says he, "to the objection to the moral obligation of the Sabbath-law, on the score that, unlike the others, it does not rise out of the necessary relations in which men stand to God and to each other—relations independent of positive institutions—I answer: It is by no means clear that all the Commandments (the seventh for instance) are founded on reason or conscience—that, on the contrary, the early and universal prevalence of polygamy seems a plain proof that the scriptural law of marriage is as much matter of positive institution as the appropriation of the seventh portion of time to the service of God; besides, the particular amount of time, a day in seven, may be, yea, certainly is, positive, while the *principle* of a stated season for worship is moral."‡

From this we learn Dr Lorimer's opinions to be—

1. That to remove an objection to the moral obligation of one commandment, it is well to affirm that the same objection *may* apply to others, and at all events *seems plainly* to apply to one of them.

2. That polygamy was forbidden to the Jews by the Seventh Commandment, which mentions adultery alone; § and the Rev. Mr Montgomery's notions about polygamy are erroneous.

3. That the Seventh Commandment is therefore a positive and not a moral precept; although, in a former page, Dr Lorimer lays much

* Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 76.

† Plain Reasons for being a Christian. By Samuel Chandler, D.D. London, §1730. In Watson's Coll. of Theol. Tracts, vol. iii., p. 480.

‡ The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath? p. 63.

§ With the Jews this word had a more limited signification than with us. See Kitto's Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., vol. i., p. 77.

stress upon the alleged fact, that in Ezekiel xxiii. 38, "Sabbath violation is classed with the greatest *moral* offences, such as the murder of children, *adultery*, *sacrilege*" (p. 55). From which passage, again, it appears that, in his opinion, not only adultery but *sacrilege* ("defiling God's sanctuary," *i. e.* the temple at Jerusalem, is the phrase in Ezekiel) is a moral offence capable of being committed by Gentile Christians; and that he regards as one and the same thing the mentioning of duties *in succession*, and the "*classing*" of them together as duties of the same species. And,

4. That, after all, the objection under consideration "*may be, yea, certainly is,*" *well founded*; but to counterbalance this fact, "*the principle of a stated season for worship,*" to which the Fourth Commandment does not even allude, "*is moral*"!

Admirable logic, worthy of the cause in which it is employed!*

To say, as Dr Arnold for instance does, that "we are bound by *the spirit* of the Fourth Commandment, because we are not fit to do without" the observance of the Sunday,† is a confused and incorrect way of

* There is an excellent demonstration of the *positive* character of the Fourth Commandment in Dr James Foster's Sermons, vol. iv., p. 260. But as the fact is sufficiently admitted in the passages above quoted from Sabbatarian writers, his argument need not be presented here.

† "The real question," says he, "is, Are we right in keeping the Sunday, or are we not right? The Fourth Commandment does not answer this question by itself; no, not though it be used every Sunday in our own service. For we do not keep the Fourth Commandment, seeing that we do not keep holy the seventh day, but the first; not the day on which God rested from all his works, but the day on which he raised up Jesus from the dead. And as to altering a command of the Law, he must know little of the obedience which the Law requires, who could think that men might alter it at their discretion."—(*Sermons*, by Thomas Arnold, D.D., vol. iii., p. 286. London, 1834.)

"Neither the Fourth Commandment," says Archbishop Whately, "nor any other law enjoining the observance of the seventh day of the week in memory of the close of the creation, is regarded by Christians as binding on them. For if it were, they would be bound strictly to obey it, as it was given. For the Apostles—who, themselves, as Jews, kept the Sabbath-day, and also, as Christians, assembled for worship on the Lord's Day—never made a *change* of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first. And no Church, consisting of un-inspired men, has any right to change any divine ordinance designed for them. But the Mosaic law having come to an end, and moreover having never been binding on Gentiles, a Christian Church is left to determine what days shall be set apart."—(*Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship*, p. 136, 2d. ed., London, 1849.)

It thus appears that these two eminent theologians have found in the New Testament no repeal of the seventh-day-Sabbath law, and no record of the institution of a first-day Sabbath. What are commonly called "proofs" from the Christian Scriptures, of a transference of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first, would excite only ridicule among educated men, if they were not adduced on behalf of a foregone conclusion. These so-called proofs we shall have occasion to consider in Note R.

When, at a meeting of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, I put Whately's opinion into the mouth of an imaginary Rabbin, in the terms appearing at pages 11 and 12 of this volume, they were received with a storm of disapprobation; but among the clerical shareholders present, none attempted to refute them. The report of this part of the proceedings, in the *Scotsman* of 13th March 1850, is as follows:—"Mr Cox proceeded to illustrate his principles, by supposing the shares of the railway to have been purchased to such an ex-

writing ; for only *laws*, and not the spirit of them, can with propriety be said to bind. The right proposition is, that we are bound by whatever natural laws the laws of any nation embody ; and, though you may call the natural law embodied in a Jewish law “the spirit” of that law, the natural law so embodied binds us no otherwise than through its own independent and eternal force as a law of nature. This is well and pithily stated by Archbishop Whately in one of his minor publications, where he is speaking of the moral duties commanded in the Jewish code. “Of course,” says he, “Christians are bound to practise these and all other moral duties. But that is because these *are*, in themselves, *moral* duties ; not because they are enjoined in the Law of Moses ; which was designed for the one people of Israel.”*

In the great controversy about state churches which took place in Scotland about twenty years ago, this point, or at least one substantially the same, was brought under discussion by Dr Inglis, in his *Vindication of Ecclesiastical Establishments*. In Chapter I., Section I., he has occasion to consider and oppose the argument, “that under the Mosaic dispensation the government exercised over the peculiar people of God was a *Theocracy*, and that the procedure under it cannot, for that reason, be regarded as an example.” He admits that in some instances they acted in a manner which, without the control and direction of God, would have been “unwarrantable,” and in which, consequently, we, who are destitute of supernatural guidance, are nowise bound to follow them. But this, he argues, is no reason why we should not imitate actions of a different kind, “if we only find it in our power to make the requisite distinction” between what we *ought* to imitate and what we *ought not*. “Were the means and the rule of distinction in any measure dubious,” he proceeds, “there might be cause for hesitation. But the principle which is to guide us, in distinguishing those acts of administration, which may be fairly regarded as an example, from others to which the objection in question applies, is so precise and unequivocal that ‘he who runs may read.’ Whatever we find inconsistent with that moral law, which God hath prescribed for the regulation of human conduct, is clearly an exception from what we either may or ought to imitate. But on the other hand, and so far as concerns the present objection, whatever appears to be consistent with the great law of moral obligation, and is at the same time exemplified by the kings of Israel and Judah, we may certainly regard as an object of imitation, just in proportion to the evidence which we have that their government was either approved by God, or was under his immediate control and direction. . . . If we be, in the first place, satisfied that the conduct in question is not incompatible with the laws of eternal and immutable obligation, it is not to be supposed that, under the guidance of an honest heart, we can be at

tent by Jewish capitalists, that a majority of Jewish Directors had been placed at the Board, and had stopped all the trains on Saturday ; and he argued that those who now oppose the Sunday trains could not consistently object to such a proceeding, but must either allow it to be justifiable, or avail themselves of that very right of private judgment which they at present practically disregard. *This portion of his address was received with IMPATIENCE AND DISAPPROBATION, mingled with applause.*”

* Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship, p. 66.

a loss to judge whether, as an example, it be or be not applicable to our own case; nor is it easy to perceive how, in such circumstances, we can escape from a moral obligation to imitate.”*

To this the reply of Mr Andrew Marshall appears to me conclusive. “If,” says he, “you appeal to the Mosaic institution in favour of your Ecclesiastical Establishments, why do you not appeal to it as a whole? Who gives you authority to cut and carve upon it? Are you not bound to take it as it stands, or not at all? We are entitled to demand an answer to these questions, and we know what that answer must be. We know you must concede that the Mosaic institution is no longer obligatory—that much of it was local—that much of it was peculiar to the ‘time then present’—that much of it served for the ‘example and shadow of heavenly things,’ and has now passed away. But you give us to understand that you contend only for the spirit of it, not the form—for the ethereal part, not the grosser part. You make your appeal to what is moral in it, and what, of course, is binding in all places and at all times. It is easy, you say, to distinguish what is ‘typical and figurative,’ from what is ‘moral and exemplary.’ ‘Under the guidance of an honest heart,’ you conceive we can be at no loss to judge what is, and what is not, ‘compatible with the laws of eternal and immutable obligation.’ Now, without saying whether Ecclesiastical Establishments are compatible with such obligation or not, (a point which may be more fully considered afterwards,) I must take the liberty to shew you, that, reasoning in this manner, you fairly give up your scriptural argument, derived from the Old Testament. By your own shewing, the establishment of religion under the Old Testament, is binding on us only in so far as it was moral. *But in so far as it was moral it is binding on us, independently of the Scriptures. Consequently it follows, by the strictest logical deduction, that the scriptural part of the obligation is reduced to a nonentity.*”†

That is to say—instead of determining, by an appeal to the law of nature, what precepts of the Jewish law are moral, and then obeying *them* because they agree with the law of nature, we shall find it a shorter and equally effective proceeding to obey the law of nature itself, without encumbering ourselves with intermediate rules which were never prescribed to any but the Jews. The circuitous process of Dr Inglis is like setting a steam-engine to turn a mill by pumping water upon the buckets of its wheel; instead of dispensing with the wheel altogether, and connecting the moving power directly with the grinding machinery.‡

A writer in *The New England Puritan*, quoted by the Rev. Mr Montgomery in the pamphlet formerly criticised, observes on this subject—

* A Vindication of Ecclesiastical Establishments. By John Inglis, D.D. Second edition, pp. 37–41. Edinburgh, 1834.

† Reply to Dr Inglis’s Vindication of Ecclesiastical Establishments. By Andrew Marshall. Glasgow, 1834. Pp. 87, 88.

‡ Nobody will question the soundness of what Conybeare and Sherlock affirm in the following passages:—

“To destroy the life of another man without sufficient cause or provocation, is so clearly wrong that no person who thinks at all can misjudge about it.”—(*Conybeare’s Defence of Revealed Religion*, p. 86.)

“The Jews had a law, commanding that they should honour their father and their mother; which implied an obligation on children to support and

“As the Jewish code, *as a code*, expired by its own limitations at the coming of Christ, none of its precepts have any force, *derived from the circumstance that they stand in that code*. The force which any of its precepts has, comes from the inherent justice and adaptedness seen to reside in those precepts. They are not repealed, simply because God cannot repeal what is intrinsically right. Yet as the code of which they make a part is as a code repealed, these single and unrepealable precepts stand on the same ground with similar principles of natural justice found in the laws of any nation foreign to us. They are binding on us because they are right, and not because the legislators of a foreign nation enacted them. The statutes of the Hebrew code are the municipal laws given by God, acting as the legislator of a nation, to us foreign, who was not at the time legislating for us; and his precepts in that capacity bear as much and no more authority over us than do those of Solon, *so far as both equally conform to principles of essential right*. Those of each are binding on us *because they are right*, and not because the author of the code exerts his authority over us.”*

maintain their indigent parents—a precept in itself so just and reasonable, that it is one of the prime laws of nature.”—(*Sherlock's Works*, vol. iii., p. 81.)

There will be less unanimity, however, in admitting the truth of this assertion of Samuel Rutherford as to the punishment of seducers to idolatry:—

“The express law of God, and of nature written in the heart of all, proveth that the seducer should die. Deut. 13: ‘If a prophet or a dreamer arise, and say, Let us go after other gods, he shall be put to death.’ *That is no temporary law obliging the Jews only.*”—(*Free Disputation, &c.*, p. 185.)

Dr Graves says that the sixth and subsequent commandments “coincide with the clear dictates of reason, and prohibit crimes which human laws in general have prohibited as plainly destructive of social happiness. But it was of infinite importance,” he adds,—avoiding, be it observed, the use of the word *necessity*—“it was of infinite importance to rest the prohibitions, ‘Thou shalt not kill,—Thou shalt not commit adultery,—Thou shalt not steal,—Thou shalt not bear false witness,’ not merely on the deductions of reason, but also on the weight of a divine authority.”—(*Lectures on the Pentateuch*, vol. i., p. 231.) If, instead of “the weight of a divine authority” (in the sense of revelation), he had here said “the admonitions of conscience,” his proposition would have been still more in accordance with the actual method of the divine government of the world; for God has spoken through the conscience far more extensively than by means of revealed laws. Let any one read the narrative of the cup in Benjamin’s sack (Gen. xlv.), and say whether the sense of the turpitude of theft was not as strongly felt before the giving of the Decalogue as after it. Among the Romans, it may be added, the sense of justice appears from their laws to have been at least as acute as among the Hebrews; and in an instance related in Acts xxv. 16, we find Festus the Roman governor giving an admirable lesson in fair play to the Jewish persecutors of Paul, who, it seems, were impatient to have judgment against him without allowing him an opportunity of self-defence. “To whom I answered,” says Festus, “It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him.” The persons to whom this pithy speech was addressed were “the chief priests and the elders of the Jews;” men familiar with the Mosaic law from their youth.

It is notorious that the laws of modern Europe are based chiefly on those of the Roman Empire, and have borrowed comparatively little from the Mosaic code.

* See Mr Montgomery’s pamphlet on Marriage with a Deceased Wife’s Sister, p. 44. The italics appear in the extract as it is given by him, and are probably in the original.

By Mr Montgomery this passage is described as containing a view which is “stated in such a way as to make it offensive to a vast number of Christian minds.” If there is any unfairness in the reasoning, or impiety in the tone, of the American writer, it is fit that the offence which he is said to have given to these Christian minds should have been taken by them. But I confess my inability to perceive in the paragraph anything calculated to offend a lover of truth, freedom, and temperate discussion; nay, the statements contained in it seem to me so incontrovertible, that I heartily wish Mr Montgomery had thought proper to *specify* the unpleasant qualities which disgust him. By doing so, he would have gratified a desire which I have long felt to see what can be said on the other side of this important question. When the passage fell under my notice in his pamphlet, I congratulated myself on the prospect of finding at the close of it such a reply as it evidently demands; but great was my disappointment at finding only this:—“*It is not altogether unpleasant to find such a cause advocated in such a way; nor is it very wonderful that a person capable of enunciating such views, should employ himself in endeavouring to remove any prohibition of the kind now under consideration*”! The smile with which this silly comment is delivered, might easily be mistaken for a sardonic simper, intended to conceal the smiler’s consciousness of inability to meet argument with argument; but when it is considered that if any such consciousness had been present in his mind, he would not have inserted the American paragraph at all, but have allowed it to remain in obscurity along with the 15th verse of the 21st chapter of Deuteronomy, the conclusion is irresistible that his self-gratulation is perfectly sincere.

That which history proves to be *really* natural and universal in the grounds of the Jewish Sabbath, is expressed in the following words of Archbishop Sumner:—“RELAXATION is certainly advantageous, and probably even necessary, to the bodily and mental powers. *Every age has found it so*: the ancients sought it in their games and spectacles: the warlike exertions of savages are followed by feasts and carousals: the man of business and the man of literature alike indulge in their season of rest; the peasant and the artisan relax on the Sabbath, in their occasional festivals, at wakes, and fairs, and harvest-home.”*

* Records of the Creation, vol. ii., p. 311.—In penning this passage, the author may have had in view the following sentences in Dr Barrow’s Exposition of the Decalogue:—“In all wise and civil societies, some provision ever hath been made, by appointing festival times, for the practice of such duties, in some kind or degree: ‘The founders of laws (saith Seneca) did institute festival days, that men should publicly be constrained to cheerfulness; interposing, as necessary, a temperament of their pains.’—‘Legum conditores festos instituerunt dies, ut ad hilaritatem homines publice egerentur, tanquam necessarium laboribus interponentes temperamentum.’—(*Sen. de Tranq. An.*) Plato, with a more admirable sagacity, refers the invention, or first institution, of such times unto God himself: ‘The gods’ (saith he, that is, the Divine Providence administering affairs here by the ministry of inferior invisible powers, according to his notion and manner of speaking), ‘pitying mankind, born to painful labour, appointed, for an ease and cessation from their toils, the recourses of festival seasons observed to the gods.’—Θεοὶ δὲ οὐκ εἰρήρατες τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίστονον πεφυκὸς γένος ἀναπαύλας τε αὐτοῖς τῶν πόνων ἐτάξαντο τῶν ἑσπεῶν ἀμοιβᾶς τοῖς θεοῖς.—(*Plat. de Leg. ii. p. 787.*) Thus, I say, reason acknowledges the substance of these duties,

Stated seasons of repose from labour—this, and this only, is the “principle,” the “spirit,” the essential idea of the Jewish Sabbath. “Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed.”* How the time thus set free from labour should be spent, is a separate and most important question, on which the Fourth Commandment throws no light whatever. And this is a wise silence. After indicating so distinctly the *purpose* of the institution, it was expedient to leave each man to choose for himself the most suitable means of effecting it. For no general rule could apply to all—no manner of “refreshment” is equally adapted to young and old, to strong and weak, to the learned and ignorant, to men of one taste or talent, and men of another taste or talent, to the refined and coarse, to sedentary workers and the bearers of burdens, to tailors, weavers, scribes, smiths, labourers, and ploughmen.

The classical proverb, *Non semper arcum tendit Apollo*, “Wisely Apollo oft unstrings his bow,” is but another expression of the principle of the Fourth Commandment. Among the Romans, “in a religious point of view all days of the year were either *dies festi*, or *dies profesti*, or *dies intercesi*. According to the definition given by Macrobin, *dies festi* were dedicated to the gods, and spent with sacrifices, repasts, games, and other solemnities; *dies profesti* belonged to men for the administration of their private and public affairs. . . . *Dies intercesi* were common between gods and men, that is, partly devoted to the worship of the gods, partly to the transaction of ordinary business.”†

“As it is impossible,” says a late Sabbatarian writer, “to reconcile Sabbath railway traffic with the observance of the Fourth Commandment, Railway Companies must proceed either by defying it altogether, or by assuming that the commandment has been rescinded or

and approves the securing their performance, as a good end, or fit matter of law, both divine and human. But as to the circumstantial determination of measure and manner; that a *seventh day* precisely should be assigned; that a total cessation from labour for man and beast should be prescribed; this is above reason to discern a necessity of, or a expediency in comparison with other limitations in those respects devisable and practicable: nor can we assuredly resolve the obligation thereto into any other ground than the pleasure of the most wise Author of this law, who did see what was most fit to be prescribed to those whom this law concerned.”—(*Barrow's Works*, vol. ii., p. 572.)

It may be added that Dr Barrow, for reasons given, agrees with “the judgment of the ancient Christians, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, &c., who refer the first institution of the Sabbath to Moses, affirming (that which indeed the history by its total silence concerning the Sabbath before him sufficiently doth seem to confirm) that the patriarchs were not obliged thereto, nor did practise it.”—(P. 571.) He quotes the words of Justin and Irenæus, and refers to Tertullian *adv. Jud.* ii. 4; but as I ascribe no particular importance to the opinions of men whose means of interpreting the Scriptures were in this case no better than our own, it seems unnecessary to transcribe the passages.

As to the natural grounds of the Sabbath, see Dr Samuel Clarke's *Sermons*, vol. vi., p. 171, ed. 1820; Sermon 161, “On the Nature and End of the Sabbath.”

* Exodus xxiii. 12.

† Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, p. 340, Art. DIES.

modified.* But surely they are not restricted to these two alternatives ! Such of them, at least, as are not Jews, may proceed upon the belief that the Fourth Commandment is a Jewish law, which, whether rescinded or not, is nowise obligatory on *them*, who are Gentiles ; or, if they think the law binding on all men, they may be of opinion that the running of Sunday trains is a work of necessity or mercy, or both. The same writer urges very emphatically, that “ all Protestant denominations in Great Britain hold that the institution of the Sabbath rest is of divine authority and perpetual obligation ;” upon which ground he asserts it to be undeniable that “ the attitude of Railway Companies on the Sabbath question is that of hostility to the Bible !”† Like other Sabbatarians, he assumes “ the morality of the Sabbath” to be “ incontrovertible,” in spite of its being actually controverted and repudiated by theologians innumerable, and whole sects of Christians, who consider themselves as well entitled, and quite as able, to interpret the Scriptures for themselves, as “ all Protestant denominations in Great Britain.”

And here it may be well to observe (what some readers might otherwise overlook), that this favourite word “ *moral*,” so frequently and dogmatically applied to the law of the Sabbath by the Puritans of these and former times, is used in two senses, one of which may be styled the *theological*, and the other the *ethical and colloquial*. Great errors may easily be fallen into by disregarding this ambiguity ; for, as Baxter well observes, “ Nothing more cheateth the ignorant, than ambiguous words and confusion ; and explaining those words, and needful, plain distinction, would save the writing of many volumes, and would make truth easily meet the seeker, and unravel all the spider webs of deceivers.”‡ The word “ *moral*,” I say, is ambiguous ; and it would be a great mistake to hold that what is moral or immoral in *one* sense of the term, is such also in the *other*. In the *theological* (which, in the writings of divines, is the older) sense, moral duties are those which “ arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command ;”§ which “ are in themselves *rational and fit to be done*, though there was no express command to enjoin it ;”|| that is to say, for the performance of which *good reasons can be given* : In the other (which I have called the *ethical and colloquial*) sense, moral duties are those which are “ *suggested to man by his conscience*” or moral sentiments ; and which, because having “ a necessary and natural connection with the dictates of that internal monitor,” are not “ dependent upon the will of a superior who prescribes them.”¶ To moral duties in both senses of the word, the phrases “ *natural duties*” and “ *universal and perpetual duties*” apply ; so that whatever may be truly said of natural duties in general, is true both of moral duties in

* Sabbath Trading : An Address to the Shareholders of the Caledonian and other Railway Lines. Edin. 1852. P. 6.

† Pp. 5, 6.

‡ Baxter's Works, vol. x., p. 514.—Southey somewhere says :—“ Beware how you allow words to pass for more than they are worth, and bear in mind what alteration is sometimes produced in their current value by the course of time.”

§ Butler's Analogy, Part ii., ch. 1.

|| Bishop Burnet's Sermon, quoted *ante*, p. 218.

¶ Horsley's Sermons, Serm. xxi.

the sense of *rational* duties, and of moral duties in the sense of those dictated by *conscience*. In regard to each alike, we may affirm with Horsley that they “are not good because they are commanded, but are commanded because they are in themselves good :”* and that “we discern in natural duties that intrinsic worth and seemliness, which is the motive that determines the Divine will to exact the performance of them from the rational part of his creation ; for God’s will is not arbitrary, but directed by his goodness and his wisdom. Or, to go a step higher, the natural excellence of these duties, we may reasonably presume, was the original motive which determined the Deity to create beings who should be capable of being brought to that dignity of character which a proficiency in virtue confers, and of enjoying, in their improved state of moral worth, a corresponding happiness.”†

To rest at fit seasons from labour, and avail ourselves of rational means of at once recruiting our strength and increasing our enjoyment of life, is a natural duty which is moral in the former sense of the word. So is the duty of observing *stated times* for the social worship of God. So are the duties of eating, drinking, sleeping, keeping the skin clean, breathing pure air, and using warmer clothing in cold weather than in hot.

But the duties of *worshipping* God, of succouring the distressed, of speaking truth, and of performing covenants, are moral in the second as well as in the first sense of the word: they are not merely expedient—beneficial—conducive to the greatest happiness of the greatest number ; but moral in the sense in which, for a century past, the term has been generally used by ethical writers, and employed in ordinary conversation.‡

When ingratitude, cruelty, adultery, or falsehood, is called *immoral*, those who hear it so described understand by this epithet not *inexpedient* or *irrational*, but what is *in opposition to the moral sentiments of man*; something wicked, base, detestable, and repugnant to the natural feelings of every well-constituted mind. Nobody is deceived by *such* a use of the word. But when a proceeding like the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoons is pronounced, as it recently was, to be “immoral,”§ not only does the writer make an unfair use of the term in a sense different from that in which most readers of newspapers understand it ; but, in adding that “the standard by which we test the morality of the case is one which no man but an infidel will directly question, though he may attempt to explain it away—it is the fourth precept of the Decalogue,”—he most unwarrantably stigmatises as infidels all who either regard the Decalogue as a series of purely Jewish laws, or hold the Sabbath to be not a *natural* but a *positive* institution. At this rate, Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Baxter, Locke, Whately—nay Luther, and even St Paul—must henceforth, on the high authority of *The Witness*, be numbered with infidels.

If occasional visits to the Crystal Palace on Sunday be beneficial

* Sermon xxiii.

† Sermon xxi.

‡ The word “immorality” is often used colloquially to express, not what is *flagitious* in general, but only those species of vice in particular, which are breaches of chastity.

§ *The Witness*, Nov. 3, 1852. This Edinburgh newspaper is a chief organ of the Sabbatarians and of the Free Church of Scotland.

as a recreation to body and mind—as a diversion of uneducated and ill-lodged people from gambling and sottishness and fighting—and moreover as a means of agreeable and useful instruction,—to pay such visits will be as clearly a moral duty (in the old sense of the term), as any duty that can be imagined; and those who stigmatise the recreation as immoral, are themselves committing what, but for their ignorance, would itself be an immorality.

Nay, if viewed through the principle that obedience to the will of God is a moral duty, and that every practice beneficial on the whole must be agreeable to his will, indulgence in such recreation becomes, even in the ordinary sense of the word, a moral duty.*

If it be said here, that since obedience to even the positive precepts of God is a moral duty, disobedience to the Fourth Commandment is justly styled “immoral” in *The Witness*,—I reply, that to those who recognise in the Fourth Commandment a divine law imposed upon *them*, disobedience is indeed in this aspect immoral; but that in the case of those who, in the exercise of their undoubted right and duty of private judgment, have formed a different opinion, it is just as little immoral as disobedience to the law of circumcision. If the writer in *The Witness* is satisfied that a precept requiring the Jews to abstain from *labour* on the *seventh* day of the week, obliges him, through the moral duty of obedience to God, to abstain from *recreation* on the *first* day of the week, it is to him unquestionably a moral duty to forbear visiting the Crystal Palace on Sundays. But to represent as “immoral” the conduct of those who take a different view of God’s will, and act according to their belief, is a proceeding utterly at variance with the principles of Protestantism and common sense.

After all, “the fourth precept of the Decalogue” contains, as I have said, not a syllable that is adverse to Sunday recreations. If the very Pharisees, whom Paul described to King Agrippa as “the most straitest sect of our religion,” † thought it allowable to walk in the fields on the Sabbath-day, and, meeting there Jesus and his disciples, found no fault but with the “*work*” of plucking ears of corn and rubbing them in their hands, why, in the name of common sense, should the Pharisees be out-pharised by Gentile Christians—why should *we* be saddled with a more stringent interpretation of a Jewish law than the Jews themselves were held by the strictest of their professors to be burdened with? To say that it is better to go to church than to visit the Crystal Palace, is to assume that the two things are incompatible—that those who go to the Crystal Palace would otherwise go to church—that all have access to churches where they can conscientiously join in the form of worship employed, and listen with improvement to the sermons preached—and that if a choice must be made between going every Sunday to church, and occasionally substituting the lessons of the Crystal Palace for those of the conventicle, the right decision can be no other than for uniform attendance at church. Each of these assumptions, however, may on very good grounds be controverted. For it cannot be doubted that many in London regard it as no part of their duty to go to church at all; ‡ many think it right to go to church

* See the extract from Dr Combe, *ante*, p. 209.

† Acts xxvi. 5.

‡ Every Christian is or ought to be aware, that no injunction of public wor-

in the forenoon and to the country in the afternoon; many who would go to church if they lived near enough a place of worship

ship by the Founder of Christianity is recorded in the Gospel; but that, on the contrary, he contrasts it unfavourably with the *private* devotions which alone he recommends to his followers. "And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men: Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him."—(Matt. vi. 5–8.) All this, of course, must be interpreted with reference to the circumstances in which it was spoken: it seems to be merely a rebuke to ostentatious hypocrites, and a warning against pagan superstition; not an injunction to the sincere and humble worshipper to abstain from publicly offering up his prayers in the synagogue. The fact, however, remains evident, that the practice of public or even social worship is built upon no law of Christ; and were the orthodox principle true, that the Bible "is the *only* rule to direct us how we may glorify" God, the duty of going to church on Sundays would have small chance of being acknowledged by those who exercise the right of private judgment in religious matters. It was the practice of Milton in his later years to worship God only in private (see Todd's *Account of the Life and Writings of Milton*, 1826, p. 333); and a scholar who was no less familiar with the New Testament than he, went so far as to maintain, in a special treatise on the subject, that public worship is positively *at variance* with the law of Christ.—(*A Short Enquiry into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship*. By Gilbert Wakefield. 1791.) The volume just referred to received a powerful and conclusive reply from Mrs Barbauld, in her *Remarks on Mr Gilbert Wakefield's Enquiry, &c.*, where it is shewn that the New Testament contains nothing in opposition to the practice, and that, on the other hand, many powerful *reasons* exist in its favour. She adds some excellent suggestions for the improvement of our *forms* of worship; among others the following:—

"Above all, it would be desirable to separate from religion that idea of gloom which in this country has but too generally accompanied it. The fact cannot be denied; the cause must be sought, partly in our national character, which I am afraid is not naturally either very cheerful or very social, and which we shall do well to meliorate by every possible attention to our habits of life;—and partly to the colour of our religious systems. No one who embraces the common idea of future torments, together with the doctrine of election and reprobation, the insufficiency of virtue to escape the wrath of God, and the strange absurdity which, it should seem, through similarity of sound alone, has been admitted as an axiom, that sins committed against an Infinite Being do therefore deserve infinite punishment—no one, I will venture to assert, can believe such tenets, and have them often in his thoughts, and yet be cheerful. Whence a system has arisen so incompatible with that justice and benevolence, which, in the discourses of our Saviour, are represented as the most essential attributes of the Divine Being, is not easy to trace. It is probable, however, that power being the most prominent feature in our conceptions of the Creator, and that of which we see the most striking image here on earth (there being a greater portion of uncontrolled power than of unmixed wisdom or goodness to be found amongst human beings), the Deity would naturally be likened to an absolute monarch;—and most absolute monarchs having been tyrants, jealous of their sovereignty, averse to freedom of investigation, ordering affairs, not with a view to the happiness of their subjects, but to the advancement of their own glory; not to be approached but with rich gifts and offerings; bestowing favours, not in proportion to merit, but from the pure influence of caprice and blind partiality; to those who have offended them severe and unforgiving, except induced to pardon by the importunate inter-

in which the service is in harmony with their religious views and feelings, will, by visiting the Crystal Palace, deprive no church of a cession of some favourite; confining their enemies, when they had overcome them, after a contest, in deep dark dungeons under ground, or putting them to death in the prolonged misery of excruciating tortures—these features of human depravity have been most faithfully transferred to the Supreme Being; and men have imaged to themselves how a Nero or a Domitian would have acted, if from the extent of their dominion there had been no escape, and to the duration of it no period.

“These ideas of the vulgar belief, terrible, but as yet vague and undefined, passed into the speculations of the schoolmen, by whom they were combined with the metaphysical idea of eternity, arranged in specific propositions, fixed in creeds, and elaborated into systems, till at length they have been sublimed into all the tremendous horrors of the Calvinistic faith. These doctrines, it is true, among thinking people, are losing ground; but there is still apparent, in that class called serious Christians, a tenderness in exposing them; a sort of leaning towards them,—as in walking over a precipice one should lean to the safest side; an idea that they are, if not true, at least good to be believed, and that a salutary error is better than a dangerous truth. But that error can neither be salutary nor harmless, which attributes to the Deity injustice and cruelty; and that religion must have the worst of tendencies, which renders it dangerous for man to imitate the being whom he worships. Let those who hold such tenets consider, that the invisible Creator has no name, and is identified only by his character; and they will tremble to think what being they are worshipping, when they invoke a power capable of producing existence, in order to continue it in never-ending torments. The God of the Assembly’s Catechism is not the same God with the deity of Thomson’s Seasons, and of Hutcheson’s Ethics. Unity of character in what we adore is much more essential than unity of person. We often boast, and with reason, of the purity of our religion, as opposed to the grossness of the theology of the Greeks and Romans; but we should remember, that cruelty is as much worse than licentiousness, as a Moloch is worse than a satyr.—When will Christians permit themselves to believe that the same conduct which gains them the approbation of good men here, will secure the favour of Heaven hereafter? When will they cease making their court to their Maker by the same servile debasement and affectation of lowliness by which the vain potentates of the earth are flattered? When a harmless and well-meaning man, in the exaggerated figures of theological rhetoric, calls himself the vilest of sinners, it is in precisely the same spirit of false humility in which the courtier uses degrading and disqualifying expressions, when he speaks of himself in his adulatory addresses to his sovereign. When a good man draws near the close of a life, not free indeed from faults, but pure from crime,—a life spent in the habitual exercise of all those virtues which adorn and dignify human nature, and in the uniform approach to that perfection which is confessedly unattainable in this imperfect state; when a man—perhaps like Dr Price, whose name will be ever pronounced with affectionate veneration and deep regard by all the friends of philosophy, virtue, and mankind—is about to resign his soul into the hands of his Maker, he ought to do it, not only with a reliance on his mercy, but his justice; a generous confidence and pious resignation should be blended in his deportment. It does not become him to pay the blasphemous homage of deprecating the wrath of God, when he ought to throw himself into the arms of his love. He is not to think that virtue is one thing here, and another in heaven; or that he on whom blessings and eulogiums are ready to burst from all honest tongues, can be an object of punishment with Him who is infinitely more benevolent than any of his creatures.

“These remarks may be thought foreign to the subject in question; but in fact they are not so. Public worship will be tinged with gloom while our ideas of its object are darkened by superstition; it will be infected with hypocrisy while its professions and tenets run counter to the genuine unperverted moral sense of mankind; it will not meet the countenance of philosophers so

worshipper; and many church-frequenters doubtless believe (as they are well entitled to do), that to devote the whole of *every* Sunday to

long as we are obliged to unlearn our ethics, in order to learn divinity. Let it be considered that these opinions greatly favour immorality. The doctrine that all are vile, and equally merit a state of punishment, is an idea as consolatory to the profligate, as it is humiliating to the saint; and that is one reason why it has always been a favourite doctrine. The indecent confidence of a Dodd, and the debasing terrors of a Johnson, or of more blameless men than he, spring from one and the same source. It prevents the genuine workings of real penitence, by enjoining confessions of imaginary demerit; it quenches religious gratitude, because conceiving only of two states of retribution, both in the extreme; and feeling that our crimes, whatever they may be, cannot have deserved the one, we are not sufficiently thankful for the prospect of the other, which we look upon as only a necessary alternative. Lastly, it dissolves the connexion between religion and common life, by introducing a set of phrases and a standard of moral feeling, totally different from those ideas of praise and blame, merit and demerit, upon which we do and must act in our commerce with our fellow-creatures.”—(*The Works of Anna Letitia Barbauld, with a Memoir by Lucy Atkin.* London, 1825. Vol. ii., pp. 463–469.)

In the *Memoirs of Gilbert Wakefield*, vol. i., p. 560, is a letter to him from his friend Dr Enfield, dated August 1, 1792, in which this passage occurs:—“I have been an attentive, and, I think, an impartial spectator of the skirmish between you and your opponents, on the subject of public worship; and I must confess that the debate does not appear to me, in the result, to terminate against the practice: nevertheless, I acknowledge that there is much necessity for reformation in the *mode* of worship, both among churchmen and dissenters; and I hope your caustics will make us all feel this necessity, and produce speedy alterations.”

Mrs Barbauld’s remarks on the doctrines of Calvinism will seem outrageous heresy to many Scottish churchmen and dissenters; but in England they nowhere shock the feelings of either the members of the Church, or those dissenters who agree with Wesley in regarding the doctrine of election and reprobation as a species of “Diabolism, than which the worst and bloodiest idolatry that ever defiled the earth is less horrid, less monstrous, less impious.”—(See *ante*, p. 54.) Tillotson, in his 147th Sermon, “On the goodness of God,” expresses the same opinion, though in language less animated than Wesley’s. “Many good men,” says he, “have had very hard and injurious thoughts of God instilled into them, from doctrines too commonly taught and received: as if he did not sincerely desire the happiness of his creatures, but had from all eternity decreed to make the greatest part of mankind with a secret purpose and design to make them miserable, and, consequently, were not serious and in good earnest in his invitations and exhortations of sinners to repentance; and it is no wonder if such jealousies as these concerning God, make men doubtful whether God love them, and very scrupulous and anxious about their everlasting condition. I have already told you, that these harsh doctrines have no manner of foundation, either in reason or scripture; that God earnestly desires our happiness, and affords us sufficient means to that end; that he bears a more hearty good will to us, than any man does to his friend, or any father upon earth ever did to his dearest child: in comparison of which, the greatest affection of men to those whom they love best, is ‘but as the drop of the bucket, as the very small dust upon the balance.’ If we have right apprehensions of God’s goodness, we can have no temptation to despair of his kind and merciful intentions to us, provided we be but careful of our duty to him, and do sincerely repent and forsake our sins. Plainer declarations no word can make, than those we meet with in the holy Scriptures, that ‘God hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live; that he would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth; that he is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; that he that confesseth and forsaketh his sin, shall have mercy; that if the wicked

the public and private worship of God and the study of theology, is by no means the most eligible way of obtaining that "refreshment" which the Jewish Sabbath was expressly designed to afford.

forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and return unto the Lord, he will have mercy, and will abundantly pardon.' "

"I dislike extremely," says Bishop Watson, "that gloomy theology which would make the Supreme Being more inexorable than a man. The whole tenor of Scripture speaks a contrary language; and we know nothing from *reason* of His divine attributes, except from their bearing some analogy to our own."—(*Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. ii., p. 312.) Again, in a letter to Bishop Tomline, he says:—"I agree with you most cordially on the two main points; that the doctrines of Calvinism are not the doctrines of Scripture, nor were maintained by the most ancient fathers of the church. In the stream of antiquity (as Whitby has said, in his preface to his discourses concerning the 'Five Points,') we see only one, St Austin, with his two boatswains, Prosper and Fulgentius, tugging hard against it, and often driven back into it by the strong current of Scripture, reason, and of common sense."—(*Ib.*, vol. ii., p. 418.) Once more:—"My religion is not founded, I hope, in presumption, but in piety. I cannot look upon the Author of my existence in any other light than as the most commiserating parent; not extreme to mark what is done amiss, not implacable, not revengeful, not disposed to punish past offences when the heart abhors them, but ready, with the utmost benignity, to receive into His favour every repentant sinner."—(*Ib.*, vol. i., p. 427.) He even speaks of "the impiety of Calvinism" (vol. i., p. 168); the impiety of a theological system taught as God's truth in the Scottish churches—to be taught as such in our national schools (if the clergy accomplish their desire) at the cost of every sect—and to which the Church of Scotland demands that that solemn assent shall be exacted from every teacher of science in our universities, as a preliminary to his appointment! In a Charge delivered in 1795, the Bishop speaks of personal predestination as "a doctrine full of impiety and despair." "In my humble judgment," says he, "they have done great service to Christianity, who have endeavoured to shew that it is not founded in Scripture. For nothing has contributed more to the propagation of Deism, than the making doctrines abhorrent from reason, parts of the Christian system. There may be doctrines above reason; but nothing which is evidently contrary to reason can ever be justly considered as a part of the Christian dispensation."—(*Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. i., pp. 108, 110.) He proceeds to speak of the doctrine of original sin, especially as it is applied by Fulgentius to the case of still-born infants; and he exclaims, "Parent of universal good! merciful Father of the human race! how hath the benignity of Thy nature been misrepresented! how hath the gospel of Thy Son been misinterpreted by the burning zeal of presumptuous man!"

For more recent discussions of these and kindred topics, see three Essays by Dr Channing, entitled, "The Moral Argument against Calvinism," "The Demands of the Age on the Ministry," and "Christianity a Rational Religion," in his *Works*, pp. 163, 585, and 731, of the Belfast edition.

In regard to the frightful doctrine of eternal torments, with which minds of high moral and religious feeling are apt to have their indignation instead of their devotion stirred up by our preachers, this also has been, and doubtless is, held in abhorrence by many learned and excellent members of the Church of England. Whiston says, in his *Memoirs of Dr Samuel Clarke*:—"About the year 1717, I wrote a small paper, not yet published, containing very briefly the reasons of what I had eight years before declared to be my opinion, in the Sermons and Essays, p. 220, 221, against the eternity of the torments of hell. And I think I may venture to add, upon the credit of what I discovered of the opinions of Sir Isaac Newton and Dr Clarke, that they were both of the same sentiments. Nay, Dr Clarke thought that 'few or no thinking men were really of different sentiments in that matter.' And as to myself, to speak my mind freely, I have many years thought that the common opinion in this mat-

I say once more, that not the Fourth Commandment, but the law of nature, is the foundation of public worship on Sundays : this it was even

ter, if it were for certain a real part of Christianity, would be a more insuperable objection against it, than any or all the present objections of unbelievers put together."—(P. 98).

So also Bishop Newton :—" It cannot consist with the mercy, or the goodness, or the wisdom, or even the justice of the Supreme Being, to punish any of his creatures for no end or purpose, neither for their own correction, nor for a warning to others. A Moloch may be pleased with the sacrifice of innocents burning in the fire ; a god of the Manichees may delight in evil for the sake of evil ; but such things cannot be conceived without horror, of the God of the Christians. . . . Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures, produced out of nothing, and therefore guilty of no prior offence, sent into this world of frailty, which it is well known beforehand they will so use as to abuse it, and then, for the excesses of a few years, delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. Imagine it you may, but you can never seriously believe it, nor reconcile it to God and goodness. The thought is shocking, even to human nature ; and how much more abhorrent, then, must it be from the divine perfections ! God must have made all his creatures finally to be happy ; he could never make any whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. . . . The letter of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments, but the spirit of Scripture intimates the contrary."—(*Works*, vol. iii., pp. 727, 729, 736 : Dissertation on the Final State and Condition of Men.)

In these views Dr Parr coincided (*Field's Memoirs of Parr*, 1828, vol. ii., p. 378) ; they were held by one whose praise is in all the churches, the late John Foster. Writing to the Rev. Edward White in 1841, he says :—

" The general, not very far short of universal, judgment of divines in affirmation of the doctrine of eternal punishment must be acknowledged a weighty consideration. It is a very fair question,—Is it likely that so many thousands of able, learned, benevolent, and pious men should all have been in error ? And the language of Scripture is formidably strong ; so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorise a limited interpretation. Nevertheless, I acknowledge myself *not* convinced of the orthodox doctrine. If asked, *why* not ?—I should have little to say in the way of criticism, of implications found or sought in what may be called incidental expressions of Scripture, or of the passages dubiously cited in favour of final, universal restitution. It is the moral argument, as it may be named, that presses irresistibly on my mind—that which comes in the stupendous idea of eternity."—(*Life and Correspondence of John Foster*, vol. ii., p. 250.)

After giving farther the grounds of his opinion, he proceeds :—" It often surprises me that the fearful doctrine sits, if I may so express it, so easy on the minds of the religious and benevolent believers of it. Surrounded immediately by the multitudes of fellow mortals, and looking abroad on the present, and back on the past state of the race, and regarding them, as to the immense majority, as subjects of so direful destination, how *can* they have any calm enjoyment of life, how can they ever be cordially cheerful, how can they escape the incessant haunting of dismal ideas, darkening the economy in which their lot is cast ? I remember suggesting to one of them such an image as this :—suppose the case that so many of the great surrounding population as he could not, even in a judgment of charity, believe to be Christians, that is, to be in a safe state for hereafter,—suppose the case to be that he knew so many were all doomed to suffer, by penal infliction, a death by torture, in the most protracted agony, with what feelings would he look on the populous city, the swarming country, or even a crowded, mixed congregation ? But what an infinitesimal trifle that would be in comparison with what he does believe in looking on these multitudes ! How, then, can they bear the sight of the living world around them ?

" As to religious teachers ; if the tremendous doctrine be true, surely it ought to be almost continually proclaimed as with the blast of a trumpet, inculcated

to the Jews, although to them the duty of resting from labour was specially prescribed in the Decalogue. On this same foundation of natural

and reiterated, with ardent passion, in every possible form of terrible illustration; no remission of the alarm to thoughtless spirits. What! believe them in such inconceivably dreadful peril, and not multiply and aggravate the terrors to frighten them out of their stupor; deploring still, that all the horrifying representations in the power of thought and language to make, are immeasurably below the real urgency of the subject; and almost wishing that some appalling phenomenon of sight or sound might break in to make the impression that no words can make. If we saw a fellow-mortal stepping heedlessly or daringly on the utmost verge of some dreadful precipice or gulf, a humane spectator would raise and *continue* a shout, a scream, to prevent him. How then can it comport with the duty of preachers to satisfy themselves with brief, occasional references to this awful topic, when the most prolonged thundering alarm is but as the note of an infant, a bird, or an insect, in proportion to the horrible urgency of the case? . . .

"A number (not large, but of great piety and intelligence) of ministers within my acquaintance, several now dead, have been disbelievers of the doctrine in question; at the same time not feeling themselves imperatively called upon to make a public disavowal; content with employing in their ministrations strong general terms in denouncing the doom of impenitent sinners. For one thing, a consideration of the unreasonable imputations and unmeasured suspicions apt to be cast on any publicly-declared partial defection from rigid orthodoxy, has made them think they should better consult their usefulness by not giving a prominence to this dissentient point; while yet they make no concealment of it in private communications, and in answer to serious inquiries. When, besides, they have considered how strangely defective and feeble is the efficacy, to alarm and deter careless, irreligious minds, of the terrible doctrine itself notionally admitted by them, they have thought themselves the less required to propound one that so greatly qualifies the blackness of the prospect. They could not be unaware of the grievous truth of what is so strongly insisted on as an argument by the defenders of the tenet,—that thoughtless and wicked men would be sure to seize on the mitigated doctrine to encourage themselves in their impenitence. But this is only the same perverse and fatal use that they make of the doctrine of grace and mercy through Jesus Christ. If they *will* so abuse the truth we cannot help it.—But methinks even this fact tells against the doctrine in question. If the very nature of man, as created, every individual, by the sovereign Power, be in such desperate disorder that there is no possibility of conversion and salvation except in the instances where that Power interposes with a special and redeeming efficacy, how can we conceive that the main proportion of the race thus morally impotent (that is, really and absolutely impotent) will be eternally punished for the inevitable result of this moral impotence?"—(*Ib.*, p. 259–261.)

"The mercy of God," says Southey, "is infinite; and it were too dreadful to believe that they who have been most miserable here, should be condemned to endless misery hereafter."—(*Life and Correspondence*, vol. iv., p. 157.) This remark occurs in a letter to Sharon Turner, in reference to the case of a wretched outcast who, having been accidentally poisoned, declared while dying, "that this was a blasted life, and she was glad to have done with it."

Dr Robert Hull, in his *Essays on Determination of Blood to the Head*, which are noticed in *The Medico-Chirurgical Review* for April 1843, exclaims—"The marvel is, that everybody who has time to think, does not run mad! In this unfathomable universe, whether viewed with the eye astronomical or microscopic, the awful so predominates, that *not to be mad* seems a special proof of the grace of God; or of a natural hebetude of soul." To this the Doctor adds the "dogmata of the Calvinistic school," which inculcates that a *few* are selected, "for no virtues, but to shew the irresistibility of their Maker," and the rest are to be damned, whether virtuous or wicked, for the same purpose of shewing the absolute power of the Deity! "There is no doubt," says the reviewer, "that these gloomy, not to say impious, tenets drive many weak minds

religion rests the duty of recreating and invigorating the mind and body by frequent egress from the crowded courts and contaminated

mad every day. It is only astonishing that people of any intellect or reflection could entertain such degrading ideas of the Omniscient, the Omnipotent Author of our existence, and Governor of the universe!" The number of patients thus prepared for lunatic asylums would be much greater than it is, if people really *believed* all that they profess, and doubtless often fancy, they believe. But instead of examining theological questions, men, it has been well said, "shut their thoughts up, and pretend to be orthodox—play at being orthodox."—(*Companions of my Solitude*, p. 237.) There is no genuine, hearty, practical belief in the case.

I know men and women who, possessing active, earnest, and logical minds, believed (in the true sense of the word) the Calvinism with which they were imbued in youth; and who drew from its principles all the *practical inferences* which the thoughtless are so happy as to overlook. The result was a cloud of melancholy which robbed of all its pleasantness the period which is *naturally and rightfully* "the gay morn of life." These distrustful Christians saw no such grounds as "Holy Willie" did, for flattering themselves that *they* would be the fortunate winners of a celestial prize, to the gaining of which their own endeavours were useless, and where the vast majority of mankind must of necessity draw blanks; and, while they knew it was their duty to love God as their Heavenly Father whose tender mercies are over all his works, they could not reflect on the conduct ascribed to Him without feeling how impossible it was to love a Being whom that conduct proclaimed to be less amiable than the gloomiest of earthly tyrants. Happy it was for these dejected sufferers when reason and knowledge dispelled the darkness which oppressed their spirits; and made them able to enjoy with thankfulness a life in which misery is by nature the exception, and rational religion proclaims, that "to enjoy is to obey."* Sunday, hitherto the most hateful portion of the week, became now a day of delightful contemplation, refreshment, and devout admiration of the God of the Universe. Concerning *that* God, Dean Swift, in a well-known epigram, asks—

" Who can believe, with common sense,
A bacon-slice gives God offence;
Or how a herring hath a charm
Almighty vengeance to disarm?
Wrapt up in majesty divine,
Does He regard on what we dine?"

Which train of thought may be thus pursued in regard to the employment of Sunday:—

Who can believe, with common sense,
A rural walk gives God offence;
Or how dyspepsia hath a charm
Almighty vengeance to disarm?
Can he be God's peculiar care
Who scorns to snuff the mountain air,
And from on high, delighted, look
On Nature's soul-inspiring Book;
Who, than the woods or sounding shore,
Avoids no deed of darkness more,
And listens to the tuneful streams
On highway to perdition deems?
No! the good Giver of the feast
Commends not him that eats the least.

It is a remark of Addison, that "People of gloomy, uncheerful imaginations,

* "What blessings thy free bounty gives,
Let me not cast away;
For God is paid when man receives;
T' enjoy is to obey."

air of London, into the refreshing atmosphere and enlivening scenery of rural districts. By improving the health you add to the power of

or of envious, malignant tempers, whatever kind of life they are engaged in, will discover their natural tincture of mind in all their thoughts, words, and actions. As the finest wines have often the taste of the soil, so even the most religious thoughts often draw something that is particular from the constitution of the mind in which they arise."—(*Spectator*, No. 483, on Attributing our Neighbours' Misfortunes to Judgments.) In the religious thoughts of Calvin we do indeed find the flavour of his stern, cold, arbitrary, unsympathetic, logical mind. His God how different from Him whom Addison adored—from the God of Tillotson, and Boyle, and Ray, and Pope, and Fenelon, and the benignant poet of the Seasons!

In another of Addison's papers in the *Spectator* (No. 494), he comments with good sense and good taste upon the error of the Puritans of the seventeenth century, who thought that to be religious it was necessary "to throw as much sanctity as possible into their faces, and in particular to abstain from all appearances of mirth and pleasantry, which were looked upon as the marks of a carnal mind. . . . I would by no means," says he, "presume to tax such characters with hypocrisy, as is done too frequently; that being a vice which I think none but He who knows the secrets of men's hearts should pretend to discover in another, where the proofs of it do not amount to a demonstration. On the contrary, as there are many excellent persons who are weighed down by this habitual sorrow of heart, they rather deserve our compassion than our reproaches. I think, however, they would do well to consider whether such a behaviour does not deter men from a religious life, by representing it as an unsociable state, that extinguishes all joy and gladness, darkens the face of nature, and destroys the relish of being itself.

"I have in former papers shewn how great a tendency there is to cheerfulness in religion, and how such a frame of mind is not only the most lovely, but the most commendable in a virtuous person. In short, those who represent religion in so unamiable a light, are like the spies sent by Moses to make a discovery of the Land of Promise, when by their reports they discouraged the people from entering upon it. Those who shew us the joy, the cheerfulness, the good humour, that naturally spring up in this happy state, are like the spies bringing along with them the clusters of grapes and delicious fruits, that might invite their companions into the pleasant country which produced them."

He gives in this paper an amusing anecdote of the repulsively serious manner in which Anthony Henley was received, when a young man, by "a very famous Independent minister who was head of a college in those times;" namely Dr Thomas Goodwin, President of Magdalen College in Oxford, *and one of the Assembly of Divines who sat at Westminster*. "The youth, according to custom, waited on him in order to be examined. He was received at the door by a servant who was one of that gloomy generation that were then in fashion. He conducted him, with great silence and seriousness, to a long gallery, which was darkened at noon-day, and had only a single candle burning in it. After a short stay in this melancholy apartment, he was led into a chamber hung with black, where he entertained himself for some time by the glimmering of a taper, till at length the head of the college came out to him from an inner room, with half-a-dozen nightcaps upon his head, and a religious horror in his countenance. The young man trembled: but his fears increased, when instead of being asked what progress he had made in learning, he was examined how he abounded in grace. His Latin and Greek stood him in little stead; he was to give an account only of the state of his soul; whether he was of the number of the elect; what was the occasion of his conversion; upon what day of the month, and hour of the day it happened; how it was carried on, and when completed. The whole examination was summed up with one short question, namely, whether he was prepared for death? The boy, who had been bred up by honest parents, was frightened out of his wits at the solemnity of the proceeding, and especially by the last dreadful interrogatory; so that, upon making his escape out of this

usefulness, and to the capability of happiness; nor did ever any man become healthier and happier without becoming also more disposed to

house of mourning, he could never be brought a second time to the examination, as not being able to go through the terrors of it.

“Notwithstanding this general form and outside of religion is pretty well worn out among us, there are many persons, who, by a natural uncheerfulness of heart, mistaken notions of piety, or weakness of understanding, love to indulge this uncomfortable way of life, and give up themselves a prey to grief and melancholy. Superstitious fears and groundless scruples cut them off from the pleasures of conversation, and all those social entertainments which are not only innocent but laudable; as if mirth was made for reprobates, and cheerfulness of heart denied those who are the only persons that have a proper title to it.”

If the following statements about the present Nonconformist preachers in England are true, we need not wonder that many Dissenters are remiss in their attendance at chapel.

“I attribute,” says Mr White, “much of the present confessedly miserable state of our Dissenting churches to the stupid but rigorous pedantry of our colleges. On the one hand we have numbers of mere dry theologians, organ-grinders I call them, who think that all that is required of them is just to play over the tunes which they learned at college; and these they do play over and over again, without the slightest variety, so that when you hear the first bar, you know the whole tune as certainly as you know what tune the well-known street organ will play at the first turn of the handle. For a time the people listen, but when the whole of the tunes marked on the barrel have been played times without number, they quietly drop away. This is one class. On the other hand, we have the men who used to think, and had all the apparatus for thinking, but at college they hypocritically concealed their thoughts for the sake of position. This habit dulled their moral sense—paralysed their spiritual life. These are the men that often make a noise in the world; they become popular preachers—they can startle an audience—they have a good style—a taking manner, and for a time the audience is deceived; but thoughtful serious hearers soon find them out. As at college they professed what they did not believe, so now they preach what they do not believe. This soon becomes evident, and when it is discovered, all their finery only disgusts. Vain frivolous people will still cling round them, and deacons and trustees support them, because the thing pays; but serious, solemn men despise the mountebanks, and rather go nowhere than be parties to such a fraud. Inanity tires, dishonesty disgusts, and yet there is often no alternative. In many cases if you go to chapel at all, you must endure one or the other. Droning platitudes, or mere mountebank exhibitions. I say there is *often* no alternative; and I wish my words to be understood in their literal meaning. That there are many blessed exceptions I joyfully allow. Many men, both amongst Dissenters and Churchmen, who are real believers in what they preach, and have the power to enforce it; to such men one can reverently listen, although one may not be able to agree with all that is advanced. For my part, I could listen to a Papist or a Puseyite, if I felt that the man was uttering what he sincerely believed, and had the sufficient power to qualify him as a teacher of men. But a routine sermon, or one got up for a special show-day, manufactured *secundum artem*, like a barrister’s speech made from his brief, must be the abhorrence of all honest men. And I fear that thousands of thoughtful men have been driven away from worship, and now go to no church or chapel on the Sabbath, because either their intellects were affronted, or their consciences hurt. . . .

“Never was there a time, in my opinion, when there was a greater need, or a grander opportunity for a new movement. A movement apart from all sects—formed upon a wider basis—having nothing to do with dead orthodoxy, spiritless creeds, and cumbrous theologies. We want, the world wants, a renovation of the teachings of Christ and his apostles. In all our large towns there are immense numbers who go to no place of worship, as they are called. These have been looked upon as outcasts, irreclaimably wicked. But it is not

kindliness and to most other Christian virtues.* Let the clergy consider seriously the hint conveyed to them in the following weighty words of Bishop Butler, extracted from his Sermon upon the Ignorance of Man:—"Our province," says he, "is virtue and religion, life and manners; *the science of improving the temper, and making the heart better.* This is the field assigned us to cultivate; HOW MUCH IT HAS LAIN NEGLECTED IS INDEED ASTONISHING. Virtue is demonstrably

so. Many are men of cultivated and thoughtful minds, who hear no religious teachers, simply because there are none within their reach whom they can hear. They used to go to chapel or church, but tired out at length with the old organ-grinding, they have silently dropped away; and who can wonder, when one remembers what is, in too many cases, iterated and reiterated from the pulpits of our land? And there are also the uncultivated classes, the masses as they are styled, the operatives, shopmen, warehousemen, &c., of our towns. These, for the most part, go to neither church nor chapel, and we have been accustomed to think that the fault lies wholly with them. We have built all sorts of chapels and churches, in all sorts of places. We have adorned them in every imaginable style. We have adopted all sorts of manœuvres. Tracts have been distributed by millions—unwearied visitors have tramped through our lanes and alleys urging the people to attend—lectures to the working classes have been got up—operative associations have been organised; but still, as a rule, they won't come. 'What a stubborn ungodly set they are!' But is it so? The people listened to Jesus' teaching 'gladly.' Why will they not listen to ours? Are the people changed, or has the truth lost its power over the human soul? Neither. The people are the same, the truth is the same. When Jesus taught, 'the common people heard him gladly.' And if he were to come again in this England of ours, they would hear him gladly again; and they will hear his messengers now if they preach his truth. But in many cases it is not preached. Indeed, in too many cases it is not believed. It may be assented to, but it is not believed. Theology is preached. Logical, or rather illogical sermons, to back up stereotyped, extinct, and dead creeds are preached; but the soul-stirring verities which Jesus uttered, and all the grand but simple truth which flowed, and evermore flows from his life, a man shall go far enough before he hears. And so the people have dropped away, or if they go, their bodies are there through the force of custom and early training, but their souls are away. The bulk, however, goes not, but looks askance upon all our organisations, our societies, platform meetings, tea parties, bazaars, associations, drummings, and trumpetings, as so many manœuvres to support a priesthood and a sect."—(*To Think or not to Think? Remarks upon the late Expulsions from New College, St John's Wood.* By W. White, Father of one of the Expelled. London, 1852. Pp. 24-25, 27.)

In my opinion, the only effectual mode of imparting to sermons the full degree of attractive and instructive quality which they are capable of having to the minds of thoughtful auditors, is to introduce into them expositions of what we learn of God's will not only from the Book of Revelation but from the great Book of Nature.—(*See Lecture on the Comparative Influence of the Natural Sciences and the Shorter Catechism, on the Civilization of Scotland,* by George Combe, p. 14; and the extracts from Archbishop Whately, &c., *ante*, pp. 205-209.) Any clergyman of good sense, piety, earnestness, eloquence, and competent knowledge of nature and its laws, who should adopt this plan of adding to the efficacy of his labours, would at once increase his own satisfaction with his work, and draw around him crowds of eager listeners from the best and most enlightened circles in the community; nor could the success of his ministrations fail to give a strong impulse to improvement in the style of preaching in general. If the trammels of creeds and confessions should seriously encumber him (as, were he a Churchman, I fear they would) in a course so useful, he might boldly cast off his fetters, not doubting that the labourer who is *worthy* of his hire will receive it from those whom he acceptably serves.

* See what was formerly said on this subject, pp. 72, 73.

the happiness of man ; it consists in good actions, proceeding from a good principle, temper, or heart. Overt acts are entirely in our power. What remains is, that we learn to keep our heart ; to govern and regulate our passions, mind, affections : so that we may be free from the impotencies of fear, envy, malice, covetousness, ambition ; that we may be clear of these, considered as vices, seated in the heart, considered as constituting a general wrong temper : from which general wrong frame of mind, all the mistaken pursuits, and far the greatest part of the unhappiness of life, proceed. He who should find out one rule to assist us in this work, would deserve infinitely better of mankind, than all the improvers of other knowledge put together."

Whatever attempts may be made to accomplish this great end of human improvement, will have but little success in comparison with what is attainable, unless two grand conditions be fulfilled :—1. The human organism must be improved by such means as physiology points out ; and, 2. Knowledge of nature and the relations among its parts must be systematically, and, as far as possible, universally, taught to the young ; who must also be early *trained* to rational and moral conduct. On the former subject I refer to what has already been said in these pages ;* on the latter, I invite the earnest attention of the reader to the admirable observations of Archbishop Sumner in the following passage :—" Ignorance is not the inevitable lot of the majority of our community ; and with ignorance a host of evils disappear. Of all the obstacles to improvement, ignorance is the most formidable : because the only true secret of assisting the poor is to make them agents in bettering their own condition, and to supply them, not with a temporary stimulus, but with a permanent energy. As fast as the standard of intelligence is raised, the poor become more and more able to cooperate in any plan proposed for their advantage, more likely to listen to any reasonable suggestion, more able to understand it, and therefore more willing to pursue it. Hence it follows, that when gross ignorance is once removed, and right principles are introduced, a great advantage has been already gained against squalid poverty. Many avenues to an improved condition are opened to one whose faculties are enlarged and exercised ; he sees his own interest more clearly, he pursues it more steadily, he does not study immediate gratification at the expense of bitter and late repentance, or mortgage the labour of his future life without an adequate return. Indigence, therefore, will rarely be found in company with good education."†

Since the foregoing observations with reference to the Crystal Palace were written, I have perused, with much satisfaction, an excellent pamphlet on the same subject by a layman.‡ The following is a portion of the summary of his argument :—

" If the Crystal Palace is closed on Sunday by authority, all other places of recreation must be closed also—for you cannot have partial legislation on the subject. Such a general measure would be highly unjust and injurious, besides being impracticable. The much depre-

* See pp. 73, 207.

† Records of the Creation, 2d edit., vol. ii., p. 332.

‡ The People's Palace and the Religious World. By a Layman. London, 1852.

cated event would not be likely to increase the irreligion or immorality of the people ; for, although some few might be led to desert places of worship, and neglect Sabbath privileges, by the superior attractions of the Sydenham Palace, many more would substitute its pleasures for those of a less elevating character offered without restriction elsewhere ; while the bulk of those who frequented it would not, in all probability, if it were entirely closed, ‘ keep the Sabbath’ in the sense of these alarmists. The day of rest can be a period of spiritual profit to those only who value it for that purpose. To impose its religious observances upon those who do not, is to promote hypocrisy, not piety. For the religious world, confessedly a minority, to seek to impose, by State interference, their notions of what constitutes a day of rest upon the bulk of their fellow-countrymen, is intolerant,—an act of coercion at variance with the first principles of Christianity. There is good reason for believing that the cause of morality, and therefore of religion, will, with the present tendencies of the metropolitan working-classes, decidedly *gain* by the opening of the Sydenham pleasure-grounds. It will be no more harmful than free access to the parks. It will not rob the poor of their ‘ day of rest,’ because it is quite optional with them to go there ; and, while they act as free agents, it may be presumed that they spend the day as best suits their inclinations.”

In the spirit of a true Christian, he thus concludes :—

“ To treat the working-classes in the spirit of those who are fomenting this agitation, is unjust and cruel, as well as impolitic. The point has been before adverted to, but will bear amplification. Suppose the Rev. Mr Orthodox, the popular preacher of the West End, discussing this question of ‘ Sabbath desecration’ in the squalid apartment (if ever he has found his way there), of John Starveling, the over-worked slop-tailor, of Typhus Court, Westminster. To the weighty arguments of the wealthy rector, on the necessity of shutting up all railways, and stopping all conveyances, may not the poor underpaid artisan reply, that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,—that God requires mercy, not sacrifice,—that the Sunday trip is to him the safety-valve of life ;—that so long as he is obliged to work for six days out of seven, without intermission, to keep body and soul together, the seventh *must* be devoted to renovation. Let the charge of mammon-worship rest on the right shoulders. If the Crystal Palace Company, who enable this poor man to inhale the pure air, and enjoy the beauties of nature, are actuated by sordid motives, how much more are they, and their name is legion, who allow their passion for money-getting to reduce thousands to a life of slavery, and oblige them to regard Sunday not as the Lord’s Day, but only an opportunity to repair their wasted health and energies.

“ There is not much doubt or danger in the conclusion, that whatever tends to ameliorate the condition of the people, to ennoble their tastes, to expand their ideas, or to improve their physical wellbeing, opens a more favourable field for the influence of religion. The converse of this truth will be seen in the almost hopelessly irreclaimable state of the adult ‘ dangerous classes.’ Religious bodies mistake in shaping their plans as if there were no medium, looked at from a Christian point of view, between the lowest depths of depraved self-

indulgence and the pure aspirations of devotion. They are not exempt from recognising the truth, that all physical, social, and political improvements, as well as the consistency, meekness, and gentleness of the followers of the Gospel, have a bearing upon the spiritual destinies of mankind. When will they cordially acknowledge in their creed, that the man who discountenances the mammon-grasping spirit of the age—who promotes the education of the poor—who advocates a reform of prison discipline—who helps to sweeten an unwholesome neighbourhood—who encourages pure and healthy recreation, is doing more to prepare a soil favourable for the reception of religious truth, and to break down the barriers which interpose between the working-classes and the religious world, than the No-Popery agitator, the loud-mouthed denouncer of ‘Sabbath desecration,’ or the zealous stickler for outward uniformity and formal observances? The one is doing something to repair dilapidated humanity—the other is interposing fresh obstacles to that great desideratum.”

By this time, it is hoped, the reader is so familiar with the difference between *God's truth* and *man's truth*, as to be in no danger of confounding them in future, or of taking offence at the conduct of those who conscientiously advocate religious opinions different from his own, but which are, nevertheless, *man's truth* equally with his, and have as good a chance of being God's truth also.

The notion that all men can ever be made to think alike on theological subjects is now pretty generally regarded as Utopian; and the more the study of human nature is pursued, the more clearly will the folly of attempting to bring about a uniformity be recognised.

“Doctrinal questions,” says a powerful advocate of religious liberty in the *Edinburgh Review*, “seem unsusceptible of general agreement, not from the abundance, but from the want, of premises. The arguments by which different sects defend their tenets consist mainly of texts of Scripture, which must be susceptible of various interpretations, since they actually receive various interpretations. With no facts to refer to, and no umpire to interpose his authority, the wrestlers waste whole lives in eventless struggles, neither party having any fulcrum by which he can lift the other.”* Pursuing the same topic in a subsequent part of the article, he observes:—“We believe that the duty of abstaining from the forcible propagation of religious truth may be maintained by an argument of universal application—one to which a Mahometan or a Pagan must yield, as well as a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. It consists in the impossibility, in almost all cases, in demonstrating that what is persecuted is really error. We have already remarked that most of the disputes which separate Christian sects relate, not to practical morality, but either to questions respecting church discipline and government, which may receive different answers among different nations and at different times; or to questions as to the nature and attributes of the Deity, and as to his dealings with mankind, which depend on the interpretation given to certain portions of Scripture, as to which men have been differing for eighteen centuries, with a tendency rather to further divergence than to agreement.

* *Edinburgh Review*, April 1850, vol. xci., p. 524.

“The Trinitarians think that the eternal co-existence of God the Father and God the Son, is the scriptural doctrine. The Arians think that the Begetter must have existed before the Begotten. The Latin Church believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Greek Church believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. Each of these opinions has been supported by hundreds of learned, conscientious, and diligent inquirers. Each has been adopted by millions of enthusiastic votaries; each has been propagated by violence, and resisted by endurance; each has had its doctors, its persecutors, and its martyrs. . . .

“*One thing at least seems clear—that if the Being who inspired the texts on which different sects found their arguments, had intended us to agree in one interpretation of them, he would not have left them susceptible of many.*

“The fact, then, on which the expediency of persecution depends—the falsehood of the persecuted doctrine—being in general incapable of demonstration, it follows, as a general rule, that persecution is not expedient. We say in general, for there are some religious opinions so obviously mischievous, that the magistrate may be bound to put them down. Such are the doctrines once attributed to the Church of Rome, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, that the Pope may release subjects from their allegiance, and that indulgences may be purchased for the darkest crimes. And with respect even to such doctrines as these, all that the State ought to prevent is their active dissemination. The mere holding them, being involuntary, is not a fit subject for legislation.”*

The conclusion here arrived at, against the expediency of persecution, applies not merely to what is generally understood by that term, but to every case of deprivation of political or social rights, good name, or personal comfort—to whatever is done on the assumption that those doing it are holier, wiser, and more infallible, in religious matters, than the “publicans” whom they think it accordant with the Christian character to despise or detest.†

The inconsistency of Protestants in this respect is truly marvel-

* Edinburgh Review, April 1850, vol. xci., pp. 552, 553. In another article it is remarked:—“The variety of sects is in truth not a subject either for satire or for tears, unless we could say how religion could otherwise adapt itself to the unequal growth of intellect in society. The polity of the Roman Church was perfect in itself, and for its own purposes. It grasped the whole body of the State, and left no grade or member of it uncared for. But when heresy broke into the fold, and conviction, instead of submission, was made the basis of the new Church, and every man had to choose his creed, or at least the keeper of his conscience, uniformity became impossible, and sects inevitable. Then arose the proverb, *Ubi una, ibi nulla!* And if a civilised commonwealth is ever again to be one fold, under one shepherd, it must be by getting through the sectarian stage, as the individual mind can best do, and resolving moral as well as material phenomena into general laws and a universal providence. To this end, the first step is not that sects should cease to be—far from it—but that they should agree to be. And this is what we rejoice to learn has been brought to pass in New England.”—(*Edin. Review*, vol. xcii., p. 343.)

† “If now no Alva torture for the state,
Is there no Alva in a private hate?
No force, when, lacking plaint of guiltier deed,
We criminate a neighbour for his creed?”

Rhymed Plea for Tolerance, p. 96. London, 1833.

lous, and has been exhibited incessantly from the time of Luther to the present day. "The original reformers," says M. Sismondi, "wished that every man should see and judge for himself, but yet should think as they did: they assumed to themselves the right of watching over the purity of the faith, of excluding or punishing dissenters; of drawing up confessions of faith, and compelling all the members of their clergy to sign them; and of inserting anathemas in them against all who thought differently from themselves. The reformers, called upon to judge for themselves, took up in a modified form all those opinions which the successive condemnation of heresies had made a part of orthodox belief, and they disagreed on all of them. At that time there really existed as many modifications of opinion as there were individuals. It has been often said that there could not be found on the largest tree two leaves entirely alike: can we hope to find in the whole human race two minds perfectly identical?"*

Often as the idea expressed in the concluding sentence of this extract has been repeated by wise and tolerant writers, its earnest inculcation is as needful at present as at almost any previous time; nor will its repetition become superfluous so long as inheritors of the Pharisæical spirit shall abound in the world. For this reason, I subjoin some passages in which the idea is ably enforced and illustrated by eminent writers.

"Remember," says Baxter, "the wonderful variety of men's apprehensions, which must be supposed in all laws," [and also, he would have added had the occasion required, in all just dealings between man and man]. "Men's faces are scarce more various and unlike, than their understandings are; for besides that nature hath diversified intellects as well as faces, the diversity and unlikeness is much increased by variety of educations, company, representations, accidents, cogitations, and many other causes. It is wiser to make laws, that all men shall take the same physie, or eat only the same meat, or that all shoes shall be of a size, and all clothes of the same bigness; upon supposition that all men's health, or appetite, or feet, or bodies, are alike; than to make laws that all men shall agree (or say that they agree) in every opinion, circumstance, or ceremony, in matters of religion."†

"Whatever," says Locke, "gains any man's assent, one may be sure had sufficient evidence in respect of that man: but that is far enough from proving it evidence sufficient to prevail on another, let him consider it as long and as much as he can. The tempers of men's minds; the principles settled there by time and education, beyond the power of the man himself to alter them; the different capacities of men's understandings, and the strange ideas they are often filled with, are so various and uncertain, that it is impossible to find that evidence, especially in things of a mixed disquisition, depending on so

* Review of the Progress of Religious Opinions during the Nineteenth Century, pp. 60, 61.

† Christian Directory, Part IV., ch. xi.; Works, vol. vi., p. 195. "For there are no two men on earth," he elsewhere says, "but differ in something, if they know or believe any thing." Vol. xiv., p. 196.

long a train of consequences as some points of the true religion may, which one can confidently say will be sufficient for all men.”*

“Honest men,” says Dr James Foster, “have always differed (and there is no ground to imagine that such differences will cease in any age hereafter) in explaining both the laws of revelation and reason.”†

“A difference of rank, and capacity, among men,” says Bishop Law, “must needs produce an equal difference in their religious notions, as was shewn above; such difference, therefore, in degree of perfection, is made necessary by the constitution of things and the general dispensations of Providence; and what by the ordinary course of Divine Providence is to men in some circumstances rendered unavoidable, that the Divine Goodness will, in these circumstances, most undoubtedly excuse, and accept with all its imperfections.

“The same thing obtains remarkably in each particular system, even in those of Christianity itself, which, to different persons, and in different times and places, appears in a very different light: though so much always, everywhere, lies level to all, as is absolutely required of each; and so much also as will, or might, have a very considerable influence upon their lives and manners.”‡

“It is to be hoped,” says Dr Jortin, “that a time will come when religion will have a fairer and a more alluring aspect; when Christians will be united, not in opinion as to all theological points, for that is impossible whilst men are men, but that they will be united in benevolence and charity, in intercommunion, and in one common and simple profession of faith; that their manners will be suitable to their profession, and that they will be more peaceable, more virtuous, and more pious; and then the external impediments to the conversion of unbelievers will in no small measure be removed.”§

“There is nothing, perhaps,” says Melmoth, “more evident than that our intellectual faculties are not formed by one general standard; and consequently that diversity of opinion is of the very essence of our natures. . . . Happy had it been for the peace of the world, if our maintainers of systems either in religion or politics, had conducted their several debates with the full impression of this truth upon their minds. Genuine philosophy is ever, indeed, the least dogmatical; and I am always inclined to suspect the force of that argument which is obtruded with arrogance and sufficiency.”||

“A persecutor,” says Gordon, “is perhaps the most extraordinary criminal in the creation. He is for cutting off or distressing men for the inevitable and involuntary operations of the brain, the certain effect of motion and life; so that no man living can escape his rage, since it is impossible for any man living to adapt his ideas (which are involuntary) to those of another. Nothing but mere matter, wood, iron, stone, and clay, can be formed into perfect resemblances: spiritual substances, such as the soul of man, are moved by so many various

* Second Letter concerning Toleration, ed. 1765, p. 217. See also Locke's *Thoughts concerning Education*, § 161.

† *Defence of the Usefulness, &c., of the Christian Revelation*, 3d ed., p. 288.

‡ *Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, 5th ed., pp. 33, 34.

§ *Remarks on Eccl. Hist.*, vol. iii., p. 445; in Jortin's *Works*, vol. ii., p. 351.

|| *Fitzosborne's Letters*, Letter 34. See to the same effect this elegant writer's notes to his *Translation of Cicero's Essay on Friendship*, p. 219. London, 1777.

and uncertain causes, air, diet, and education, and by the figure and temper of the vehicle to which they are joined ; so liable to different impressions, prejudices, disgusts ; so apt to conceive affection or dislike to names and sounds, to grow melancholy or merry at the very same conceits and phrases ; that it is impossible that any two souls can ever agree in all their conceptions, or exactly in any one conception.”*

* Extracted from an unpublished essay in MS., by Thomas Gordon, who died in 1750. He is known as the translator of Sallust and Tacitus, and as a bold and powerful advocate of religious liberty in *Cato's Letters*, *The Independent Whig*, and other celebrated publications. The original MS. is in the possession of Sir Walter Calverley Trevelyan, Bart., in whose family it has descended from Gordon's widow. It is entitled "Upon Persecution, and the natural ill Tendency of Power in the Clergy: occasioned by the Trial and Tragical Death of Lord Cobham." Having been favoured by Sir Walter with a perusal of this essay, and liberty to make use of it at pleasure, I subjoin a passage in which one source of persecution is described with a freedom of expression characteristic of the author's times:—

“ But besides the force of attachment to national usages, religious usages receive an extraordinary recommendation and strength from the strains of ecstasy attending them, from the pleasure of obliging and cajoling the Deity and his chief favourites, and from the dread of offending them ; from the pride of being in his and their present favour, or of soon obtaining it, and from the joyous hopes of future bliss.

“ People thus inured from their birth to such practices and impressions, animated with such hopes, alarmed with such fears, excited by universal example, awed by the dreadful penalties which, in all countries, and in all sects, pursue heretics (who are only nonconformists to established modes and tastes in religion)—holding too, as an essential part of their religion, that all other religions are wrong, and that reason is a pernicious thing to religions ; I say, such people are not likely to leave their own pleasing delusions. Their religion, however absurd, and amazing, and foolish, is become part of themselves, an essential part, like the head or heart, never to be parted with but with life, as 'tis often dearer, much dearer than life.

“ Whatever is once accounted pious, despises and defies reason, and is therefore safe from all the attacks of reason ; so that the more enthusiastic religion is, the more secure and the more delightful it is : and who would be deprived of so much joy as enthusiasm brings ? It is natural to abhor whatever lessens that joy, as reason certainly does and even takes it away. To gain the favour of God and all the advantages of saintship, is such a pleasing ambition, and so interesting a pursuit, that whoever attempts to wean men from it, will be always reckoned an implacable enemy, certainly a most impious and profane man, probably a devil ; and to use and destroy him as such, will be reckoned an acceptable, nay a glorious service to Heaven and Earth.

“ Enthusiasm always implies, and, wherever it can, always produces a mortal war against reason, as what tends everywhere to destroy enthusiasm, which is a pleasing dream, out of which none care to be waked. 'Tis a real and high joy, though entirely formed by fancy, and makes people think that they see clearest when their eyes are shut closest. This holy delusion is much stronger, as 'tis much more extensive and awful, than the gay delusion of the man in Horace, who constantly frequented the theatre, and by mere force of fancy saw and enjoyed all public entertainments, when there were none there. Yet even this limited and temporary delusion was so dear to him, that he complained that his friends by cooling his brain had killed him rather than saved him.

“ Is it any wonder that enthusiasm, which is only a child of uninflamed fancy, should run as it does into such extravagancies and variety of madness ? Like the brain in sleep, or heated with strong liquor, it knows no laws or bounds. This will be still less wonderful, when to the natural force and wildness of en-

“In none of the works of God,” says Lord Kames, “is variety more happily blended with uniformity than in the formation of man. Uniformity prevails in the human face with respect to eyes, nose, mouth, and other capital parts; variety prevails in the expressions of these parts, serving to distinguish one person from another, without hazard of error. In like manner, the minds of men are uniform with respect to their passions and principles; but the various tones and expressions of these, form different characters without end. A face destitute of a nose or of a mouth, is monstrous; a mind destitute of the moral sense, or of a sense of religion, is no less so. . . . Endless differences in temper, in taste, and in mental faculties, that of reason in particular, produce necessarily variety in sentiment and in opinion. *Can God be displeased with such variety, when it is his own*

thusiasm we add the arts and influence of revered impostors, who, finding the more advantage in it the more it reigns, are not likely to stop or lessen it, but to use all means to preserve and heighten it, and to disable or destroy whatsoever and whosoever would weaken and expose it. Thus they everywhere persecute and destroy Truth and Sense, to preserve what they call religion; and thus they persecute and destroy the good Lord Cobham, all in the name of God and Christ—a most blasphemous aggravation of all their sacred barbarities.”

Only those who have some acquaintance with the writings of the High Church clergy of Queen Anne’s time, can have a just idea of the debt of gratitude we owe to such champions of religious freedom as Locke, Hoadly, and Gordon. Dr Jortin, who was born in 1698, tells of a preacher whom he heard say, “If any one denies the uninterrupted succession of bishops, I shall not scruple to call him a *downright Atheist*.” On which Jortin remarks: “He might have said *pawnbroker, smuggler, or pickpocket*. This, when I was young, was sound, orthodox, and fashionable doctrine.”—(*Jortin’s Works*, vol. xii., p. 436.) An admirable specimen of what passed with the multitude for “God’s truth” in the days of Pope and Addison!

By practising the Christian virtues of moderation and charity, a prelate so excellent as Archbishop Tillotson brought upon himself this charge of atheism. He was stigmatized as an “atheist” by Dr Hickee, a clergyman of learning and integrity, but full of the most bigoted notions, an example of which was given in a former part of this work. (See p. 126.)

I do not know whether a certain Rev. Mr Gathercole,—whose *Letters to a Dissenting Minister* are quoted in the Rev. E. Stanley’s *Observations on Religion and Education in Ireland*, p. 18,—flourished at the time referred to; but he certainly delivers precisely that “fashionable doctrine” which Dr Jortin speaks of. “All Dissenters,” says he, “are actuated by the devil;” and “the curse of God appears to rest heavily upon them;” and “every Dissenter, in choosing his own teacher, *despiseth and rejecteth God*, in despising and rejecting his regularly appointed ministers, who are his representatives, acting in his name, and in virtue of the authority which he has committed to them, through a medium of his appointment.” These passages suggest to me a resolution of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, passed on 27th May 1848, which, as it is interesting in several points of view, may be fitly quoted here: “The Assembly, feeling it to be the duty of this Church to cherish a holy and enlightened zeal for the honour of the *Lord of the Sabbath*, and an affectionate regard to the best interests of the flock OVER WHICH THE HOLY GHOST HATH MADE HER OVERSEER, as well as to those of this nation, in which God has largely blessed her,—resolves through grace to spare no efforts for promoting a devout and increased respect for this loved and blessed institution; reminding the people of her communion, that they who are guilty of its violation are liable to the discipline of the Church, in the same manner, and to the same extent, as those who are guilty of transgressing *any OTHER commandment of the moral law*.”

work? He requires no uniformity, except with respect to an upright mind and clear conscience, which are indispensable.”*

“When we take,” says Bishop Watson, “an enlarged view of the nature of man, and of different situations in which not only different nations, but different individuals in the same nation, are placed with respect to religious attainments, we must feel the necessity of vindicating to every individual of the human race the absolute right of worshipping God in his own way, without losing on that account the benefits accruing from a state of civil society. . . . If God Almighty thinks fit to tolerate different religions in the world, suited, there is reason to believe, to the different intellectual and moral attainments of mankind, surely it becomes us to be kindly affectioned towards those who, agreeing with us in all the fundamental verities of the Christian religion, differ from us only in matters of little importance. . . . An uniformity of sentiment in matters of religion is a circumstance impossible to be obtained, and has never yet existed in the Church of Christ, from the Apostolic age to our own.”†

“Whether,” says Dr John Cook, “we consider the nature of the subjects of which the books of the New Testament treat, or the designedly incidental cursory manner in which some of the most mysterious have been alluded to, or the peculiarities of the language and style of the writers, (points which will open upon us more clearly as our inquiry proceeds,) we shall be satisfied, that these diversities of opinion could not, consistently with the ordinary laws by which God governs this world, and with the particular plan adopted for the propagation of Christianity, have been prevented; and that their causes form a part of that great system of intellectual and moral discipline by which the trial and improvement of the human race is conducted.‡ The part to be taken, therefore, by a student of theology is, neither on the one hand to be fretful and angry, on account of the

* Sketches of the Hist. of Man, B. III.; Sk. iii., ch. 3, § 2. See also some admirable remarks in this estimable author’s *Loose Hints upon Education*, p. 273, Section x., Art. iii., entitled, “Differences in Opinion make the Cement of Society.”

† *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. i., pp. 289, 290, 330. See also vol. ii., pp. 13, 24.

‡ The author of the *Rhymed Plea for Tolerance* (p. 50) expresses this sentiment in verse:—

“Perchance, who doomed us thus to disagree,
Planned this arena for our charity;
For beauteous end, bade virtue, weakness join,
And turns our freedom’s self to discipline.
By many a step we mount heaven’s awful stair,
And love fits here, as knowledge waits us there.”

He next views the matter in a light in which it was formerly regarded in these pages (see p. 34, *et seq.*); urging that they who dissent without bitterness from their earlier selves, may learn to be charitable towards *other* dissenters than those selves of the present time:—

“If e’er some slight misgiving thou shouldst know
Of present creed—for thought will ebb and flow—
Straight, from thyself, the passing lesson take,
And spare another’s for thine own mind’s sake.
Faith, vowed unchangeable, may win thee sorrow,
When light to day appears less light to morrow.”

various opinions of professing Christians, nor to give up in despair patient inquiry, the only means through which he can hope to discover the truth. As there is a measure of intelligence and vigorous research which would certainly discover it, so the nearer we approach to that measure, the more success will our efforts have.”*

“In pressing upon you,” says the Rev. Sydney Smith, “the great duty of religious charity, the inutility of the opposite defect of religious violence first offers itself to, and indeed obtrudes itself upon, my notice. *The evil of difference of opinion must exist; it admits of no cure.* The wildest visionary does not now hope he can bring his fellow-creatures to one standard of faith. If history has taught us any one thing, it is that mankind, on such sort of subjects, will form their own opinions. Therefore to want charity in religious matters is at least useless; it hardens error, and provokes recrimination; but it does not enlighten those whom we wish to reclaim, nor does it extend doctrines which to us appear so clear and indisputable. But to do wrong, and to gain nothing by it, is surely to add folly to fault, and to proclaim an understanding not led by the rule of reason, as well as a disposition unregulated by the Christian faith.”†

“Uniformity of opinion,” says Dr Parr, “is a project which the constitution of the human mind, and the experience of all ages, have at length compelled us to abandon. Even the enthusiast despairs of obtaining, and the politician is ashamed of attempting it. What cannot be accomplished, need not be desired.‡ . . . Impatience of contradiction in these remote and sublime speculations, always sug-

* An Enquiry into the Books of the New Testament. By John Cook, D.D., Professor of Divinity in St Mary’s College, St Andrews. Edin. 1821. P. 10.

† A Sermon on those Rules of Christian Charity, by which our Opinions of other Sects should be formed; preached at Bristol, Nov. 5, 1828; *Works*, ed. 1850, p. 592.

‡ It is curious that so long ago as the reign of Henry VIII., the impossibility, and even the inexpediency, of universal sameness of religious opinion, were broadly hinted at by Sir Thomas More in his *Utopia*; but neither did he practise his doctrine himself, nor does it seem to have been regarded as other than Utopian by his contemporaries. He says:—

“Those among the Utopians that have not received our religion, yet do not fright any from it, and use none ill that goes over to it; so that all the while I was there, only one man was punished on this occasion. He being newly baptised did, notwithstanding all that we could say to the contrary, dispute publicly concerning the Christian religion, with more zeal than discretion, and with so much heat, that he not only preferred our worship to theirs, but condemned all their rites as profane, and cried out against all that adhered to them, as impious and sacrilegious persons, that were to be damned to everlasting burnings. Upon this, he, having preached these things often, was seized on, and after a trial, he was condemned to banishment, not for having disparaged their religion, but for his inflaming the people to sedition; for this is one of their ancientest laws, that no man ought to be punished for his religion. At the first constitution of their government, Utopus having understood, that before his coming among them, the old inhabitants had been engaged in great quarrels concerning religion, by which they were so broken among themselves, that he found it an easy thing to conquer them, since they did not unite their forces against him, but every different party in religion fought by themselves; upon that, after he had subdued them, he made a law that every man might be of what religion he pleased, and might endeavour to draw others to it by the force of argument, and by amicable and modest ways, but without bitterness against those of other opinions, but that he ought to use no other force but that of per-

gests suspicion that men do not clearly comprehend, or entirely believe, what they zealously maintain. Uniformity, if it ever exist, will

suasion, and was neither to mix reproaches nor violence with it; and such as did otherwise were to be condemned to banishment or slavery.

“This law was made by Utopus, not only for preserving the public peace, which he saw suffered much by daily contentions and irreconcilable heats in these matters, but because he thought the interests of religion itself required it. He judged it was not fit to determine anything rashly in that matter; and seemed to doubt whether those different forms of religion might not all come from God, who might inspire men differently, he being possibly pleased with a variety in it: and so he thought it was a very indecent and foolish thing for any man to frighten and threaten other men to believe anything because it seemed true to him; and in case that one religion were certainly true, and all the rest false, he reckoned that the native force of truth would break forth at last, and shine bright, if it were managed only by the strength of argument, and with a winning gentleness; whereas, if such matters were carried on by violence and tumults, then, as the wickedest sort of men are always the most obstinate, so the holiest and best religion in the world might be overlaid with so much foolish superstition, that it would be quite choked with it, as corn is with briars and thorns. Therefore he left men wholly to their liberty in this matter, that they might be free to believe as they should see cause; only he made a solemn and severe law against such as should so far degenerate from the dignity of human nature, as to think that our souls died with our bodies, or that the world was governed by chance, without a wise, overruling Providence: for they did all formerly believe that there was a state of rewards and punishments to the good and bad after this life; and they look on those that think otherwise, as scarce fit to be counted men, since they degrade so noble a being as our soul is, and reckon it to be no better than a beast. So far are they from looking on such men as fit for human society, or to be citizens of a well-ordered commonwealth; since a man of such principles must needs, as oft as he dares do it, despise all their laws and customs: for there is no doubt to be made, that a man who is afraid of nothing but the law, and apprehends nothing after death, will not stand to break through all the laws of his country, either by fraud or force, that so he may satisfy his appetites. They never raise any that hold these maxims, either to honours or offices, nor employ them in any public trust, but despise them, as men of base and sordid minds: yet they do not punish them, because they lay this down for a ground, that a man cannot make himself believe anything he pleases, nor do they drive any to dissemble their thoughts by threatenings, so that men are not tempted to lie or disguise their opinions among them; which being a sort of fraud, is abhorred by the Utopians. They take, indeed, care that they may not argue for these opinions, especially before the common people; but they do suffer and even encourage them to dispute concerning them in private with their priests, and other grave men, being confident that they will be cured of those mad opinions, by having reason laid before them.”—(*Utopia*, pp. 173–176. Mr J. A. St John's edition; London, 1845.)

We are now got beyond even King Utopus, in perceiving the folly of all endeavours to prevent men from thinking as they please about the mortality of souls and the existence of an overruling Providence; and although the teaching of Atheism is still sometimes opposed with legal as well as logical weapons, to the credit of the *wisdom* and liberality of this age be it said, that in general, the prosecution of unbelievers is reserved for occasions when they offensively and pertinaciously obtrude their publications upon the notice of unwilling spectators, in a manner amounting to a nuisance, and calculated to produce disturbance of the public peace. By *such* conduct they bring themselves within the sphere of the civil authority. On this subject I had occasion to offer some remarks in self-defence, in an article entitled “Intellectual Freedom, its Advocates and Opponents,” published several years ago in the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. xviii., p. 226, in reference to the trial of one Paterson before the High Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh in 1843.

With respect to Atheism in particular, we have already seen, as the result

probably be the result of gross ignorance, or unfeeling indifference ; it gives stability to error, and shuts out the knowledge of many useful truths ; it is seldom successful in stifling the first rise of new opinions, and, when they have gained any ground, inflames the heat of those who adopt them.”*

The beneficial effects of diversity of opinion, here slightly touched upon by Dr Parr, are handled with great power by Milton in the following passage from the *Arcopagitica* :—

“ Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions ; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making. Under these fantastic terrors of sect and schism, we wrong the earnest and zealous thirst after knowledge and understanding which God hath stirred up in this city.

“ What some lament of, we rather should rejoice at, should rather praise this pious forwardness among men, to re-assume the ill-deputed care of their religion into their own hands again. A little generous prudence, a little forbearance of one another, and some grain of charity, might win all these diligences to join and unite into one general and brotherly search after truth ; could we but forego this prelatial tradition of crowding free consciences and Christian liberties into canons and precepts of men. I doubt not, if some great and worthy stranger should come among us, wise to discern the mould and temper of a people, and how to govern it, observing the high hopes and aims, the diligent alacrity of our extended thoughts and reasonings in the pursuance of truth and freedom, but that he would cry out as Pyrrhus did, admiring the Roman docility and courage, ‘ If such were my Epirots, I would not despair the greatest design that could be attempted to make a church or kingdom happy.’

“ Yet these are the men cried out against for schismatics and sectaries, as if, while the temple of the Lord was building, some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars, there should be a sort of irrational men, who could not consider there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber ere the house of God can be built. And when every stone is laid artfully together, it cannot be united into a continuity, it can but be contiguous in this world : neither can every piece of the building be of one form ; nay, rather the perfection consists in this, that out of many moderate varieties and brotherly dissimilarities that are not vastly disproportional, arises the goodly and the graceful symmetry that commends the whole pile and structure.”†

To the same effect Paley says :—“ Differences of opinion, when accompanied with mutual charity, which Christianity forbids to violate, are for the most part innocent, and for some purposes useful. They promote inquiry, discussion, and knowledge. They help to keep up an attention to religious subjects, and a concern about them, which might be apt to die away in the calm and silence of universal agreement.

of experience (p. 200), that it does not necessarily lead every man who adopts it “ to break through all the laws of his country ;” and if it did, the magistrate would act soon enough in punishing him *after* he had broken through them—and this, not for the *Atheism*, but for *violation of the laws*.

* Works, vol. iii., p. 708.

† Prose Works, vol. ii., pp. 92, 93.

I do not know that it is in any degree true, that the influence of religion is the greatest, where there are the fewest dissenters.”*

* Evidences of Christianity, Part III., ch. vii., at the end. See also the Edinburgh Review, vol. xxvii., p. 176.—In a letter to Dr Percival, on subscription to Articles of Faith, Paley makes the remark that those who enacted the necessity of subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles probably did not expect, “what they must have known to be impracticable, the exact agreement of so many minds in such a great number of controverted propositions.”—(*Literary Correspondence of Dr Percival*, vol. i., p. cl., quoted in Meadley’s *Life of Paley*, 2d ed., p. 372.) Dr Jortin is still more explicit:—“There are,” says he, “propositions contained in our Liturgy and Articles, which no man of common sense amongst us believes. No one believes that all the members of the Greek Church are damned, because they admit not the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; yet the Athanasian Creed, according to the usual and obvious sense of the words, teacheth this. No one believes himself obliged to keep the *Sabbath* day; yet the Liturgy, strictly interpreted, requires it.

“It is evident, beyond a doubt, that the whole body of the clergy, and of the learned laity, depart, some more, some less, from the religious opinions of their ancestors in the days when the Articles were established by law, and from the rigid and literal sense of them. This universal consent of a nation, to deviate thus in some points from the old doctrines, amounts to an abrogation of such rigid interpretations of the Articles, and to a permission of a latitude in subscribing.

“If ye will not allow thus much, we must suppose that in an age—and an age not perhaps the most learned—an assembly of fallible men *may determine concerning all points of faith and practice for themselves, and for their heirs; and entail bondage and darkness, worse than Egyptian, upon their posterity, for ever and ever.*”—(*Strictures on the Articles, Subscriptions, Tests, &c.*; Jortin’s Works, vol. xii., p. 419, 420.)

When Gilbert Wakefield consulted a clerical friend about the propriety of subscribing the Articles of the Church of England, some of which he disbelieved, he obtained the following reply, which is dated 10th September 1778:—

“Indeed, my dear Sir, you pay me too high a compliment in expecting any advantage from my advice on this subject: it is a matter that can only be settled in your own heart, and in attempting to give any I shall but expose my weakness. But I persist, because I would rather you should look upon me as your friend, and love me, than give me the cold esteem which is due to a man of sense.

“You have doubts on the subject of our Articles, and where is the man who has not? at least I should have a very bad opinion both of the sense and the heart of such a man. But the only difference between us is, that you suppose no man in such circumstances can conscientiously subscribe to articles which he does not believe. You have certainly seen Powell’s sermon upon that subject; and let us abuse him as much as we will, it is the case, that they are, and must be, subscribed in different senses by different men. And do you really think that every man who subscribes is guilty of perjury, but the very few who understand them literally? Perjury, perhaps, is too harsh a term; subscribing that a thing is true, being very different from swearing to the truth of it.

“But you, at least, think us guilty of gross prevarication; and here remains the difficulty, whether you think the possession of the comforts, and, what some think, the honours of life, worth such a prevarication or no. This, my dear Wakefield, you only can determine. *Fecerunt alii, et multi et boni.* But I own authority is a very bad argument against conscience; if it was not, I would mention in particular your fellow collegian, Jortin, between whose character and yours there is, in many respects, a great resemblance. He professes himself a doubter about the Trinity. He had a mind far above worldly views; yet, whether from a desire to be useful in his profession, or any other good (it certainly was some *good*) motive, he subscribed repeatedly, both before and after this profession.

“I do not see why we need scrupulously inquire in what sense the Articles were originally, or are now imposed: if I can make the declaration that I be-

In accordance with these sentiments, Montaigne says:—"I rather choose the frequentation of those that ruffle me than those that fear me. 'Tis a dull and hurtful pleasure to have to do with people who admire us and approve of all we say."*

In the same liberal spirit, Professor Sedgwick observes:—"Men are constantly craving for some infallible living authority to guide them on religious and moral questions. But neither the evidences of our religion, nor the limits of Church-authority, are put before us with the clearness of demonstration. Were it so, there could be no such thing as schism, for there could be no difference of opinion on religious questions: but we should thereby lose (as is admirably argued by Bishop Butler) one of the greatest and best elements of our probation; and our religious training would have no analogy to God's dealings with us in the natural world. Unity and peace are pleasant words; but while human nature remains what it is, the direst social evils may be lurking behind the outward semblance of peace and unity. Suppose the whole Christian world in a state of external religious unity brought about by Church-authority; might not intellectual stagnation among religious teachers, indifference among the people, cold-heartedness, and scepticism, grow naturally out of such a condition of society? Like a political despotism, it might, no doubt, extinguish some great social evils; but it would foster other and far greater evils; for it would stop the growth of those great Christian virtues that spring from Christian freedom. In such a state of things the world would not be the searching school of Christian wisdom that it is now."†

lieve them to be *true* (take the word truth as you please), I have done enough. This, you will say, is very relaxed morality; but there is something very like it in St Paul, when (though eating of meat offered before to idols is forbidden by all the Apostles as a great sin) he tells his scrupulous converts, whatever they think of the matter, to ask no questions, and that then they may eat with a safe conscience.

"I fear I shock you; and I told you at the beginning of this letter, I should only expose myself. I repeat, therefore, again, that it is the concern of your own heart. If you cannot persuade yourself to the attempt, God forbid that I should persuade you. As an honest man you will then make the sacrifice required of those who cannot subscribe (and a great one, indeed, it is), and, as an honest man, you will be rewarded for it. 'Blessed are ye, when ye suffer for righteousness' sake.'"—(*Memoirs of Wakefield*, vol. i., p. 377-380.)

Wakefield was not convinced, and the natural consequences followed. In his *Defence* of himself, delivered in the Court of King's Bench, on 21st February 1799, p. 55, he describes them thus:—"Every opportunity of worldly elevation and ecclesiastical emolument have I promptly and largely sacrificed on the altar of Liberty and Conscience; and I stand alone, like a hermit in the wilderness, reaping a scanty harvest from the hard and barren soil of learning, unpreferred, unpatronised, unpensioned, unregarded, amidst my contemporaries, whom I see risen and rising round me, daily, to the highest situations in Church and State, with original pretensions to distinction far less flattering than my own." Of his more prudent correspondent (whose name is withheld), the editors of the *Memoirs* say,—“We have understood that this gentleman, as might not unreasonably be expected, afterwards obtained considerable preferment. *Sicutur ad astra.*”

* Montaigne's *Essays*, B. iii., ch. 8; Cotton's *Transl.*, vol. iii., p. 236.

† Sedgwick's *Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge*, 5th edition, 1850, p. cclxxviii. See likewise Butler's *Analogy*, Introduction, and Part II., chap. vi.; and his *Sermon upon the Ignorance of Man*: Also Lord

Although, happily, we have now in Great Britain no laws directly compelling men to worship God otherwise than they think fit, the principle, it cannot be too often repeated, is still in full practical vigour among thousands of professing Christians, that whosoever is at variance with them in religious opinion, *ought* to agree with them—is *to be blamed* for differing—and *might* agree with them, if he did not obstinately shut his eyes to the truth: “As if,” to borrow the words of John Howe, “theirs were to be the universal conscience, the measure of all consciences; and he that cannot be governed by their conscience, must have none at all: or he be stark blind towards truth, towards God, and towards himself, that sees not every thing they see, or fancy themselves to see.”† “To judge other men’s consciences,” continues this most charitable of divines, “is of so near affinity with governing them, that they that can allow themselves to do the former, want only power, not will or inclination, to offer at the other too.”‡ To him who is indignant at the obstinacy of such as held other tenets than his own, it does not readily occur that if he may justly take amiss their differing from him, *they* have exactly the same reason to treat *him* uncharitably for rejecting *their* opinions. “For what can be more unreasonable or unaccountable than to fall out with another man, because he thinks not as I do, or receives not my sentiments as I also do not receive his? Is it not to be considered, that he no further differs from me than I do from him? If there be cause of anger, upon this account, on one side, there is the same cause on the other too; and then whither shall this grow? And how little can this avail upon a rational estimate! Can any good come of it? Doth it tend to the clearing of truth? Shall we see the better through the clouds and dust we raised? Is a good cause served by it? or do we think it possible the wrath of man should ever work the righteousness of God?”§ “If I judge not you about this matter, what greater reason have you to judge me? And they have little reason to value such a man’s judgment concerning their duty in a doubtful matter, who cannot see his own in so plain a case. The matter for which they judge me may be very doubtful, but nothing can be plainer than that they ought not so to judge.”||

The carnality of religious contention appears, says Howe, “when

Shaftesbury’s *Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour*, Part II., Sect. I (Characteristics, vol. i., p. 64, ed. 1758); *Memoirs of the Life of Gilbert Wakefield*, vol. i., p. 403; and Mr Cornewall Lewis on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, pp. 74, 97, 101.—I beg the reader, with the impression of the above-quoted passages on his mind, to turn back to page 41 of this volume, and re-peruse the extract there given from Archdeacon Daubeny as to the origin of the existing diversity of religious opinions.

† Howe’s Sermon on the Carnality of Religious Contention, p. 201 of his *Select Works*, in *Works of the English Puritan Divines*, Lond. 1846.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 203.

§ *Ib.*, p. 200.

|| Sermon concerning Union among Protestants, *Ib.*, p. 135. “There are, I think,” says Mede, “few men living who are less troubled to see others differ in opinion from them than I am (whether it be a vice or virtue I know not); so far is it from me to take it unkindly that I should not be believed in a paradox. If any man can patiently suffer me to differ from him, it nothing affects me how much or how little they differ from me: which disposition so much the more increaseth in me, as I take daily liberty to examine either mine own former persuasions or other men’s opinions.”—(Letter to Dr Twisse, dated 18th

we over-magnify our own understandings, and assume too much to ourselves: That is, do expect that our minds be taken for standards to all minds; as if *we*, of all mankind, were exempt from error, or the possibility of being mistaken. A certain sort of *φιλαυτία* or *αὐθάδεια*, an excess of love and admiration of ourselves, or over-pleasèdness with ourselves, too much self-complacency, is the true (though very deep and most hidden) root of our common mischief in such cases. We wrap up ourselves within ourselves and then we are all the world. Do only compare ourselves with ourselves, never letting it enter into our minds that others have their sentiments too, perhaps wiser than ours; but abound in our own sense; and while (as the apostle in that case says) we are not wise, and perhaps are the only persons that think ourselves so, we yet take upon us, as if we were fit to dictate to the world, to all Christians, and to all mankind; or as if we only were the men, and wisdom must die with us.

“ This is a sort of evil, than which there is none more common and none less observed; none wherewith the guilty are so little apt to charge themselves, or admit conviction of it. For, I pray, do but consider; all the several differing parties amongst us do with one voice pretend to be for peace; but how, and upon what terms? Why, that all the rest are presently to be of their mind; and that is all the peace that most are for. For where (scarce anywhere) is the man to be found, or how great a rarity is he, that entertains the thought ‘ That there may, for ought I know, be much to be redressed and corrected in my apprehensions of things, to make me capable of falling in with that truth which ought to be common to all.’ There is an expectation with many, of a good time and state of things, before this world end, when all shall be of one mind and judgment; but the most think it must be by all men’s becoming of their mind and judgment. And of this self-conceit it is usually a harder thing to fasten conviction upon men, than of most other evils. We have more hope in speaking against drunkenness, murder, or any the grossest kind of wickedness; for there the conscience of the guilty falls in, and takes part with the reprove. But we can more easily, and more frequently do (though not frequently enough), observe the faults of the inferior faculties or of our external actions, than of the faculty itself which should observe.”*

To these admirable and (one would think) convincing observations, I shall add on this subject only one brief but pregnant passage from a distinguished leader among the recent advocates of the right of private judgment—the Rev. Baden Powell of Oxford. “ If the inevitable *varieties* of private judgment be objected, as inconsistent with the *unity* and invariableness of truth,—I reply—truth is indeed *one* and *inva-*

April 1635, in *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede*, p. 811. London, 1677.)

Dr Campbell states his opinion as follows:—“ What then shall we say of those who differ from us in important articles? What shall we say? That, in our judgment, they err, not knowing the Scriptures. What more should we say? It belongs to the Omniscient, the Searcher of hearts, and to him only, to say whether their error, if they be in an error, proceeds from pravity of disposition, or from causes in which the will had no share.”—(*Sermon on the Spirit of the Gospel*.)

* Sermon on the Carnality of Religious Contention; Select Works, p. 203.

riable, but it not only may, but must, be seen under *different aspects*, and with *different degrees of clearness* by different minds. To each it is realised, as far as the nature of the case permits, if he seek and receive it honestly to the *best* of his ability (2 Cor. viii. 12); not resting satisfied in any attainment (Phil. iii. 13; Heb. vi. 1), but continually striving to advance and improve. The measure of that ability, and the light vouchsafed, may be more or less. Christianity looks only to an improvement *proportional* to the means granted (Matt. xxv. 14); a constantly progressive *advance* (2 Peter iii. 18). It assures the disciple, that increase of grace and light will always be given, if properly sought (John vii. 17; James i. 5),—that every one has enough given him to profit by,—to judge for *himself*, but not to *judge others* (Phil. ii. 3; 12, 14).”*

“Gracious God!” exclaims Bishop Watson, “whence is it that men are so little conscious of the imperfection of human knowledge in all sciences; of the utter impotency of human reason in whatever respects Deity; of the fallibility of human judgment in everything; that they have so little humility as men, so little charity as Christians, as not to blush at erecting their interpretation of Scripture into an idol, which all men must either worship, or perish ‘without doubt everlastingly.’”†

Vinet has well said, that “the formation and existence of the Protestant communion are nothing but a *protest* against the principle of authority;”‡ and Dr Merle D’Aubigné lays down with equal brevity the almost identical truth, that “the character of Protestantism is *movement*, in the same manner as that of Rome is *immobility*.”§ Such is the *theory of Protestantism*; but—as we have had, and shall yet have, too many occasions to see—the *practice of Protestantism* has been very imperfectly in accordance with it.

Our Scottish forefathers of 1647 received a Confession of Faith from their ancestors—that prepared by Knox in the reign of Mary. They abandoned it for that of Westminster, and thought they did well; in which opinion the Church of Scotland has ever since concurred. A contemporary of the Westminster divines, writing of Luther, says:—“Although it cannot rationally be expected, that at the first dawning of the gospel light, all spiritual truths should be known *in that perfection whereunto God hath brought the knowing professors of this age*, yet I am persuaded that the defects which are in some parts [of his *Table-Talk*] which speak him a man like to others, will not be prejudicial to the evidence of truths in other parts.”|| Now, although there is much reason to think that in certain particulars (including

* Tradition Unveiled, p. 76. Some excellent observations on the same subject will be found in the Preface to Mr Greg’s Creed of Christendom, pp. xi. xii.

† On the Expediency of Revising the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England; in his Miscellaneous Tracts, ii. 112. See also Dr Campbell’s admirable Sermon on “The Spirit of the Gospel,” and his equally admirable “Address to the People of Scotland upon the Alarms that have been raised in regard to Popery,” published in 1779. The latter may be read with great advantage at the present time.

‡ See the original passage quoted *ante*, p. 114.

§ History of the Refromation, B. xi., ch. xi. See also B. xi., ch. i.

|| Letter by J. D., prefixed to Captain Henry Bell’s Translation of Luther’s Table-Talk, and dated 30th December 1650.

the doctrine of the Sabbath) these “knowing professors” moved rather backwards than forwards in their pursuit of spiritual truths, still it would have been strange, if, after more than a century’s cultivation of learning by scholars, considerable progress had not been made beyond Luther’s views. At all events, the knowing professors believed, and were entitled to believe, that they had made some progress; and they embodied their opinions in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Why should not *we* follow their example by improving upon *it*? why forget that “the character of Protestantism is MOVEMENT,” and that it is our grand duty as Protestants to repudiate in deed as well as in word “the principle of authority?” Can two additional centuries of far more extensive and accurate investigation, have done nothing to bring the knowing professors of *this* age to a more perfect knowledge of spiritual truths than that enjoyed by Henry Scudder and Samuel Rutherford? If our Church, at the epoch of “the Second Reformation,” did well to abandon John Knox’s Confession for that of Westminster, have not the members of the same Church now—has not every human being in Scotland, or in the world—an equal right to abandon the Westminster Confession for such *new* body of doctrine as each, in the exercise of his own judgment (employed either in searching independently for “spiritual truths,” or in determining which of the many guides that offer themselves it is safest to follow), may consider to be a more accurate exposition of the truths of natural and revealed religion?*

* Bishop Hare has employed his eminent power of irony against the imposition of complicated creeds, in his famous tract on “The Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures, in the way of Private Judgment, represented in a Letter to a Young Clergyman; in order to shew, that, since such a Study of the Scriptures is Men’s indispensable Duty, it concerns all Christian Societies to remove (as much as possible) those Discouragements.”—This celebrated production may be seen in Hare’s *Works*, vol. ii., p. 1, (London, 1746), or in Baron’s collection of pieces under the title of *The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken*, vol. iv., p. 1. (London, 1768.) It was reprinted separately in 1840, as No. VI. of a series of *Tracts for the People, designed to vindicate Religious and Christian Liberty*. (London: Effingham Wilson.) Here is a part of the serious “Conclusion” which Hare appends to his Letter:—

“In truth, there is nothing more absurd than to say the glorious things we do daily of the Scriptures, and at the same time make the study of them, to men of sincere and honest minds, so extremely hazardous and inconvenient. If, then, we would not be guilty of discouraging a study which we acknowledge to be the great duty of the clergy, as we are Christians; if we would be true to the fundamental principles of the Reformation, as Protestants, that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith; let us use our best endeavours to remove the great obstacles that lie against the study of them; let us do what we can that learned men may have full liberty to study the Scriptures freely and impartially; good encouragement given them to go through the labour and difficulties of such a study, not slightly and superficially, but with such application and diligence as the nature of the thing requires, and have leave to speak their sense with all manner of safety; that their opinions may be examined fairly and with temper; that their names be not unjustly loaded with calumny and slander; that their words and actions may be interpreted with the same candour as is shewn to those that differ from them: that, if what they advance be right, it may be received; if wrong, their errors may be refuted, as the mistakes of learned men on other subjects; if doubtful, and the Scriptures say so little or speak so obscurely that nothing can certainly be decided either way, that then nobody may be obliged to take either side as necessary; that, whether their

To this course we are encouraged by one of the ablest of the Westminster divines themselves, who says :—" I do not deny, but most notions be right or wrong, their persons may, in all events, be safe, and their maintenance not affected by it ; that, as long as they live virtuously, and write with all due modesty and good manners, and advance nothing that breaks in upon morality and government, they may be treated in all respects as those are, or ought to be, who employ themselves in any other part of useful learning.

" I must add, let them be never so much in the wrong, I can apprehend no danger from it to the Church ; or that the errors of a few men can have any considerable influence in opposition to a great body of a vigilant and learned clergy, who will be always able and ready to defend the received notions, if they can be defended ; and, if they cannot, it must be allowed they ought not. But, if some inconveniences would arise from the liberty I contend for, they are nothing in comparison of those that must follow from the want of it.

" Till there is such a liberty allowed to clergymen ; till there is such a security for their reputations, fortunes, and persons ; I fear I must add, till so difficult a study meets with proportionable encouragement, it is impossible a sincere, impartial, and laborious application to it should generally prevail. And, till it does, it is as impossible the Scriptures should be well understood ; and, till they are, they are a rule of faith in name only. For it is not the words of Scripture, but the sense, which is the rule ; and, so far as that is not understood, so far the Scriptures are not our rule, whatever we pretend, but the sense that men have put on them : men fallible as ourselves, and who were by no means so well furnished as the learned at present are with the proper helps to find out the true meaning of Scripture. And while we take the sense of the Scriptures in this manner upon content, and see not with our own eyes, we insensibly relapse into the principles of Popery, and give up the only ground on which we can justify our separation from the Church of Rome. It was a right to study and judge of the Scriptures for themselves, that our first Reformers asserted with so good effect ; and their successors can defend their adherence to them on no other principle.

" If, then, we are concerned for the study of the Scriptures further than in words ; if we in earnest think them the only rule of faith, let us act as if we thought so. Let us heartily encourage a free and impartial study of them ; let us lay aside that malignant, arbitrary, persecuting, Popish spirit ; let us put no fetters on men's understandings, nor any other bounds to their inquiries but what God and Truth have set. Let us, if we would not give up the Protestant principle, that the Scriptures are plain and clear in the necessary articles, declare nothing to be necessary but what is clearly revealed in them."

In Scotland the clergy have even *far less* freedom of thought and teaching than their brethren in England ; being liable, for slight deviations from the opinions of the Westminster divines upon dark metaphysical points in theology, to be ejected from their livings, and reduced to beggary and disgrace. It is not many years since a learned and thoughtful minister of the Church of Scotland—respected and beloved by his flock, and a diligent performer of his pastoral duties—was deposed for being guilty, in an anonymous book, of an alleged deviation of this kind. I admit that in Established Churches *some* declaration of belief is indispensable, and must be enforced ; but such events are calculated to raise the questions, Whether the standards of our Church are not needlessly minute ? and, Whether State-paid Churches in which men of only one favoured theological denomination are permitted to share in the emoluments, and this on the condition of being fettered by a creed, ought to exist at all ?

See also Archdeacon Blackburne's *Confessional* ; Bishop Law's *Considerations on the Propriety of Requiring a Subscription to Articles of Faith* ; Paley's *Defence* of that work ; Meadley's *Memoirs of Paley*, pp. 88, 141, 369, 2d ed. ; Bishop Watson's *Miscellaneous Tracts*, Preface to *Theological Tracts*, and *Anecdotes of his Life* ; the *Edin. Review*, vol. xxx., p. 255, and vol. xlv., p. 504 ; a quotation from Dr Taylor of Norwich, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 7th ed., vol. xii., p. 261 ; the conclusion of the article TOLERATION, *ib.*, vol. xxi., p. 323 ; and the works mentioned *ante*, pp. 47, 114, 115, in the notes.

lingly yield, yea assert, as a necessary truth, that as our knowledge (at its best in this world) is imperfect (for we know but in part), so it ought to be our desire and endeavour to grow in the knowledge of the mind of Christ, to follow on to know the Lord, to seek after more and more light, ‘For the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.’ (Prov. iv. 18, &c.)”*

So also Dr Owen says:—“We find in human sciences, that no ability, no industry, no combination of the most happy wits for their improvement in former ages, hath hindered persons of ingenuity and learning in the present day from adding considerably in several kinds unto their respective advancement. Nor shall the sedulity of this age in the furtherance of these sciences, be ever able to bring them to any such perfection, as to condemn succeeding generations to the slothful and servile drudgery of the mere perusal of their dictates and prescriptions, and so by their inventions leave to others only the use of their memories. If new discoveries are thus constantly making in human science, how much more may we expect, that renewed researches will advance the spiritual knowledge of the things of God, whose stores are absolutely inexhaustible in this life, and whose depths can never be fully fathomed.”†

“It is not denied,” says a yet more illustrious contemporary of the Westminster divines, “but gladly confessed, we are to send our thanks and vows to heaven, louder than most of nations, for that great measure of truth which we enjoy, especially in those main points between us and the Pope, with his appurtenances the prelates: but he who thinks we are to pitch our tent here, and have attained the utmost prospect of reformation that the mortal glass wherein we contemplate can shew us, till we come to beatific vision, that man by this very opinion declares that he is yet far short of truth.”‡

I am afraid we have amongst us not a few nominal Protestants, who, if weighed in Milton’s balance, would be found wanting. With them it is the summit of Christian duty to pitch their tents where the Puritan camp of the seventeenth century continues to stand.

But as every attempt to fix religious opinion by means of Confessions and Articles of Faith does violence to human rights and human nature, the consequences, though grievous enough, inevitably fall far short of the design; and by such means as these no real uniformity of belief among Protestants worthy of the name has ever been produced.

* George Gillespie’s Treatise of Miscellany Questions, chap. x., p. 52; edit. 1844. He however proceeds to qualify this liberal declaration with a *but*:—“But on the other hand, the greatest deceits and depths of Satan have been brought into the world under the name or notion of new lights;” and so on: Therefore new lights are very much to be suspected, and some of them to be forcibly extinguished—George Gillespie’s party being the judges what *are* deceits and depths of Satan in their neighbours’ opinions, but no neighbour having a right to pronounce a similar judgment upon their’s! Among the new lights which they most loudly proclaimed to be of Satanic origin, and, as one of them says (see *ante*, p. 151), “contended for *tanquam pro aris et focus*,” was the principle of what another of them calls “pretended liberty of conscience;” a principle, nevertheless, upon which alone they could effectually defend the separation of their ancestors and themselves from the Church of Rome.

† Preliminary Exercitations to the Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by John Owen, D.D.; Preface, p. vi.

‡ Areopagitica; Milton’s Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 89.

Abundant (perhaps superfluous) evidence of this has already been adduced in these pages. Members of the same church disagree with each other in opinion; every thinking man, the more he considers, finds the more reason to modify the traditional opinions of his former self; the prevalent beliefs in even creed-bound churches vary from age to age, in spite of the unchanging Confessions to which homage is outwardly paid. "Every age," says a late writer, "has had its own phase of thought peculiar to itself, and when the same words have been preserved in successive periods, different meanings have been given to them. One theological dogma has achieved a day's triumph and given way to another—even thus 'worlds on worlds are rolling ever from creation to decay, like the bubbles on a river, sparkling, bursting, borne away.' Have *we* arrived so near the Truth that *our* theology can never change? Shall we say thought has advanced until now, but can take no other onward step, having measured the entire nature of God? Our forefathers said the same thing. Thus spake the priest of Jupiter and the priest of Osiris, but the shrines of their gods are no more! What reason have we to believe ourselves more infallible than they? True, we have the Bible; yet within a stone's throw of our conventicle a man more learned perchance than any of us, deduces quite different doctrine from that same Bible, and claims for his views the permanence we would fain assert for our own."*

"Luther and Calvin," says Dr Priestley, "reformed many abuses, especially in the discipline of the Church, and also some gross corruptions in doctrine; but they left other things, of far greater moment, just as they found them. . . . It was great merit in them to go so far as they did, and it is not *they*, but *we* who are to blame, if their authority induce us to go no farther. We should rather imitate them in the boldness and spirit with which they called in question, and rectified, so many long-established errors; and availing ourselves of their labours, make farther progress than they were able to do. Little reason have we to allege their name, authority, and example, when they did a great deal, and we do nothing at all. In this, we are not imitating *them*, but those who opposed and counteracted them, willing to keep things as they were; among whom were many excellent characters, whose apprehensions at that day were the very same with those of many very good and quiet persons at present, viz., the fear of *moving foundations*, and overturning Christianity itself. Their fears, we are now all sensible, were groundless, and why may not those of the present age be so too?"†

In such an epoch of rapidly-extending mental activity as this, no stereotyped interpretation of Scripture can long maintain its ground, unless it be fully capable of standing the test of reason, morality, true scholarship, and accurate science. In vain theological and ecclesiastical

* *The Past and Future of Christianity; a Discourse by Henry W. Crosskey*, pp. 3, 4. Derby, 1851.—See also *The Decay of Traditional Faith, and the Re-establishment of Faith upon Philosophy*, by Henry Ierson, A.M.; London, 1850:—and *Catholicity Spiritual and Intellectual—an Attempt at Vindicating the Harmony of Faith and Knowledge*, by Thomas Wilson, M.A., late Minister of St Peter's Mancroft, Norwich; London, 1850.

† Sermon on the Importance and Extent of Free Inquiry in Matters of Religion; Priestley's Discourses, p. 157–9. Birmingham, 1787.

tical antiquaries in England and Scotland endeavour to reanimate the dry bones of departed systems; in vain they display for our acceptance the tenets, and for our imitation the practices, of an ignorant and superstitious age. A temporary state of convulsive action may be produced, but the course of nature cannot be resisted long. Already the signs of a Third Reformation are abundantly visible—a Reformation which will at length, we may hope, secure to *every* man the comfortable exercise of his right of private judgment in matters of faith and worship, and purge religion of much that has descended to us from the times of darkness. “We are sailing,” said the Rev. George Gilfillan in a recent lecture at Manchester, “we are sailing on unknown seas; but we have reason to hope that there is land before us, and that this new land will present, when we reach it, many of the features, the landmarks, and the great outlines of the past. The restlessness of the age is evidenced in the rapidity with which childhood, in its education, grows into youth, and youth into manhood and old age; in the unexampled progress of mechanical invention and science, and in several other obvious respects. The religious aspects of our times seem at first almost entirely perplexing and terrible. There are some who persist in closing their eyes to the danger by which we are surrounded; but they who can abstract themselves from nearer and more clamorous sounds, and from the pleasant but partial prospects under their eyes, become aware of many and complicated dangers, which seem deepening into a crisis, and darkening into a noon of night, above the churches of Christ. It requires no prophetic vision to see and shew the auguries which are so manifestly around us, of a great coming religious revolution. The symptoms of this include the general indefinite panic of apprehension which prevails;—the increase of a determined spirit of doubt among many classes of men;—the spread of Popery, the going forth of which beast of darkness is itself a proof that there is night at hand;—the re-agitation of many questions which in general belief were supposed to be settled for ever;—the tremulous and uncertain state of many churches;—the gradual breaking up of the bands of creeds and confessions of faith;—nprise of a stern individualism and a formal habit of analysis, which takes nothing on trust;—the eagerness with which innovation is welcomed;—the hurry of the weak to plunge into the arms of implicit faith, of low infidelity, or of hardened indifference;—the listening attitude in which the stronger stand;—the politician listening for his ‘coming man;’ the student of morals and mind for his *new* Plato; and the religious thinker for his new teacher, if not for his old one back again.” Having thus shewn the dark side of the picture, the lecturer turned the other side to his audience. “First,” he said, “we must not confound the battlements of Christianity with Christianity itself. The incorporations of our religion are but battlements; let them fall whenever they please. Popery is another battlement, still more rotten, and reeling to its downfall. Let it fall whenever God pleases. Our creeds, excellent as they are, and in the main true,—our ecclesiastical organisations, powerful as they still seem,—even the office of the ministry, deservedly honoured as it still is,—and even our external evidences, convincing as they seem,—these are all but battlements, and not

Christiainity; and though they were all ignored to-morrow, she would remain untouched,—her doctrines, her fasts, her text-book, her spirit, her blessed hope, would still remain; for they belong to the imperishable, the infinite, and the divine.”*

In a sermon lately published by a minister of the Church of Scotland, the necessity of a new Reformation is honestly acknowledged:—

“The outward form of Truth,” says he, “changes,—the science of theology grows and expands, and suits itself, liberally, to a more enlightened and liberal age. The theological clothing that suited Europe,—as a child, a boy, a youth,—in the first, fifth, twelfth, and sixteenth centuries, will not suit Europe, as a man, in the nineteenth. Truth, therefore, must now assume another form, so as to be fit clothing for the expanding Church of the future; and so, as in times past, it may be now, during these transition periods, that the Church of the future, and the theological teaching of the future, may be as much altered from our present notions of things, as was the Church

* Lecture on the General Characteristics and Prospects of the Present Age, reported in the *Manchester Examiner*, Nov. 17, 1852.

Few of either the clergy or the laity look the facts in the face with the courage of Mr Gilfillan. But—in the words of Mr Helps—“according to the usual course of human affairs, some crisis will probably occur which nobody foresees, and then men will be obliged to speak and act boldly. It behoves them to bethink themselves, from time to time, of whither they are tending in these all-important matters.”—(*Companions of my Solitude*, p. 237.)

An able writer in the *Westminster Review* for July 1852, says:—“It is the vainest of hopes, that a body of clergy, brought up to the culture of the nineteenth century, can abide by the Christianity of the sixteenth or of the second: if they may not preserve its essence by translation into other forms of thought, they will abandon it, in proportion as they are clear-sighted and veracious, as a dialect grown obsolete. The number accordingly is constantly increasing, in every college capable of training a rich intellect, of candidates for the ministry, forced by their doubts into lay professions, and carrying thither the powerful influence, in the same direction, of learning and accomplishment. The higher offices of education are, to no slight extent, in the hands of these deserters of the church: and through the tutor in the family, or the master in the school, or the professor in the lecture-room, contact and sympathy are established between the best portion of the new generation and a kind of thought and culture with which the authorised theology cannot co-exist. College friendships, foreign travel, current literature, familiarise all educated young men with the phenomenon of scepticism, and in a way most likely to disenchant it of its terrors. Thus by innumerable channels it enters the middle class at the intellectual end of their life; assuming in general the form of historic and critical doubt; while from below, from the classes born and bred amid the whirl of machinery, and shaped in their very imagination by the tyranny of the power-loom, it pushes up in the ruder form of material fatalism.”—(P. 174.)

This I believe to be a true representation of the facts. Many will deplore them; but so far as the opinions renounced are false, and those adopted true, there is much reason to rejoice. Besides, we may draw comfort from a reflection of Mr Gilfillan, in the lecture above quoted, that “out of the severe sifting which Christianity is enduring, nothing but good can come: let the sifting go on fearlessly.” Whoever desires to stop it, either insults Truth by imagining that she cannot keep her ground in a free and open encounter, or is secretly conscious that he and Truth are opposed to each other.

“For, well you know, we of the offering side
Must keep aloof from strict arbitrement;
And stop all sight-holes, every loop, from whence
The eye of reason may pry in upon us.”

First Part of K. Henry IV., Act iv., Sc. 1.

of the Reformation from the Church of the dark ages, or that again from the Church of Peter and Paul.

“ Now we have hinted at these things to guard you against a prevalent sophism, viz., that Truth develops and expands just as a seed, a blade, a stalk, and an ear of corn. Not so, however. Theology does so. The outward forms of Truth change, just as that Truth, in its journey down the stream of time, comes into contact with different sciences, and races, and literatures. But Truth itself changes not. Unalterable Truth,—evanescent, changing Form. The form of Truth amongst the Fathers of the first centuries, and amongst the schoolmen of the middle ages, and at the Reformation, and now, has always been different; and hence we say, unchangeable Truth, but changeable Forms. You cannot chemically decompose or analyse Truth. You cannot, as in the machinery of a watch, take its parts separate, and then unite them together. It is unchangeable, indivisible, and perfect as in the days of the Apostles—‘ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.’

“ True, our ideas of Truth may be larger to-day than yesterday. Our vision may be clearer to-day, and we may see a broader field of Truth. But the change here is not in the Truth itself; it is in our vision—in our mode of perceiving the Truth. So in like manner, it may be, that the Church of the fourth century had a clearer vision of the Truth than the Church of the first century,—that the Church of the Reformation had a clearer vision of the Truth than the Church of the dark ages; and again, *that the Church of our day has a clearer vision of the Truth than our own Fathers, two centuries ago, as when, with the growing enlightenment and progress of the arts and sciences, we now see new forms of Truth, especially since astronomy and geology, as sciences, have assumed a perfect form.* All this is true in reference to the covering that Truth assumes, in reference to its theology, as different applications of the Truth take place; but the difference is only in the application of it, not in the Truth itself.”*

Here the distinction between God’s Truth and Man’s Truth is excellently illustrated, and the wisdom of our ancestors represented in its true light, as wisdom which may have occasionally misled us, by representing “ evanescent, changing *Forms* of Truth” as Truth itself. Let us then endeavour to separate, as we best may, the Form from the Substance. Let us make use of that reason and conscience which, having been given us, must have been intended to be employed. These are “ the candle of the Lord” within us; the “ Divine monitors by which,” says Dr Beattie, “ a wise man is to judge even of religion itself, and which he is not at liberty to disobey, though an angel from heaven should command him.”† If the God who implanted in us

* Truth : as Distinguished from Modern Infidelity and Popery. A Sermon preached by the Rev. William Graham, Newhaven, on separate evenings, in South Leith, and St Andrew’s, Edinburgh. 1851. Pp. 12, 13.—“ The Papal Aggression” was the occasion which called forth this discourse.

† Essay on Truth, Part I., ch. ii., Sect. iii.—To the similar passages formerly quoted with respect to the authority of reason and conscience (see pp. 202 *et seq.*) may be added the following observations of Sir James Mackintosh, in his admirable *Discourse on the Study of the Law of Nature and Nations*. Speaking of the law of nature, he says:—“ It may with sufficient correctness, or at least by an easy metaphor, be called a ‘ law,’ inasmuch as it is a supreme, inva-

these monitors is wise and good, we have the strongest grounds for reliance, that, by observing and following their admonitions as far as our several abilities and opportunities enable us to hear and understand them, we shall not by our inevitable errors incur the dis-riable, and uncontrollable rule of conduct to all men, of which the violation is avenged by natural punishments, which necessarily flow from the constitution of things, and are as fixed and inevitable as the order of nature. It is '*the law of nature,*' because its general precepts are essentially adapted to promote the happiness of man, as long as he remains a being of the same nature with which he is at present endowed, or, in other words, as long as he continues to be a man, in all the variety of times, places, and circumstances, in which he has been known, or can be imagined to exist: because it is discoverable by natural reason, and suitable to our natural constitution; because its fitness and wisdom are founded on the general nature of human beings, and not on any of those temporary and accidental situations in which they may be placed. It is with still more propriety, and indeed with the highest strictness, and the most perfect accuracy, considered as a law, when, according to those just and magnificent views which philosophy and religion open to us of the government of the world, it is received and revered as the sacred code, promulgated by the great Legislator of the Universe for the guidance of His creatures to happiness, guarded and enforced, as our own experience may inform us, by the penal sanctions of shame, of remorse, of infamy, and of misery; and still farther enforced by the reasonable expectation of yet more awful penalties in a future and more permanent state of existence. It is the contemplation of the law of nature under this full, mature, and perfect idea of its high origin and transcendent dignity, that called forth the enthusiasm of the greatest men and the greatest writers of ancient and modern times, in those sublime descriptions, where they have exhausted all the powers of language, and surpassed all the other exertions, even of their own eloquence, in the display of the beauty and majesty of this sovereign and immutable law. It is of this law that Cicero has spoken in so many parts of his writings, not only with all the splendour and copiousness of eloquence, but with the sensibility of a man of virtue, and with the gravity and comprehension of a philosopher.* It is of this law that Hooker speaks in so sublime a strain:—'Of law, no less can be said, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy.'—(*Eccles. Pol.*, book i. in the conclusion.)

"Let not those, who, to use the language of the same Hooker, 'talk of truth,' without 'ever sounding the depth from whence it springeth,' hastily take it for granted, that these great masters of eloquence and reason were led astray, by the specious delusions of mysticism, from the sober consideration of the true grounds of morality in the nature, necessities, and interests of man. They studied and taught the principles of morals; but they thought it still more necessary, and more wise, a much nobler task, and more becoming a true philo-

* " 'Est quidem vera lex, recta ratio, *nature congruens*, diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna, quæ vocet ad officium jubendo, vetando à fraude deterreat, quæ tamen neque probos frustra jubet aut vetat, neque improbos jubendo aut vetando movet. Huic legi neque obrogari fas est, neque derogari ex hæc aliquid licet, neque tota abrogari potest. Nec verò aut per senatum aut per populum solvi hæc lege possumus. Neque est quærendus explanator aut interpret ejus alius. Nec erit alia lex Romæ, alia Athenis, alia nunc, alia posthac, sed et omnes gentes et omni tempore una lex et sempiterna, et immortalis continebit, unusque erit communis quasi magister et imperator omnium Deus. Ille legis hujus inventor, disceptator, lator, cui qui non parebit *ipse se fugiet et naturam hominis aspernabitur*, atque hoc ipso luet maximas pœnas etiamsi cætera supplicia quæ putantur effugerit.'—(*Fragm.*, lib. iii., *Cicero de Republ. apud Lactant.*)

"It is impossible to read such precious fragments without deploring the loss of a work which, for the benefit of all generations, *should* have been immortal."

pleasure of that Heavenly Father who knows our frailty, and cannot expect to reap where He has not sown.* It was by the free use of reason that Luther and his colleagues brought down the doctrines of Transubstantiation, Indulgences, Absolution, and Papal Infallibi-

sopher, to inspire men with a love and reverence for virtue.† They were not contented with elementary speculations. They examined the foundations of our duty, but they felt and cherished a most natural, a most seemly, a most rational enthusiasm, when they contemplated the majestic edifice which is reared on these solid foundations. They devoted the highest exertions of their mind to spread that beneficent enthusiasm among men. They consecrated as a homage to virtue the most perfect fruits of their genius. If these grand sentiments of 'the good and fair' have sometimes prevented them from delivering the principles of ethics with the nakedness and dryness of science; at least, we must own that they have chosen the better part; that they have preferred virtuous feeling to moral theory, and practical benefit to speculative exactness. Perhaps these wise men may have supposed that the minute dissection and anatomy of Virtue might, to the ill-judging eye, weaken the charm of her beauty."—(Pp. 10-15; ed. 1835.)

* "No man is bound to do more than his best; no man is bound to have an excellent understanding, or to be infallible, or to be wiser than he can; for these are things that are not in his choice, and therefore not a matter of a law, nor subject to reward and punishment."—(*Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying*, Epistle Dedicatory.)

Again:—"Although every man is bound to follow his guide, unless he believes his guide to mislead him; yet when he sees reason against his guide, it is best to follow his reason: for though in this he may fall into error, yet he will escape the sin; he may do violence to truth, but never to his own conscience; and an honest error is better than an hypocritical profession of truth, or a violent luxation of the understanding, since if he retains his honesty and simplicity, he cannot err in a matter of faith or absolute necessity; God's goodness hath secured all honest and careful persons from that: for other things, he must follow the best guides he can, and he cannot be obliged to follow better than God hath given him."—(*Ib.*, Sect. ix.)

Dr South puts this Protestant doctrine into still stronger language. He says:—

"If it be here demanded, whether a man may not remain ignorant of his duty, after he has used the utmost means to inform himself of it; I answer, that so much of duty as is absolutely necessary to save him, he shall, upon the use of such a course, come to know; and that which he continues ignorant of, having done the utmost lying in his power that he might not be ignorant of it, shall never damn him. Which assertion is proved thus: The gospel damns nobody for being ignorant of that which he is not obliged to know; but that which upon the improvement of a man's utmost power he cannot know, he is not obliged to know; for that otherwise he would be obliged to an impossibility; since that which is out of the compass of any man's power, is to that man impossible.

"He, therefore, who exerts all the powers and faculties of his soul, and plies all means and opportunities in the search of truth which God has vouchsafed him, may rest upon the judgment of his conscience so informed, as a warrantable guide of those actions which he must account to God for. And if, by following such a guide, he falls into the ditch, the ditch shall never drown him, or if it should, the man perishes not by his sin, but by his misfortune. In a word, he who endeavours to know the utmost of his duty that he can, and prac-

† "Age verò urbibus constitutis ut fidem colere et justitiam retinere discerent et aliis parere suâ voluntate consuescerent, ac non modò labores excipiendos communis commodi causâ sed etiam vitam amittendam existimarent; qui tandem fieri potuit nisi homines ea que ratione invenissent eloquentiâ persuadere potuissent."—(*Cic. de Inv. Rhet.*, lib. i. in præm.)"

lity, from their position among Truths universally reputed in Western Europe to be God's. In this age, the question presses, "What doctrines must *now* descend from the high place where, for centuries past, they have stood?" It is a question more easily asked than

tises the utmost that he knows, has the equity and goodness of the great God to stand as a mighty wall or rampart between him and damnation, for any errors or infirmities which the frailty of his condition has invincibly, and therefore inculpably, exposed him to.

"And if a conscience thus qualified and informed, be not the measure by which a man may take a true estimate of his absolution before the tribunal of God, all the understanding of human nature cannot find out any ground for the sinner to pitch the sole of his foot upon, or rest his conscience with any assurance, but is left in the plunge of infinite doubts and uncertainties, suspicions and misgivings, both as to the measures of his present duty, and the final issues of his future reward."—(*Sermons*, by Robert South, D.D., vol. i., p. 373; ed. 1843.)

Whoever disputes the soundness of the doctrine here expressed, and at the same time denies either the existence of an infallible living guide to religious truth, or the infallibility of his own judgment in distinguishing who that guide is, takes up a position which cannot but be most uncomfortable to *himself*, if he is capable of logical reasoning, and not wholly besotted with spiritual pride.

For additional observations on this subject, see Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. I., ch. iv., Rule ix., § 6, 7, 8; and B. IV., ch. i., Rule v.; in his *Works*, vols. xi. and xiii.;—his *Via Intelligentiæ*, in vol. vi.;—Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*, ch. ii., § 104, 127, 152; and ch. iii., § 14, 52;—Milton's *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 514;—his tract *Of True Religion*, &c., in *Prose Works*, vol. ii., p. 511;—Le Clerc's *Treatise on the Proper Choice of a Religious Creed, among the Various Opinions of Christian Disputants*, Sect. v., entitled, "Error, and even Sin resulting from Error, may find Favour and Forgiveness from God, but Hypocrisy never can!" (appended to Dr Spencer Madan's Translation of Grotius *On the Truth of Christianity*, London, 1814, p. 251);—Locke's Common-place Book, quoted in his *Life* by Lord King, vol. ii., p. 75, 2d ed. (part of the passage is in Chambers's *Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, vol. i., p. 515);—Chandler's *Plain Reasons for being a Christian*, in Watson's *Coll. of Theological Tracts*, vol. iii., p. 481;—Dr Priestley's Sermon on the Importance of Free Inquiry, in his *Discourses* (1787), pp. 154, 164;—Bailey's *Essays on the Pursuit of Truth*, &c., pp. 50, 89, 91, 99;—and Rogers's *Reason and Faith, their Claims and Conflicts*, p. 22.

The sentiments of Chillingworth, expressed in the passages above referred to, are perfectly in accordance with those of Taylor and South. They are repeated with characteristic liveliness in a little piece of his, entitled, "Reasons against Popery; in a Letter from Mr William Chillingworth to his friend Mr Lewger, persuading him to return to his Mother the Church of England from the corrupt Church of Rome." Lewger had written to him with an affected strangeness, renouncing in a manner all relation to him; and he thus expostulates in reply:—

"For God's sake, Mr Lewger, free yourself from this blind zeal, at least for a little space, and consider with reason and moderation what strange crime you can charge me with, that should deserve this strange usage, especially from you. Is it a crime with all my understanding to endeavour to find your religion true and to make myself a believer of it, and not to be able to do so? Is it a crime to employ all my reason upon the justification of the infallibility of the Roman Church; and to find it impossible to be justified? I will call God to witness, who knows my heart better than you do, that I have evened the scale of my judgment as much as possibly I could, and have not willingly allowed one grain of worldly motives on either side, but have weighed the reasons for your religion, and against it, with such indifference, as if there were nothing in the world but God and myself; and is it my fault that the scale goes down which hath the most weight in it?—that the building falls that hath a false foundation? Have you such power over your own understanding, that you can believe what you please, though you see no reason?—or that you can suspend your belief, when you see reason? If you have, I pray for old friendship's

answered, and which no man, or collection of men, is entitled to answer imperiously. Each of us must answer it for himself, or choose his own advisers; and if, in the answers given, there be as little unanimity as in all time past, let us shew our good sense and charity by agreeing to differ. On some points, of course, agreement will be more general than on others; and I venture to predict, that in Great Britain, before other fifty years shall pass away, the decision will be pretty unanimous, *that the Fourth Commandment of the Jewish Decalogue is not a portion of the Law of Christ.*

NOTE, E. page 6.

The Duty of Preserving Health.

Mr Alexander Oliver, in his Prize Essay entitled *A Defence of the Universality and Perpetuity of the Sabbath*, (Part II., on "The Morality of the Sabbath,") adopts that definition of "*moral precepts*" which represents them as those "founded on the nature and relations of God and man, and therefore immutable." He proceeds to maintain the morality of the Sabbath-law in this sense, on the grounds of nature and revelation; both of which, says he, "contain the word of God, and are of equal authority." He then investigates "the evidence which is derivable from the light of nature."

"In proceeding to this inquiry," says he, "it is necessary to explain what we mean by a *law of nature*. In the present case, what we understand by it is, one of the conditions of our existence. By observing these, we fulfil the grand end of our being. Now, that end is the glory of God; and we have been so constituted that it is inseparably connected with our own good. To fulfil, therefore, what is the grand purpose of life, the harmony of our being must be strictly

sake teach me this trick; and until I have learned it, I pray blame me not for going the ordinary way; I mean for believing, or not believing, as I see reason. If you can convince me of wilful opposition against the known truth, of negligence in seeking it, of unwillingness to find it, of preferring temporal respects before it, or of any other fault which is in my power to amend, that is indeed a fault, if I mend it not; be as angry with me as you please: But to impute to me involuntary errors, or that I do not see that which I would see, but cannot; or that I will not profess that which I do not believe; certainly this is a far more unreasonable error than any you can justly charge me with. . . . Perhaps you will say (for this is the usual song of that side), 'Pride is a voluntary fault, and with this I am justly chargeable for forsaking the guide that God hath appointed me to follow;' but what if I forsook it, because I had reason to fear it was one of those blind guides, which whosoever blindly follows, is threatened by our Saviour, that both he and his guide shall fall into the ditch? Then, I hope you will grant it was not pride, but conscience, that moved me to do so; for as it is wise humility to obey those whom God hath set over me, so it is sinful credulity to follow every man, or every Church, that without warrant will take upon them to guide me. Shew, then, some good and evident title which your Church of Rome hath to this office; produce but one reason for it, which upon trial will not finally be resolved and vanished into uncertainty; and if I yield not unto it, say, if you please, I am as proud as Lucifer."—(*Works*, pp. 391–2; ed. 1742.)

This beautiful argument applies not only to the Papists, but to millions of so-called "Protestants," who, by treating others unjustly and uncharitably on account of difference in theological opinion, shew that they are Papists at heart, usurping, equally with the Pope whom they abuse, the office of infallible judges of those along with whom they are but fellow-servants of the common Master.

preserved. The different constituents of our nature must be carefully brought to a healthy maturity. The intellectual, moral, spiritual, and physical interests of man must *all* be promoted ; and the attention which is given to the advancement of one of these must never (when possible) be such as to lead to the detriment of another. The cultivation of the mind, for example, must never be pursued to the neglect and injury of the body, nor must the body be attended to without any reference to the development of the mental faculties, and the cherishing and refinement of the social affections. It is by having our whole constitution—mental, moral, and spiritual—in the *highest possible state of health*, that we best accomplish the end of our existence. All things, then, work together for good.

“ But this can never be effected without some intermission of toil. Man cannot always be fighting with nature for his daily food. It is surely enough if for six days together he endeavours assiduously to gather the bread which perisheth, from the ‘ cursed’ earth. ‘ By uninterrupted labour, the *body* becomes weak, loses that activity which the alternations of labour, rest, and amusement produce, and soon grows old. . . . The man who is obliged to toil day after day without intermission, and especially if he has done so from infancy, becomes in a manner cramped, stiff, and awkward at all other bodily exercises ; continues, as it were, naturally of small stature ; and, like a horse daily hacked, is prematurely worn out.’*”

These are sound and highly important principles, which go the full length of proving the necessity of such stated periods of repose from toil as human nature stands in need of. To the Jews the seventh day of the week was positively *appropriated* to this purpose : in Christendom, the custom has prevailed from the time of Constantine, of devoting, though less strictly, the *first* day of the week to the same purpose ; and as experience affords no reason for thinking that any more or less frequent holiday would be of superior advantage to us, we ought, on rational grounds, to adhere to this custom, even were it not recommended likewise by affection, by adaptation to long-established modes of business and social life, and by the pious feelings of all who believe that, as *Christians*, they are bound to keep holy the first day of the week.

Dr John Richard Farre, of London, in his evidence before Sir Andrew Agnew’s Committee of the House of Commons, in 1832, says :—“ I have been in the habit, during a great many years, of considering the *uses* of the Sabbath, and of observing its *abuses*. The abuses are chiefly manifested in labour and dissipation. The use, medically speaking, is that of a day of *rest*. In a theological sense, it is a *holy rest*, providing for the introduction of new and sublimer ideas into the mind of man, preparing him for his future state.† As a day of rest,

* “ Michaelis’ Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. iii., art. 194.”

† This is true if the word “ theological” be here understood to refer to the theology, not of the ancient Jews, but of the Protestant Christians in Great Britain and America, and perhaps of the Roman Catholics also. As formerly observed, *rest* alone was prescribed ; the introduction of sublime ideas into the mind, preparing the Jew for his future state, was no part of the design of the Fourth Commandment. Nowhere in his whole law does Moses teach the Israelites aught concerning a future state, or hold out to them, as inducements to obedience, any other than temporal rewards and punishments.

I view it as a day of compensation for the inadequate restorative power of the body under *continued* labour and excitement. A physician always has respect to the preservation of the restorative power, because if once this be lost, his healing office is at an end. If I shew you, from the physiological view of the question, that there are provisions in the laws of nature which correspond with the Divine commandment, you will see from the analogy that ‘the Sabbath was made for man,’ as a necessary appointment. A physician is anxious to preserve the balance of circulation, as necessary to the restorative power of the body. The ordinary exertions of man *run down* the circulation every day of his life; and the first general law of nature by which God (who is not only the giver, but also the preserver and sustainer of life) prevents man from destroying himself, is the alternating of day with night, that repose may succeed action. But although the night apparently equalises the circulation well, yet it does not sufficiently restore its balance for the attainment of a *long* life. Hence, one day in seven, by the bounty of Providence, is thrown in as a day of compensation, to perfect by its repose the animal system. You may easily determine this question, as a matter of fact, by trying it on beasts of burden. Take that fine animal, the horse, and work him to the full extent of his powers every day in the week, or give him rest one day in seven, and you will soon perceive, by the superior vigour with which he performs his functions on the other six days, that this rest is necessary to his well-being. Man, possessing a superior nature, is borne along by the very vigour of his mind; so that the injury of *continued* diurnal exertion and excitement on his animal system is not so immediately apparent as it is in the brute; but, in the long-run, he breaks down more suddenly. It abridges the length of his life, and that vigour of his old age, which (as to mere animal power) ought to be the object of his preservation. I consider, therefore, that in the bountiful provision of Providence for the preservation of human life, the Sabbatical appointment is not, as it has been sometimes theologially viewed, simply a precept partaking of the nature of a political institution, but that it is to be numbered amongst the natural duties—if the preservation of life be admitted to be a duty, and the premature destruction of it a suicidal act. This is said simply as a physician, and without reference at all to the theological question; but if you consider farther the proper effect of real Christianity, namely, peace of mind, confiding trust in God, and good-will to man, you will perceive in this source of renewed vigour to the mind, and through the mind to the body, an additional spring of life imparted from this higher use of the Sabbath as a holy rest.”*

“I consider,” says the same witness, “that the two officers of healing, so to speak, are the clergyman and the medical man; they are the only two classes of persons called on to labour on that day for the benefit of the community. I have found it essential to my own well-being to abridge my labour on the Sabbath to what is actually necessary. I have frequently observed the premature death of medical men from *continued* exertion. In warm climates, and in active ser-

* Report of Select Committee on Sabbath Observance, pp. 116, 117. Q. 1776.

vice, this is painfully apparent.”* Of clergymen he says:—“ I have advised the clergyman, in lieu of his Sabbath, to rest one day in the week ; it forms a continual prescription of mine. I have seen many destroyed by their duties on that day ; and to preserve others, I have frequently suspended them for a season from the discharge of those duties.”† Here is suggested to us the mode of dealing with enginemmen, guards, &c., employed (it should be in turns) on railways on Sunday.‡

* Q. 1795.

† Q. 1796.

‡ “ Is it to be wondered at,” asks an anonymous writer, “ that railway accidents of the most fearful description should be traced to carelessness and drunkenness, or rather, *is it not to be expected?* A railway guard, who resigned his situation in order that he might *regain his Sabbaths*, told a friend of the writer that he has seen engine-drivers who had been deprived of their Sabbath rest, *asleep at their post from pure exhaustion*. Could these men be reasonably blamed or fairly punished ?”—(*Sabbath Trading: An Address to the Shareholders of the Caledonian and other Railway Lines*, p. 10. Edin. 1852.)—There is probably some exaggeration here ; but the principle illustrated is a sound one.

Where a man's work is severe and protracted for six days of the week, rest even during the whole of the seventh is insufficient for his due refreshment, and extra holidays may usefully be given. On principle, it might be expected that no pecuniary loss would be thus entailed ; for the work done by an exhausted operative is neither so much nor so good as if he were fresh. Experience confirms the conclusion, as I learn from a printed letter, dated 4th November 1852, addressed by Messrs J. P. Wilson and G. F. Wilson, Managing Directors of Price's Patent Candle Company, London, to the Board of Directors of that great establishment. Messrs Wilson have honourably distinguished themselves by introducing some excellent arrangements (including railway-excursions to the country), for the health, education, and enjoyment of the numerous persons employed in the works ; and the result has entirely satisfied them, both as benevolent individuals, and as managers for a manufacturing company whose pecuniary interest it is their duty to promote. Not only have the work-people been greatly benefited by the outlay, but the profits of the concern have been decidedly increased. In the letter referred to, Messrs Wilson say :—

“ We propose that the Saturday half-holiday of the summer should be made a real half-holiday, instead of being, as at present, a mere arrangement of the men themselves, sanctioned by us, to work more on five days of the week, and less on the sixth. . . .

“ In some cases, for instance of those who are piece-workers all the year round, or of those whose work cannot stop at half-past twelve on Saturday afternoon (for there are parts of the work which never can stop without loss to the Company between twelve o'clock on Sunday night and twelve o'clock on Saturday night), it would be almost the making of a man or boy, after a year's hard work, to pay him a fortnight's wages (which would be equal to the summer weekly half-holiday), and to let him go for that time to friends in the country, if he has any, or if he has not, then to the seaside. He comes back, especially if a boy, a different creature from what he was when he went away, in point of vigour of body and mind, and fitness for another year's hard work ; and, for such hard work as ours is at present, a man or a boy at his best in these respects will not find that he has much vigour to spare.

“ Why we speak of this particular form of granting the summer indulgence in particular cases is, that we have already tried it in a small way, and with such results as have made us wish to attempt something more general. We have sometimes seen a valuable man flagging at his work, being evidently in a state in which it was too much for him, and we have, as a matter of pecuniary interest to the Company, sent him off for a holiday for a week or two, without stopping his wages ; and the experiment, considered as an economical speculation by the Company, has completely succeeded. This last summer, also, we sent away, at different times, five boys to the country ; three of them being

Let them be allowed to rest on Monday like the clergy, or on any other suitable day. It is no doubt to be wished that *all* should have repose on Sunday; but this being impracticable, some other arrangement must be made in the exceptional cases—just as it is arranged that those watchmen, editors, printers, and post-office clerks, who do nocturnal work, shall sleep by day, notwithstanding the admitted fact that the night is the fitter time for sleep, and the day for labour. Dr Farre

apprentices, had money of their own; the apprentices having a certain amount of weekly wages paid out, and a small weekly sum placed to their credit in the books, to lie at interest, and not to be touched except in very special cases. To each of these three we paid out £5 of his own money, that he might invest it in good health. The other two boys had no means of their own, and, indeed, had been helped by the Sick Fund of the factory through long and dangerous fevers. They returned to their work, but it was plain that they were losing strength again daily, instead of gaining it. They would probably, like too many a factory boy before them, on returning to his work, pulled down by fever, have continued to get weaker and weaker at it, until compelled to leave it altogether; and here would cease, according to the established trade principle of a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, all connection between their master and them, and he need not, in walking through his factory, let any uncomfortable thoughts be raised in his mind by two new and healthy faces appearing where two sickly faces had been before; and, if he wishes to avoid such thoughts, he had better ask no questions, for the answer would probably be, that, losing with their work the wages which gave them their only chance of recovering their strength, they sank all the faster after leaving it, so that but few weeks at home were needed to prevent their sickly faces troubling any one more. But the Factory Sick Fund gave our two boys £2 each, and the Company as much more, and sent them off to Margate. The two or three weeks' change sent these two and the other three back to their work quite different beings, able to bear anything.

“Upon this proposal of a fortnight's holiday in summer to some of those deprived, by the nature of the work, of the weekly half holiday, we would remark in deprecation of our being thought to propose something too much out of the course of common factory management, that all engaged in the counting-house have, as a matter of course, three weeks' holiday in each year, and that we ourselves get holidays as we can, and this without any doubt in our mind that holiday-making is a positive saving of time in the long run, from the greater power of work given by it; and we would state, that the result of our observation here, both on such little chance opportunities of observation as those above noticed, and on such others as are afforded us by those of our men who are able to make visits to the country on their own funds, is, that the value of holiday and change, so generally admitted in the case of those who work with their heads, holds good also, although not generally thought to do so, in the case of those whose work is chiefly bodily. In our particular case, indeed, the principle holds more strongly for the body-workers than for the mind-workers, because the former have not even the partial daily change of sleeping in an atmosphere a little more free than that in which their day's work is passed; the situation and air of a London labourer's home being even worse in general than those of his factory. We believe that such holiday-makings as are here proposed, whether the weekly or the other, in all cases where the people are already far enough advanced to be out of danger of mis-spending the time so given them, would be one important means of arresting the sad physical degeneration notorious in city working people, and which made a recruiting officer assert that it would be impossible in all Manchester to raise a regiment of dragoons; and if this be so, then our point is proved, that holiday-making is as much saving of time to body-workers as to mind-workers.

“It is possible that, for the many cases of boys weakened through sickness so as to need change, and yet without friends in the country, and not themselves such as could well be trusted alone, the best and cheapest way of carrying the

proceeds:—"I would say, further, that quitting the grosser evils of mere animal living from over-stimulation and undue exercise of body, the working of the mind in one continued train of thought, is destructive of life in the most distinguished class of society, and that senators themselves stand in need of reform in that particular. I have observed

plan out, will be that the Company should have some place at Margate or elsewhere, with a trustworthy person in charge of it, to receive and look after them. We mention this now not as a thing upon which we have at all made up our minds, but only to prevent our being suspected of carrying out some wild scheme of our own fancy, if any one should hear of our making the experiment, and not be aware of the circumstances under which it is made."

Messrs Wilson shew good grounds for expecting that the expense of the proposed arrangements will be more than repaid to the Company; and I understand that at a meeting of the shareholders, held on 16th December 1852, a cordial sanction was given to them.

When any serious amount of night-work or Sunday-work needs to be done, the number of hands employed ought to be increased, so that night-workers may have diurnal rest, and Sunday-workers have sufficient repose, and leisure for recreation and mental improvement, on one of what are called in Scotland the "lawful days." Employers who follow this plan will be rewarded by finding the general rule hold true, that the *right* course is also the *most profitable* in the end.

It is said that in some of the Lancashire machine-works, the employers, who, in busy times, are able to pay high wages to men that will continue at work till a late hour, induce them to exhaust themselves so completely, that after leaving the factories at night, and even on the Sundays, they are utterly destitute of the power of thought and elevated emotion, are driven to stimulants by that incontrollable craving which exhaustion naturally produces, become dishonest and reckless, and finally have their health ruined at an early age. If this representation be true, both masters and men stand much in need of enlightenment concerning their duties and true interest; and I have learnt with great pleasure that for the purpose of disseminating that kind of knowledge which is primarily required for effecting the needful reform, a society called the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association has lately been established. The objects of the association are—"1. To promote attention to temperance, personal and domestic cleanliness, and to the laws of health generally. 2. To induce general co-operation with the boards of health and other constituted authorities in giving effect to official regulations for sanitary improvement. The means to be employed for these purposes are—1. Visitation of districts. 2. Familiar and well-illustrated lectures given in school-rooms or elsewhere. 3. The distribution of short tracts written in plain language, and given or lent to the poor by the clergy and other ministers of religion, school teachers, and the various agents of societies employed in district visiting. 4. Such other means as experience and opportunity may from time to time suggest." "The committee shall consist of three classes of members, in equal proportions; 1st, of the medical profession; 2dly, clergymen and other ministers of religion; and 3dly, persons not belonging to either of such professions. . . . In addition to directing and superintending all arrangements and proceedings for carrying into effect the general objects of the association, the committee shall endeavour to promote the formation of congregational committees in connection with congregations and schools, and other local committees, and shall maintain a correspondence with such committees, and assist them in promoting the objects of the association." District visitation, which is an important part of the scheme, is thus provided for:—"1. Sub-committees shall annually be formed out of the committee to direct and superintend the visitation of districts assigned to them by the committee. 2. Such sub-committees shall associate with themselves other persons residing in, or connected with, their respective districts, to form *visiting committees*. 3. The visiting committees, with the assistance of the congregational and local committees, and any other suitable agency acting within

many of them destroyed by neglecting this economy of life.”—(Q. 1797.) He adds that all would gain “by giving to their bodies the repose, and

their districts, shall, subject to the approval of the council, organise a complete and regular visitation of the district. 4. The visiting committee for each district shall, once a month, report their proceedings to the general committee.” The committee “may appoint and pay an assistant secretary; whose duty it shall be to make all necessary arrangements to obtain the use of schoolrooms and other places for the purpose of giving lectures; to provide for the distribution of notices respecting such lectures; and to act generally under the direction of the committee and council for the purpose of procuring attendance at the lectures. It shall be his duty to place all tracts and other papers for distribution in the hands of such persons as the committee or council may direct; he shall also make himself personally acquainted with the secretaries and other officers of congregational and local committees; and shall perform such other duties as the committee or council may approve. The committee may employ any other agency they deem necessary for the same or like purposes.” Among other regulations are these:—“Lecturers shall, in general, be members of the medical profession. All lectures shall be delivered in plain language, and be illustrated, if possible, by specimens, models, or drawings. Opportunity for inquiry and conversation shall be afforded after each lecture; and the giving of lectures in connection with congregational tea-parties shall be encouraged. Tracts shall not exceed four pages *duodecimo*; they shall be generally illustrated by wood engravings; and be written in plain language, as much as possible in harmony with the lectures which may have been previously delivered. Short illustrated placards, containing useful hints, shall, where permission can be obtained, be hung up in mills, workshops, and conspicuous places. . . . Congregational and local committees shall be employed as direct agencies for inducing attendance at the lectures; and securing the distribution and explanation of the tracts. For these purposes the committee shall endeavour to obtain the services of Sunday-school teachers, district visitors, and other persons. . . . The committee shall nominate annually an illustration committee, elected at their discretion out of the committee, or otherwise. The illustration committee shall associate with themselves, as corresponding members, such ladies and gentlemen as may be willing to assist in preparing illustrations. The expenses for the illustrations shall be subject to the approval of the general committee. All illustrations prepared by this committee shall be the property of the association, and shall, after use, be handed as such to the council.”

Were such associations to become numerous, and to perform their work efficiently, very great improvements would speedily follow. “Town Councils and Boards of Health,” says a Manchester journalist, in reference to the association in question, “may remove public nuisances, cleanse streets, whitewash houses, supply water, and perform for the community other beneficial acts; but unless ‘the masses’ themselves understand something of their own physical constitution, and the laws by which it is governed, and be disposed to reduce their knowledge to practice, the chief sources of disease will remain unchecked. We cannot conceive of any mission of good will to the poor, more likely to be beneficial, than that which will explain to them the organisation of their bodies, the functions of the skin, the consumption of oxygen by the lights which are in their places of employment, as well as by their own breathing, the necessity of ventilation and cleanliness, the properties of different kinds of diet and drinks, and the best modes of cooking. Were these subjects discussed by visitors, introduced into addresses, or promulgated by tracts, the ravages of fever and cholera would be arrested, and the enjoyment, as well as the duration of life, would be greatly increased. It has frequently appeared to us to be strange, that religious people have so much overlooked the connection between the physical and moral condition of their fellow-men, and should have considered the spiritual alone in the schemes of philanthropy which they have prosecuted. There can be no doubt, however, that living in cellars, the *promiscuous* use of sleeping apartments, an impure atmosphere, badly prepared food, and agencies of a similar nature, are most injurious to the moral as well as to the bodily health of humanity. Lan-

to their minds the change of ideas suited to the day, for which it was appointed by unerring wisdom ;”* “that more mental work would be accomplished in their lives by the increased vigour imparted ;”† and that, in short, “a human being is so constituted that he needs a day of rest from both mental and bodily labour.”‡

“Were a young man,” says an eminent American educationist, “to write down a list of his duties, health should be among the first items in the catalogue. This is no exaggeration of its value ; for health is indispensable to almost every form of human enjoyment ; it is the grand auxiliary of usefulness ; and should a man love the Lord his God with all his heart and soul and mind and strength, he would have ten times more heart and soul and mind and strength to love Him with, in the vigour of health, than under the palsy of disease. Not only the amount, but the quality of the labour which a man can perform, depends upon his health. The work savours of the workman. If the poet sickens, his verse sickens ; if black venous blood flows to an author’s brain, it beclouds his pages ; and the devotions of a consumptive man scent of his disease as Lord Byron’s obscenities smell of gin. Not only ‘lying lips,’ but a dyspeptic stomach, is an abomination to the Lord. At least in this life, so dependent is mind upon material organisation,—the functions and manifestations of the soul upon the condition of the body it inhabits,—that the materialist hardly states practical results too strongly, when he affirms that thought

guor and feebleness of the physical constitution produce lowness of spirits, and this again leads to the use of intoxicating drinks and to intemperance ; and to the same ruinous results, many of the poor are brought by the raw and indigestible kinds of food which they use. In our opinion, the sanitary lecture is in many cases the best preparation which can be made for the religious address, and the tract which treats of the laws of physical health, for the distribution of the Bible and the books which speak of the concerns of the soul. We are glad, therefore, to see the institution of agencies amongst us, the direct tendencies of which are intimately connected with the bodily health and enjoyments of our fellow-men, whilst they have also an important bearing on their moral and religious improvement.”—(*Manchester Examiner*, 9th October 1852.)

The remark before quoted from Bishop Wilkins (see pp. 205–206), is as true of the laws of health, as of the divine ordinances in general. Before sanitary regulations can be well obeyed, the principles on which they are founded must be understood, and this is possible only where some knowledge is possessed of the structure and functions of the body, and its relations to surrounding objects. Such knowledge is of peculiar importance to the labouring classes, who are far less favourably situated than wealthier people in a sanitary point of view ; and it may with especial advantage be imparted to the children in Ragged Schools and workhouses—since nothing is so important, with the object of elevating these children above the pauper class, as to teach them how to invigorate their bodies, including the brain ; on the condition of which, not less than on that of the bones and muscles, the power of successful and creditable exertion in the fields of industry depends. Indeed it is almost exclusively on the young that such impression can be made, or improved habits engrafted ; and we may hope that in any national system of education which may be established in England, the vital importance of physiological instruction and training will be fully recognised. I expect that the Schoolmaster, when adequately encouraged and remunerated, will shew himself a more efficient promoter of rational and moral conduct among the people than even the Clergyman ; although the latter, too, will always have a noble field of usefulness before him, in which to employ the highest gifts and most ample stores of knowledge.

* Q. 1798.

† Q. 1799.

‡ Q. 1800.

and passion, wit, imagination, and love, are only emanations from exquisitely organised matter, just as perfume is the effluence of flowers, or music the ethereal product of an Æolian harp. . . .

“Do I need an apology for dwelling thus long and earnestly, not only on the economical benefits, but on the moral and religious obligation of taking care of health? I find one in the facts, that ethical and theological writers, almost if not quite without an exception, have left this field out of the domain of conscience; and that the constituted guardians and directors of youth,—those at the head of our colleges and higher seminaries of learning,—have so generally omitted it in their counsels of wisdom. Let no young man attempt to palliate a continued neglect of this high duty, by saying that an imperfect education has left him without the requisite knowledge. There are books and drawings, and anatomical preparations, where this knowledge may be found. Do you say you have not money to buy them? Then, I reply, sweep streets, or sweep chimneys, to earn it!”*

* *A Few Thoughts for a Young Man: A Lecture delivered before the Boston Mercantile Library Association.* By Horace Mann, First Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. London, 1850. Pp. 8, 15.—See also the first two chapters of Dr Combe’s *Physiology applied to Health and Education*.

Dr John Gregory, in his *Legacy to his Daughters*, says:—“An attention to your health is a duty you owe to yourselves and to your friends. Bad health seldom fails to have an influence on the spirits and temper.”—(Sect. iv.)

“Certainly,” says a medical journalist, “no more useful object of inquiry can be presented to the attention than that of the means of preserving good health; without which all the goods of fortune are deprived of their value, and life itself is a burthen. There are melancholy cases of disease against which no prudence would have been effectual; but their number is insignificant compared with that of those which spring from ignorance and neglect. By removing this ignorance, the instances of neglect will be made more rare; and nothing is more certain than that by increasing the general health of mankind, the general amiability and virtue, and thus in every way the happiness of human beings, is increased at the same time. . . . Medical men, who see more of the interior of society, and the details, if we may so call them, of domestic life, than any other class of observers, well know to what an extent happiness is abridged by mere infirmities of temper, and how often the peevishness, despondency, irritability, and discontent, which torment the social circle, in despite of many respectable, and even amiable qualities, are in a great measure the direct results of an imperfect attention to hygienic rules; less the product, in other words, of a bad disposition, than of a confined atmosphere, and indolence, bodily and mental.”—(*British and Foreign Medical Review*, vol. i., pp. 360, 368.)

Consider now the effects of confining, as the old Puritan clergy endeavoured to do (see *ante*, p. 149, and Note F.), the whole inhabitants of Edinburgh, men, women, and children, to their houses on Sunday, except in going to and returning from church. Those who know the dark and filthy “closes” of Edinburgh, as they are even in these days of sanitary reform, may judge how far the laws of hygiene could be observed by persons confined all day, with no better recreation than theological reading and Sunday “tasks,” to dark, ill-aired houses, in localities so filthy. Above all, think of the imprisoned children, thus deprived to glorify God and to delight in his service!—impatient wretches, deprived of the lively exercise to which Nature impels the young for their good; withdrawn from the solar light, so conducive to their healthy growth; and reduced by indigestion, ennui, discontent, and the horrors of the Catechism, to an extremity of peevishness and disobedience, which their tormented parents deplore as unquestionable symptoms of the corruption of human nature brought into the world by the fall, and of the evil instigations of the arch-enemy of mankind! On the strength of Solomon’s adage, applications of the rod are

The uniform lesson of experience in the case of labouring men and

added to sharp words; but the peevishness, whining, and insubordination are not to be repressed—the pious father almost loses confidence in the wise King of Israel, and wonders for what impiety the curse of disobedient children is inflicted on him by the Almighty. At length the youngsters are banished to bed; but in vain the good man attempts to reanimate his devotional feelings by social prayer and praise.—In all this is seen the operation of an important principle already more than once adverted to (particularly at p. 72); I mean the natural tendency of happiness to increase virtue, and of misery to engender vice. When children are thus cooped up on Sundays, and forced to engage in distasteful (because unsuitable) employments, the course of events is plain: the digestive organs, probably overloaded for want of better amusement than eating, are deranged by gluttony and want of exercise in the open air; bad digestion, and the prevailing gloomy constraint, give rise to restless uneasiness; compulsory tasks, uninteresting at the best, and not to be easily performed by children whose stomach and nervous system are out of order, increase the unhappiness; and this, agreeably to the law referred to, extinguishes the moral feelings of the sufferers, at the same time exciting those lower propensities which are the sources of peevishness, quarrelsomeness, anger, disobedience, and obstinacy.

In the last edition of Dr Combe's *Physiology applied to Health and Education*, it is well remarked as a thing which "deserves to be seriously considered, whether young people who are busily occupied during six days of the week with study, should be burdened so much as they frequently are in Scotland, with Sunday 'tasks,' demanding such painful efforts in committing to memory the prescribed portions of abstruse theological works and ill-understood hymns, that the day of rest and refreshment, in place of being a 'delight,' as it ought to be, is looked forward to with a feeling of aversion which is apt to extend to religion itself."—(P. 264, 14th ed.) Pretty much to the same purpose, Principal Lee recommends that parents and masters should on the Sundays "exercise their authority over their children and dependents, so as to restrain them from every invasion on the serenity and sanctity of the Lord's Day, and to engage them in the due observance of this reasonable service, *not by repulsive strictness or harsh reproofs, or the execution of difficult tasks, but rather by associating religious exercises with peaceful enjoyments, and giving practical proofs of their pleasantness and profitableness*, as contributing at once to temporal comfort, and to the eternal safety of the soul."—(*Report of Sir A. Agnew's Committee*, p. 288.) Here Dr Lee gives utterance to the spirit of humanity which is a feature of his character.

We learn from the *Memoirs of Mrs William Veitch*, an eminent Scottish Puritan of the seventeenth century, that she made a solemn covenant with God that her sons should be devoted to his service as ministers of the Gospel; but that when they grew up, they refused to act according to this agreement, and, in spite of her earnest intreaties, and extreme perplexity to account for the failure of the Almighty to perform *his* part of the covenant, persisted in their own design to enter military service abroad. It is hardly to be doubted that the austerity of their early religious education gave them a lasting disgust at everything connected with Puritanism. The deplorably fanatical autobiography of their mother has lately been reprinted (Edin., 1846), for the edification of Christians in the nineteenth century, by "the Committee of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland for the publication of the works of Scottish Reformers and Divines."

As to the law that misery breeds vice, and happiness virtue, see the final paragraph of a paper on Benevolence, by Grove, in the *Spectator*, No. 601; *The Adventurer*, No. 46, by Dr Hawkesworth; Gaubius on *The Passions*, pp. 68, 91, of the English translation; Sterne's *Sermons*, Sermon v. (Works, ed. 1783, vol. iv., p. 73); Archbishop Whately's Charge on *The Right Use of National Afflictions*, p. 8; Miss Martineau's *Life in the Sick-Room*, p. 150; Bulwer's *Student*, vol. i., pp. 58–60, ed. 1835; the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xlvii., p. 2; Wade's *History of the Middle and Working Classes*, p. 325, 2d ed.; Dr Combe on *Digestion and Diet*, p. 107, 9th ed.; and an article on "Material Prosperity" in *Chambers's Journal*, 15th Feb. 1851.

horses is, that more work can be done by them in six days, with rest on the seventh, than in seven days of unremitted toil.*

“But this rest,” says Mr Oliver, “is demanded not merely for the sake of the health of the body, but for the welfare of man’s higher nature. We cannot here enter into an investigation of the influence which the state of the body has upon the intellect and the moral feelings; but it is unquestioned that, when the physical health is impaired, an injurious effect is made upon our spiritual nature. Independently of this consideration, however, the rest on which we insist is required for the cultivation of the intellectual powers. We do not mean to assert by this that man is at liberty to devote the day, whose sacred claims we advocate, to the pursuit of *any* kind of knowledge; for there are other considerations to be adduced which shew that his mind must then be turned in a certain direction. But what we insist on is, that he ought to have leisure for thought—thought

* In Arvine’s *Cyclopædia of Moral and Religious Anecdotes*, p. 338 of the London edition of 1851 (in which sundry facts confirmatory of the expediency of resting one day in seven are given, pp. 337–341), we read as follows:—“At a regular meeting of the Newhaven Medical Association (U.S.), composed of twenty-five physicians, among whom were the Professors of the Medical College, the following questions were considered:—

“1. Is the position taken by Dr Farre, in his testimony before the Committee of the British House of Commons, in your view correct?

“2. Will men who labour but six days in a week be more healthy and live longer, other things being equal, than those who labour seven?

“3. Will they do more work, and do it in a better manner?

“The vote on the above was *unanimously in the affirmative*. Signed by Eli Ives, chairman, and Pliny A. Jewett, clerk.”

See to the same effect *Four Months among the Gold-Finders in Alta California*, by J. Tyrwhitt Brooks, M.D.; quoted by Mr Oliver in his Prize Essay, p. 33.

Mr Jorgenson, in his *Travels through France and Germany* (London, 1817), says:—“I have been informed, by persons who have resided for many years in France, that the middling and lower orders of French are not so lively, gay, and sociable, at present, as they were before the Revolution. This change in their manners may, in a great measure, be imputed to the republican principles which were afterwards instilled among them; but the *chief* cause, I apprehend, is the violation of the Sabbath. The shopkeepers and tradespeople are confined to their houses on Sundays, as well as on other days. This prevents them from forming those little sociable parties and connexions, which tend to unbend and relieve the mind from the cares of business. The shopmen and apprentices have no day of rest; there is no end to their work; they become careless in consequence. In England, every person of this description looks forward with pleasure to the day which suspends his weekly occupations. He displays his gayest apparel; and, in the intervals of public worship, visits his parents or friends, and enjoys the pleasures of society, which amply compensate for the labours of the week. On the ensuing morning, he returns to his work with alacrity, looking forward to the following Sunday, for the recurrence of the same gratification. In France, the master-tradesmen will ask whether their apprentices do not eat and drink on Sundays, as well as other days; and therefore ought to work. This moroseness has an effect on the cleanliness of the young men: they pursue their daily drudgery in their dirty working-dresses; and habit renders them, at length, averse to a change of linen and clothes. After Louis XVIII. returned to Paris, a decree was issued, forbidding the shops to be open during the hours of divine service on Sundays, under a penalty of ten francs for each offence. This measure gave cause for loud complaints: the citizens paid the fine rather than discontinue their old practices; and the Government, seeing that the abuse was not to be remedied in this way, no longer enforced the law; and things go on as usual.”—(Pp. 117, 118.)

which may give vigour to his mind, extend and refine his sympathies, and strengthen his spiritual vision. To *think rightly* that he may *act well*, is a most important part of man's duty. But the short time which intervenes, in most cases, between the hours of labour and repose is not sufficient. The mental energy has been impaired by the toil of the day, and rest is more congenial, and to the body much more beneficial, than thought. The inference, therefore, seems plain, that there must be entire cessation from labour during the ordinary hours of work at certain seasons.

"This conclusion might be farther enforced by the necessity under which man lies to cherish the social affections of his nature. We might have shewn how these are dried up within him, and the warm heart made cold and misanthropic by the hardships of unintermittent toil; but we waive this for the higher consideration of his interests as a *moral* being. He is bound to worship. To adore the Being who made him is the way to become assimilated to the character of that Being, and thus to reflect in himself, in so far as his finite nature permits, the moral attributes of the infinite God. Worship, too, must be social. Heart animates heart; and devout worshippers become more sincere and ardent when they have earnest companions. The eye of faith grows brighter when it meets another eye lighted up with the same living light. For this purpose, there must be special seasons set apart, and these must recur regularly; for *regularity* in *spiritual* exercises is as essential to the existence of the divine life in the soul, as regularity in the observance of the rules of health is necessary to the preservation of the animal life in the body. 'Religion,' it has been well remarked, 'of which the rewards are distant[?], and which is animated only by faith and hope, will glide by degrees out of the mind, unless it be re-invigorated and re-impressed by external ordinances, by *stated calls* to worship, and the salutary influence of example.'*

"From these observations we think it clear that a periodical resting from the ordinary avocations of life is necessary to the welfare of the various constituent parts of man's nature; and, therefore, is demanded by no positive enactment, but by the laws under which we have been created, and which we are bound to obey."†

All this is admirable, and I rejoice to see so just an appreciation of natural religion exhibited by a young divine. The assertion that "worship *must* be social" may be objected to, as implying that in *all* circumstances, and with men of *all* frames of mind, social worship is a duty. Such, however, I do not understand to be the meaning of the writer; he is treating of what is right in the general case, and not of those who, from peculiarities of opinion or disposition, are unable to join with self-approval or spiritual advantage any assembly of worshippers within their reach. Such cases apart, the expediency of social worship is evident; and since man is a social, as well as a religious being, there is, in my opinion, as little risk of a discontinuance of social worship in the world, as of a discontinuance of social meals, social games, and social working for the advancement of science. In fact, it is from the natural and immutable dispositions of man, even more than from his perception of utility, that the custom of holding reli-

* "Dr Johnson's Life of Milton."

† Prize Essay, pp. 35, 36.

gious assemblies has always and everywhere prevailed, except among the lowest savages. The Law of Moses did not appoint public worship to be performed by the Jewish people on the Sabbath; nor, as we have seen, did the Founder of Christianity impose, either by precept or example, any such duty upon his followers.

In embracing among Sabbath-duties the cultivation of the intellectual powers, with the view of learning to *think rightly* that we may *act well*, Mr Oliver shews more wisdom than orthodoxy; his opinion being here at variance with that of the Westminster Divines, who teach that it is our duty to spend the whole of the Christian Sabbath "in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy." He has, however, done well in disregarding their authority; and if the principles laid down in the foregoing extracts from his Essay be followed to their practical results, they will, I think, lead to the conclusion that not only the refreshment of *rest*, but the additional refreshment which rural excursions, manly exercises, the fine arts, and all other means of innocent *recreation*, are so well fitted (and doubtless were intended) to give, ought to be sought for by our countrymen upon that weekly day of leisure which it is their happiness to enjoy.

NOTE F., page 6.

The History of Modern Sabbatarianism.

It has already been mentioned, that, in the early ages of the Christian Church, no connection was thought of between the Lord's Day and the Sabbath which the Jews observed in obedience to the Fourth Commandment (pp. 163, 173, 221); that the Decalogue never was imposed upon the Gentile converts (p. 172); and that long after the death of Jesus Christ, the Sabbath, and other Mosaical rites, continued to be observed by Christians of the Hebrew race (p. 167). We learn from Mosheim, that in course of time these adherents to the law of Moses were separated from the rest of their Christian brethren. "The first rise of this sect," says he, "is placed under the reign of Adrian. For, when this emperor had, at length, razed Jerusalem, entirely destroyed even its very foundations, and enacted laws of the severest kind against the whole body of the Jewish people; the greatest part of the Christians who lived in Palestine, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews, abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites, and chose a bishop named Mark, a foreigner by nation, and consequently an alien from the commonwealth of Israel. This step was highly shocking to those whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was violent and invincible; and such was the case of many. These, therefore, separated themselves from the brethren, and founded at Pera, a country of Palestine, and in the neighbouring parts, particular assemblies, in which the Law of Moses maintained its primitive dignity, authority, and lustre. This body of Judaising Christians, which set Christ and Moses upon an equal footing in point of authority, was afterwards divided into two sects, extremely different both in their rites and in their opinions, and distinguished by the names of

Nazarenes and Ebionites.”* These sects are said to have become nearly extinct about the beginning of the fourth century.

“Of those Hebrews who conformed to the regular order and discipline of the catholic body of believers,” says the author of a valuable modern treatise on the Sabbath, “there appears to have been a considerable number who still continued to pay some regard to a few of the venerated practices of their ancestors. Of all their old usages, the weekly Sabbath seems to have been that which these persons found the greatest difficulty in relinquishing. Through the influence of their example in continuing to pay a respect to the seventh day, and not improbably owing to their frequent justification of their conduct in doing so, and recommendation of the practice to others, the partial observance of the Sabbath ultimately became very general among several of the Eastern churches, in addition to, and in conjunction with, the celebration of the weekly festival of Sunday. In this way arose the ancient Sabbatarians, a body, it is well known, of very considerable importance in respect both to numbers and influence, during the greater part of the third and the early part of the next century. Socrates, the historian, states, that with the exception of Rome and Alexandria, all other churches devoted Saturday as well as Sunday to religious purposes. It was their practice to sabbatize on Saturday, and to celebrate Sunday as a day of rejoicing and festivity. While, however, in some places, a respect was thus generally paid to both of these days, the Judaizing practice of observing Saturday was, by the leading churches, expressly condemned, and all the doctrines connected with it steadfastly resisted. Among the general body of believers it seems to have been the prevailing doctrine, that the Mosaic institution was, as a whole, entirely abolished. In the writings of the earliest and most esteemed of the Fathers, the Sabbath is uniformly spoken of as an integral part of the Jewish constitution. ‘All its ordinances,’ says Justin, ‘its sacrifices, *its Sabbath*, the prohibitions of certain kinds of food, were designed to counteract the inveterate tendency of the Jews to fall into idolatry.’† The view most generally taken of the Sabbatical institution by the Christian writers of the two following centuries, seems to have been, that it was purely an ordinance of the Mosaic economy, which had been wholly superseded, having naturally terminated in the Christian dispensation; they contended, that instead of being continued under the Gospel, or transferred to any new day, it had been succeeded by the whole life of a Christian believer, of the spiritual rest and holiness enjoyed by whom it had, under the law, been an appointed type. . . .

“The Sabbatarian controversy appears to have been very little agitated subsequent to the close of the third century; and, very shortly after the period when Constantine issued his edict enjoining the general observance of Sunday throughout the Roman Empire, the party that had contended for the observance of the seventh day dwindled into insignificance. The observance of Sunday as a public festival, during

* Mosheim’s *Ecl. Hist.*, Cent. ii., ch. v., § 1. For ample details on this subject, see Neander’s *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, vol. iii., p. 421, (Bohn’s Standard Library); also his *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, vol. i., pp. 29, 50, 114, 156, 210 (same Series).

† “Bishop of Lincoln’s Justin Martyr, p. 22.”

which all business, with the exception of rural employments, was intermitted, came to be more and more generally established, ever after this time, throughout both the Greek and the Latin Churches. There is no evidence, however, that either at this or at a period much later, the observance was viewed as deriving any obligation from the Fourth Commandment: it seems to have been regarded as an institution corresponding in nature with Christmas, Good Friday, and other festivals of the Church; and as resting, with them, on the grounds of ecclesiastical authority and tradition. ‘Thus do we see,’ says the learned Heylin, ‘upon what grounds the Lord’s Day stands; on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings: that custom continued by the authority of the Church of God, which tacitly approved the same; and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires.’”*

Dr Arnold observes:—“I believe that it is generally agreed amongst Christians, that the Jewish Law, so far as it was Jewish and not moral, is at an end; and it is assuming the whole point at issue to assume that the Ten Commandments are all moral. If that were so, it seems to me quite certain that the Sabbath would have been kept on its own proper day; for, if the Commandments were still binding, I do not see where would be the power to make any alteration in its enactments. But it is also true, no doubt, that the Lord’s Day was kept from time immemorial in the Church as a day of festival; and, connected with the notion of festival, the abstinence from worldly business naturally followed. A weekly religious festival, in which worldly business was suspended, bore such a resemblance to the Sabbath, that the analogy of the Jewish Law was often urged as a reason for its observance; but, as it was not considered to be the Sabbath, but only a day in some respects like it,† so the manner of its observance varied from time to time, and was made more or less strict on grounds of

* The Modern Sabbath Examined, pp. 136, 137, 139. London, 1832.—See also Heylin’s History of the Sabbath, *passim*; Lardner’s Credibility of the Gospel History, Part II., ch. lxxxv. (Works, ed. 1815, vol. ii. p. 432); Dr George Cook’s General and Historical View of Christianity, vol. ii., p. 285; Coleridge’s Table Talk, vol. ii., p. 313; Neander’s General History of the Christian Religion and Church, vol. i., p. 406, and vol. iii., p. 419; his History of the Planting of the Christian Church, p. 156; his Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages, vol. i., p. 260; Archbishop Whately’s Thoughts on the Sabbath; Mr Francis Russell’s The Lord’s Day not the Sabbath, an Inquiry into the Teaching of Scripture on the Subject (Edinburgh, 1847); a learned article on the LORD’S DAY, in Kitto’s Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, vol. ii., p. 268; and, above all, a very able treatise, entitled The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in Proof of a Christian Sabbath, by a Layman (London, 1849.)

† This is an important remark, which the reader will do well to bear in mind, as it is the key to much apparent perplexity in what has been written by non-judaizing divines about the Christian Sabbath. In this phrase the word “Sabbath” is used *figuratively*; just as in England a clergyman is figuratively called a priest, while in Scotland the Sabbatarians figuratively style themselves “the true Israel,” and it is usual in the pulpit to apply the word “sanctuary” to places of public worship, although not believed to be in fact holy like the temple at Jerusalem. This figurative way of speaking makes it easy for divines who are so acute as to see that the Fourth Commandment and the Lord’s Day have really no connexion with each other, to express themselves so as not to excite alarm by any *appearance* of heterodoxy when treating of the Christian Sabbath. Dr Cook, however, (*op. cit.*, ii. 293,) writes frankly on the subject.

religious expediency, without reference in either case to the authority of the Fourth Commandment. An ordinance of Constantine prohibits other work, but leaves agricultural labour free. An ordinance of Leo I. (Emperor of Constantinople) forbids agricultural labour also. On the other hand, our own Reformers (See Crammer's Visitation Articles) required the clergy to teach the people that they would grievously offend God if they abstained from working on Sundays in harvest time; and the statute of Edward VI., 5th and 6th, chap. iii. (vol. iv., part i., p. 132, of the Parliamentary edition of the Statutes, 1819), expressly allows all persons to work, ride, or follow their calling, whatever it may be, in the case of need. And the preamble of this statute, which was undoubtedly drawn up with the full concurrence of the principal Reformers, if not actually written by them, declares in the most express terms that the observance of all religious festivals is left in the discretion of the Church, and therefore it proceeds to order that all Sundays, with many other days named, should be kept holy. And the clear language of this statute,—together with the total omission of the duty of keeping the Sabbath in the Catechism, although it professes to collect our duty towards God from the four first commandments,—proves to my mind that in using the Fourth Commandment in the church service, the Reformers meant it to be understood as enforcing to us simply the duty of worshipping God, and devoting some portion of time to His honour; the particular portion so devoted, and the manner of observing it, being points to be fixed by the Church.”*

* Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., vol. ii., pp. 207–209; 5th edit.

It has, I think, been fully made out by the acute, diligent, and learned author of *The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts, &c.*, that in the *Apology* of Justin Martyr, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius some time between A.D. 139 and A.D. 150, we have the earliest evidence of the existence, among Christians, of a generally-established custom of observing the Sunday as a day (not of rest from labour, but) of *public prayer and other religious exercises*.—(See pp. 273, 294.) From Justin, says he, we first derive “proof—positive unequivocal proof—on the subject in discussion. From it we learn the fact, that in somewhat more than a century after the death of Christ, the Sunday had come to be regarded as a stated day of public prayer and religious instruction; but that it was observed also as a Sabbath there is still no trace to be found. All that Justin states of the religious rites of the day is not only compatible with the belief that it was not Sabbatically observed, but authorises, by its silence on that point, a clear inference that, except during the time of divine service, the Christians of that period lawfully might, and actually did, follow their worldly pursuits on the Sunday. This inference appears irresistible when we further consider that Justin, in this part of his *Apology*, is professedly intending to describe the mode in which Christians observed the Sunday.”—(P. 274.)

It may be objected that the position here maintained is different from that of Heylin, who, though the leading champion against the Sabbatarians, allows, in speaking of the first century, that Sunday “began to grow into some credit towards the ending of this age. . . . It came in time to be entitled *κατ' ἐξοχήν* [by way of eminence] the Lord's day, which attribute is first found in the Revelation writ by St John about the year 94 of our Saviour's birth.” But the discoveries made by scholars since Heylin's book was published, have undermined the sole foundation of his opinion, so that on this point his authority is now worthless. As the author just quoted well observes, “He could not avoid putting this interpretation on the text in the Revelation, for in his time implicit credit was given to an ancient writing attributed to one of the Fathers, who was contemporary with St John, in which the phrase of ‘the Lord's day’ is fully recognised in its modern sense; but this ancient document is now uni-

It appears that, for several centuries before the Reformation, it was customary to commit to memory the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer,

versally acknowledged to be spurious."—(P. 117.) The writing referred to is a pretended passage in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians; a passage which Bishop White, who wrote at the same time with Heylin (1635) against the "Sabbatarian novelty," likewise quotes as genuine. But the elaborate history of the works of Ignatius given by our author (pp. 237–251), not only deprives the popular theory of its prop, but does the Sabbatarians the further disservice of proving that the interpolator of the passage ("who, it is clear, was determined to make it apparent that Ignatius was an especial patron of observing the Lord's Day,") thought of the Christian weekly festival solely as a *prayer-day*, and not at all as a *Sabbath*, or day of rest from labour. "Let us, therefore," he makes Ignatius say, "no longer observe Sabbaths after the manner of the Jews, . . . but let every one of you observe Sabbaths in a spiritual manner, rejoicing in the meditation of the law; . . . and after the Sabbath-day let every lover of Christ celebrate the Lord's Day, which is consecrated to our Lord's resurrection, and is the queen and chief of all days." And, what is more—when sound criticism is applied to the interpretation of the *genuine* part of the Epistle, Ignatius is found contrasting the observance of the old Sabbath, not with that of the Lord's Day, as is commonly believed, but with *living according to the Lord's life!*—(P. 242; and Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii., p. 270.)

Notwithstanding these and similar exposures by scholars, it is probable that the Sabbatarians, who seem never to read anything but the special pleadings on their own side of the question—pleadings which reiterate, in a way very trying to human patience, the baseless assumptions, intrepid assertions, and dexterous insinuations of what it is thought dangerous to *affirm*—will go on with their usual confidence in the beaten track. In doing so, they will continue to present what to those who look at only one side of controverted questions may have the appearance of irrefragable proof. But in theological as in military warfare, improved weapons, emulating in efficiency those with which the enemy has armed himself, are now plainly indispensable; and if any man of learning shall succeed in refuting the "Layman's" volume on *The Sabbath*, he will, in my opinion, do a more signal service to the Sabbatarian cause than has been done to it by all the tracts and speeches of the Sabbath Alliance, and the shoals of prize-essays and sermons, in which musty theological dogmas are yearly sent forth in a new garb of declamation—to the perfect satisfaction of those who arrogate to themselves the title of "Evangelical Christians," but very little to the edification of such as would rather be supplied with treatises in which the real questions should be *grappled with*, and the facts elicited by modern scholarship be boldly met, instead of being ignorantly or dishonestly, and, at all events, very conveniently, left out of view.

The edict of Constantine, by which, as far as we *know*, the Lord's Day was first appointed to be kept (by the inhabitants of towns) as a day of rest from labour (*i. e.*, as a *Sabbath*—though the word used is "*Sunday*,") is as follows:—"Omnes iudices, urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ liberè licenterque inserviant; quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cœlesti provisione concessa."—(*Corp. Jur. Civ., Codicis* lib. iii., tit. xii., 3.) We have no evidence whatever, that before the issuing of this edict by the mere authority of a Roman emperor in the year 321, there was *Sabbatical* observance of the Lord's Day in any part of Christendom. Respecting the origin of the observance of Sunday even as a *prayer-day*, we are destitute of positive information. "What we do know respecting it is of a negative character, but, nevertheless, of the highest importance; for it is this, that we have no grounds for believing that its observance was, and, on the contrary, we have much evidence to shew that its observance was not, in use by the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Hence it is a question of mere curiosity, how soon after that time it came into general, and, at length, into universal use as

and the Ten Commandments, as convenient and comprehensive summaries of Christian faith and duty. In this way the people became familiar with the Fourth Commandment—which the Church made use of as a kind of authority for the observance of holy days in general; but neither before nor after the Reformation, was it generally regarded as otherwise significant of Christian duty than to the extent indicated by Dr Arnold in the conclusion of the foregoing extract.* It has al-

a Christian rite; for the observance of it cannot be a religious duty incumbent upon Christians at this time, if it was not so (and most certainly it was not) during the ministry of the eminent apostles above named, one of them more especially the teacher of the Jewish nation, the other the great teacher of the Gentile world.”—(*The Sabbath; or an Examination of the Six Texts, &c.*, p. 333.)

Archbishop Whately, therefore, seems to outrun his warrant in saying that “the Apostles, as Jews, kept the Sabbath-day, and also, as Christians, assembled for worship on the Lord’s Day” (*ante*, p. 221); unless by “assembled” we may here understand, *not steadily*, but *sometimes and casually* assembled. Dr Arnold, in the passage above quoted from his *Life*, avoids this mistake or ambiguity by confining himself to the averment, “that the Lord’s Day was kept *from time immemorial* in the Church as a day of festival.” I respectfully invite Mr Isaac Taylor to reconsider the statement in his *Ancient Christianity*, vol. i., p. 51, that “the religious observance of the first day of the week” is “clearly, though not copiously, alluded to by the inspired writers.”

The statute of Edward VI., referred to by Dr Arnold, may be seen in a pamphlet entitled *The Sunday not the Jewish Sabbath*, p. 6; London, 1850.

* My former statement, that “it was reserved for the ingenuity of modern times to identify the Lord’s Day with the Sabbath, and call it by that name” (p. 173), is too broad, and must be qualified by what is said above, after a closer examination of the subject. For I find that St Augustine, bishop of Hippo, who died A.D. 430, writes in a strain which shews that Sabbatarianism is no modern invention, although apparently it never, in practice, made any figure in the world till after the Reformation. Speaking of the Lord’s Day he says:—“It appears from the sacred Scriptures, that this day was a solemn one; it was the first day of the age, that is, of the existence of our world; in it the elements of the world were formed; on it the angels were created; on it Christ rose also from the dead; on it the Holy Spirit descended from heaven upon the apostles, as manna had done in the wilderness. For these and other such circumstances, the Lord’s Day is distinguished; and therefore the holy doctors of the church have decreed, that all the glory of the Jewish Sabbath is transferred to it. Let us therefore keep the Lord’s Day as the ancients were commanded to do the Sabbath.” He then admonishes those to whom he is writing, “that from the evening of the Sabbath to that of the Lord’s Day” (the two being still thus distinguished by their appropriate appellations) “they should abstain from their usual pursuits,—that they should not spend the day in hunting,—that they should not engage even in rural occupations,—but that they should attend the public worship of God.”* He does not, however, seem to discountenance *refreshing* employments, or to fancy that public worship was enjoined by the Fourth Commandment.

“It is evident,” says Dr Cook, “that the object of this distinguished theologian was, to rest the Lord’s Day upon a positive divine appointment; he endeavours to shew, that this may be deduced from the events which Scripture records as having taken place upon it; but not trusting altogether to such an inference, he introduces the doctors of the church as having decided, that the only change made by the Christian dispensation upon the Fourth Command-

* Augustini Opera, vol. x., p. 397; quoted by Dr Cook in his *General and Historical View of Christianity*, vol. ii., p. 391. Dr Cook refers also to pp. 127 and 567 of the same volume of Augustine, and adds that many quotations might be given from other parts of his voluminous works.

ready been shewn (*ante*, pp. 121, 122), that the opinions of Luther and Calvin on this subject were similar to those of Cranmer. That

ment was to transfer the rest which it enjoins from the seventh day of the week to the first. Assuming this, he immediately holds it forth, or considers it as a matter of divine appointment, that the Lord's Day was to be observed in all respects as the Jewish Sabbath had been. This is certainly proceeding much farther than the New Testament seems to warrant, or even, if we may judge from their works, than is warranted by the earliest writers of the Church; and it is difficult to conceive, that when the apostles rank the Sabbath as amongst the Jewish rites abolished by Christianity, they should not have given even the most distant intimation, that all which they meant by this assertion was, that, on account of the resurrection of Christ, God was to be worshipped on the first day of the week instead of the seventh.

"It cannot, however, be doubted that the opinion, supported by authority so much revered as that of Augustine, would be extensively disseminated; and it is certain that successive emperors published new edicts for the observance of the first day of the week, till at length the Emperor Leo, repealing the ordinance of Constantine, substituted one still more rigorous.* Different councils also directed their attention to the same subject, formed decrees by which they gave their high and revered authority to the acts of the civil power, and minutely detailed the manner in which the Lord's Day ought to be spent. It was thus established, that the observance of the peculiar day which, from the commencement of the Christian era, had been venerated by the disciples of Jesus, was in consequence of divine appointment, and that there should be upon it a suspension of temporal employments and pursuits."†

With respect to the Schoolmen of the middle ages, Heylin says:—"They tell us generally, of the Sabbath, that it was a ceremony, and that the Fourth Commandment is of a different nature from the other nine: that whereas all the other precepts of the Decalogue are simply moral, the fourth, which is the third in their account, is partly moral and partly ceremonial."—(Part II., p. 169.) He quotes Aquinas as saying,—“Moral it is in this regard, that men must set apart some particular time for God's public service; it being natural to man to destinate particular times to particular actions—as for his dinner, for his sleep, and such other actions. But in as much as that there is a day appointed in the law itself, in token of God's rest and the world's creation, in that respect the law is ceremonial.” This, it will be observed, is precisely the line of argument employed by the Sabbatarians of the present day to reconcile their *general* obedience to the Fourth Commandment with their neglect of an essential provision of it *in particular*—that, namely, which appoints the *seventh* day of the week to be the Sabbath. From what Heylin adds, it appears that this doctrine of Aquinas was given out by the Schoolmen in general; and it will shortly be seen that even by some of the English Reformers, who were *not* Sabbatarians, the Lord's Day was familiarly, but of course figuratively, called the Sabbath. The Waldenses also, who held the leading doctrines of the Reformation for several centuries before the age of Luther, employed the word or its equivalent (“le jour de repos”) in a similar way. In an Exposition which they had of the Ten Commandments, and which is given by the Rev. Adam Blair in his *History of the Waldenses*, vol. i., p. 527 (Edinburgh, 1833), we read as follows:—“They that will keep and observe the Sabbath of Christians, that is to say, sanctify the day of the Lord, must be careful of four things. The *first* is to cease from all earthly and worldly labours; the *second*, not to sin; the *third*, not to be idle in regard to good works; the *fourth*, to do those things that are for the benefit of the soul.” Quotations from the Pentateuch are added, in support of these propositions; and St Augustine is quoted with approval, to

* “Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. Hist., vol. ii., p. 132.” [Cod. lib. iii., tit. xii., 11. By this decree, about A.D. 470, obscene pleasures, and theatrical and other spectacles, are forbidden.]

† “Index to the Acts of General Councils. Bingham's Christian Antiquities, Book 20, chap. 2, and Book 16, chap. 8. Council of Laodicea, Canon 29.”

the other early Continental leaders in the Protestant cause viewed the matter in the same light, will appear from the following particulars:—

According to Beza, no cessation of work on the Lord's Day is required of Christians; "for that," says he, "had not so much abolished Judaism, as put it off and changed it to another day:"—"Sic tamen ut Judaica cessatio ab omni opere non observaretur, quoniam hoc plane fuisset Judaismum non abolere, sed tantum, quod ad diem attinet, immutare."* And he then adds, says Heylin, "that this cessation was first brought in by Constantine, and afterwards confirmed, with more and more restraints, by the following emperors: by means of which it came to pass, that that which first was done with a good intent—viz., that men being free from their worldly businesses, might wholly give themselves to hearing of the Word of God, 'in merum Judaismum degeneravit'—degenerated at the last into downright Judaism."

"Bucer," says Heylin, "goes further yet, and doth not only call it a superstition, but an apostasy from Christ, to think that working on the Lord's Day, in itself considered, is a sinful thing."†—"Si existimetur operari in eo die, per se, esse peccatum, superstitio, et gratiæ Christi, qui ab elementis mundi nos suo sanguine liberavit, negatio est." He adds, that he did very well approve of the Lord's Day meetings, "si eximatur è cordibus hominum opinio necessitatis"—if men were once dispossessed of these opinions: that the day was necessary to be kept; that it was holier in itself than the other days; and that to work upon that day, in itself, was sinful.

The Confession of the Swiss Churches, cap. 12, declares, "Neque enim alteram diem alterâ sanctiorem esse credimus, nec otium Deo, per se, probari existimamus;" "For neither do we conceive one day to be more holy than another, nor think that rest from labour, in itself considered, is any way pleasing unto God." The same Confession teaches,—1. That the keeping of one day in seven is not a moral duty;

the effect that "it is better to labour and dig the earth on the Lord's Day, than to be drunk, or to commit any other sins; for sin is a servile work, by which a man serves the devil." See also the Confession of Faith dated 1532, Art. 8; *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 594. I have searched in vain not only Blair, but Morland, Jones, and the two works of Dr Gilly, on the Waldenses, for evidence that they disapproved of Sunday recreations. This, at least, is certain, that the Vaudois of the present day (who are the successors of the Waldenses) do not observe the Sabbath in the Puritanical fashion. They "indulge themselves in amusements which," says Dr Gilly (from whom I take leave to differ), "are inconsistent with the spirit of an institution mercifully intended to bring us into closer communion with God. Their favourite game of bowls is not suspended; the tirata, or firing at marks, is pursued with eagerness, when they can meet the expense of it; and after the hours of public worship the remainder of the day is spent more like a festival than a solemnity."—(*Waldensian Researches*, by W. S. Gilly, M.A., Prebendary of Durham, p. 243. London, 1831.) Dr Gilly seems to be ignorant that the Lord's Day was a festival in the early ages of the Church, and not what he calls a solemnity. In another part of his volume (p. 461) he makes the true remark, that "excitement is as necessary to some minds as food to the body." If, then, the Vaudois need excitement, and can best get it by playing at bowls and firing at marks on the Sundays, where is any law of Christ forbidding them to perform what might be called this "work of necessity," if work it were at all?

* *In Apoc.* i. v. 10; quoted by Heylin, Part II., p. 180.

† Bucer, *In Matt.* xi.; *Ib.*, p. 181.

2. That the observance of the Lord's Day is founded, not on any commandment of God, but on the authority of the Church; and, 3. That the Church may alter the day at pleasure.*

The Swiss Reformer Zuinglius, in a passage quoted by Heylin, ascribes the same power to the Church.† He also expresses the opinion, that it is lawful “*Die Dominico, peractis sacris, laboribus incumbere,*” —“on the Lord's Day, after divine service, for any man to pursue his labours; as commonly we do,” says he, “in the time of harvest.”‡

In the Augsburg Confession, which was drawn up by Melancthon, to the question, “What ought we to think of the Lord's Day?” it is answered, that the Lord's Day, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other such holy days, ought to be kept, because they are appointed by the Church, that all things may be done in order; but that the observance of them is not to be thought necessary to salvation, nor the violation of them, if it be done without offence to others, to be regarded as a sin. “For they who think the observance of the Lord's Day has been appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches, that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the Church appointed for this purpose the Lord's Day, which, for this reason also, seems to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance, neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary.”§

It is well known that, at the same period, views identical with these were published in England by the Reformers Tyndale and Fryth. “As for the Sabbath,” says the former, “we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or into any other day, as we see need, or may make every tenth day holy day only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, but to put a difference between us and the Jews; neither need we any holy day at all if the people might be taught without it.”|| And Fryth writes: “Our forefathers which were in the beginning of the Church did abrogate this Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an ensample of Christian liberty, and that they might know that neither the keeping of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary according to Paul: ‘Ye observe days, times, and months; I am afraid of you, that I have laboured in vain towards you.’ Howbeit, because it was necessary that a day should be reserved, in which the people might come together to hear the word of God, they ordained in the stead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next day following, which is Sunday. And although they might have kept the Saturday with the

* Heylin, Part II., p. 182.

† *Ib.*, p. 189.

‡ *Resp. ad Val. Gentilem*; *ib.*, p. 194.

§ Quoted in *The Modern Sabbath Examined*, p. 276.

|| Tyndale's Answer to Sir Thomas More, p. 287; quoted by Heylin, Part II., p. 235.—Tyndale being, like Luther, a translator of the Bible, was as well qualified as most people of his age to declare what it teaches of the Sabbath. He knew what St Paul had written to the Romans, Galatians, and Colossians, about the observance of days.

Jews as a thing indifferent, yet did they much better to overset the day, to be a perpetual memory that we are free, and not bound to any day, but that we may do all lawful works to the pleasure of God and profit of our neighbour. We are in manner as superstitious in the Sunday as they were in the Saturday, yea, and we are much madder. For the Jews have the word of God for their Saturday, sith it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemm. And we have not the word of God for us, but rather against us; for we keep not the seventh day as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God's law. But Paul biddeth that no man judge us as concerning holy days, meats, and such other exterior things; yea, and in no ways will he that we observe them, counting them more holy than other days. For they were institute that the people should come together to hear God's word, receive the sacraments, and give God thanks; that done, they may return unto their houses, and do their business as well as any other day. He that thinketh that a man sinneth which worketh on the holy day, if he be weak or ignorant, ought better to instruct, and so to leave his hold; but if he be obstinate, and persevere in his sentence, he is not of God, but of the devil, for he maketh sin in such as God leaveth free. According to this ensample would I that our ceremonies were altered, because (as I have said) the people seek health in them, and what villany can they do more to Christ's blood?"*

Bishop Hooper, who, like these two, suffered for his Protestantism in the sixteenth century, expresses himself thus:—"We may not think that God gave any more holiness to the Sabbath than to the other days. For if ye consider Friday, Saturday, or Sunday, in as much as they be days, and the work of God, the one is no more holy than the other; but that day is always most holy, in which we most apply and give ourselves unto holy works. To that end did he sanctify the Sabbath-day, not that we should give ourselves to idleness, or such Ethnical pastime as is now used amongst Ethnical people; but being free that day from the travails of this world, we might consider the works and benefits of God, with thanksgiving; hear the word of God, honour him, and fear him; then to learn who and where be the poor of Christ, that want our help."† This doctrine is an evident advance towards the Sabbatarianism of the Puritans, and perhaps was brought by Hooper from Switzerland, where he resided a considerable time.

The practice of committing the Decalogue to memory as a summary of religious and moral duty, if taken in connection with the effects of the revival of Hebrew literature in the beginning of the sixteenth century (see *ante*, p. 173), and with the extended study of the works of St Augustine, affords a natural and sufficient explanation of the rise of that class of Judaising Christians whom Calvin denounced as "false prophets," going "thrice as far as the Jews in the gross and carnal superstition of Sabbatism."‡

* Fryth's Works, p. 69; quoted in *The Sunday Not the Jewish Sabbath* (London 1850), p. 9. The same passage is partly quoted by Heylin, p. 235, who refers to the author's Declaration of Baptism, p. 95.

† Hooper on the Ten Commandments, p. 103; quoted by Heylin, p. 235.

‡ Institutes, quoted *ante*, p. 122. As to Calvin's views, see Cook, vol. ii., p. 308.

In England, where the Fourth Commandment was in the year 1552 placed in the Liturgy, and the people were thenceforward taught to pray for Divine help to enable them "to keep this law," the Sabbatarian doctrines of the Continental "false prophets" naturally found an easy reception among serious Christians, who were doubtless apt to think that if a law ought to be kept at all, it ought to be kept as strictly as their circumstances allowed. Some, therefore, regarded the Lord's Day as a festival ordained in the Fourth Commandment; while others, more consistent, thought it their duty to keep the *seventh* day holy. In general, however, the English Protestants of the sixteenth century appear to have vaguely regarded the Decalogue as only "*in some sense* the rule of human duty; and the Popish doctrine was by many retained, that the Lord's Day, and all the other holy days, ought to be kept as Sabbaths, in obedience to the Fourth Commandment. In the Book of Prayer set forth in the last year of Henry VIII., the Fourth Commandment is curtailed as follows:—"Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath-day;" and in the General Confession, enumerating the violation of each of the Commandments, that on the Fourth states, 'I have not sanctified *the holy days* with works which be acceptable unto Thee.' When the Commandments were added to the English Liturgy, the practice of enforcing the observance of all the holy days appointed by the Church, by a reference to the Decalogue, appears to have become very common: by those who did this, however, it was at the same time maintained, that 'one day is no more holy than another; for that day is always the most holy in the which we most apply and give ourselves to holy works;' and along with this doctrine they held also, that as 'the Sabbath is a figure of that rest and quietness which they have that believe in Christ, it is meet, therefore, that faithful Christians, *on such days as are appointed for holy days*, should lay aside unholy works, and give them earnestly to religion and serving of God.' In short, all the leading divines of that age appear to have adhered to the original doctrine of the primitive Church, namely, 'that the Sabbath was a type of the present spiritual rest enjoyed by the believer of the Gospel, and of the eternal rest that is to come.'* But the inconsistency of these views with the practice of reading the Fourth Commandment, and making the people pray for help to give simple and unqualified obedience to it, is so glaring, that no ingenuity has ever been able to vindicate the shortsighted policy of retaining in the Liturgy a Jewish law, prescribing the observance of a day (the seventh) which in fact has at no time been kept holy, in any form whatever, by the English Church. In consequence of this great mis-

* The Modern Sabbath Examined, p. 277.—Cranmer, in his Catechism, which was published in 1548, says:—"And here note, good children, that the Jews in the Old Testament were commanded to keep the Sabbath day, and they observed every seventh day, called the Sabbath or Saturday. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses' law concerning differences of times, days, and meats, but have liberty and freedom to use other days for our Sabbath days, therein to hear the word of God, and keep an holy rest. And therefore that this Christian liberty may be kept and maintained, we now keep no more the Sabbath on Saturday as the Jews do; but we observe the Sunday, and certain other days, as the magistrates do judge convenient, whom in this thing we ought to obey."

take, the opinions of the authors of the Liturgy have often been misunderstood and misrepresented;* and the Church was not long in discovering, like the horse in the fable after invoking the assistance

* Dr Lorimer, for instance, says:—"Turning for a moment to the British Reformers and their immediate successors, it is scarcely necessary to say that they were warm friends of the scriptural Sabbath" (by which is here meant the Sabbath of the Westminster Confession), "and embodied their views in the standards of the Churches which they planted. Not only is the Decalogue, with the Fourth Commandment, of everlasting obligation, recorded and made matter of prayer in the Liturgy of the Church of England from Sabbath to Sabbath, but in many, if not in most, of the churches, the Sabbath law is set up, visibly painted in her places of worship. I intended," he adds, "to have quoted various testimonies of distinguished divines of the Church of England, but space forbids me even to enumerate their names. I may merely mention that Becon, the chaplain of Cranmer, and Hooper the martyr, the latter one of the noblest sons of the English Church, were decided in their reverence for the scriptural Sabbath."—(*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* p. 46.) Whether this is a correct representation of the opinions of the English Reformers, the reader, who has their own words before him in the previous pages, will easily judge for himself. Of the tenets of the illustrious Becon I confess I know nothing. As for the other "distinguished divines of the Church of England," whose testimonies in favour of the so-called "scriptural Sabbath" Dr Lorimer "intended" to quote, it is really a pity that having found the *names*, he could not find *space* "even to enumerate them." Are the names of these "distinguished divines" so numerous that a page or two would not have held them? If they are, could not at least ten lines in a tract where hundreds are filled with mere declamation, be spared for the surnames of a few of the *most* "distinguished?" Was it impossible to find room for the names of even half a dozen, to counterbalance the weighty and "distinguished" names of Chillingworth, Taylor, Barrow, Horsley, Paley, Whately, and Arnold? He has occupied several pages in demonstrating the errors of Popery about the Sabbath, from Daniel's prophecy about "the little horn" (Dan. vii., 25; Lorimer, p. 9), and in maintaining the not less laughable theory, that the 118th Psalm, v. 24, contains a prophetic intimation of "the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the day which the Lord was himself emphatically to consecrate" (p. 31.) Could not these precious arguments (concerning the latter of which he is careful to say he "entertains no doubt") have been omitted or abridged, so as to leave "space" for a score or two of names of the distinguished Sabbatarians of the Church of England—as well as for what would have been much more instructive and important, a quotation from the 14th chapter of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans? I say "much more important;" for, after all, the opinions of the old theologians about the Sabbath are immaterial, except in a historical point of view. In the present age we are far better able to judge for ourselves on the subject than they could be. Like all other men of ability and learning, they are entitled to be listened to with respect when they deliver their opinions on any subject which they have studied; the reasons of those opinions deserve to be candidly weighed, and, if sufficient, will necessarily produce conviction by their own force, independently of the influence or "authority" of those by whom they are urged. "To the law and to the testimony!" exclaimed Sir Andrew Agnew, when he found the opinions of the Reformers less favourable to his cause than he wished; and although my own opinions are much nearer than his were to theirs, I cordially second his proposal.

Those who wish to see the opinions of Luther, Calvin, and others, placed in the most favourable light for the Sabbatarians, are referred to Dr Hetherington's *Historical Notices on the Subject of Sabbath-observance, shewing its Influence on the Prosperity of Churches*; in the volume entitled *The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects* (Edinburgh, 1850), pp. 272–8.—Dr Hetherington there opposes what he considers to be an erroneous tenet of the Reformers, that the Sabbath, as typical of a spiritual rest in Christ, came to an end with the Mosaic institution in general. To me, however, they seem not only to have

of the man against its enemies, that she had encumbered herself with a "help to godliness," which was also a help to Nonconformity, to Judaical Christianity, and finally to rebellion.

The explanation which Heylin gives of this matter is distinct and satisfactory. He says:—"This statute [the one mentioned by Dr Arnold, about keeping the Sunday and other holy days], as before we said, was made *in anno* 5 and 6 of Edward the Sixth: and in that very Parliament the Common Prayer-Book was confirmed, which still remains in use amongst us; save that there was an alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday of the year, the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences added in the delivery of the sacrament unto the communicants.* Now, in this Common Prayer-Book, thus confirmed in the fifth and sixth years of King Edward the Sixth,† it pleased those who had the altering and revising of it, that the commandments, which were not in the former Liturgy, allowed of in the second of the said king's reign, should now be added, and accounted as a part of this: the people being willed to say after the end of each commandment, 'Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law;' which being used accordingly, as well upon the hearing of the Fourth Commandment as of any others, hath given some men a colour to persuade themselves, that certainly it was the meaning of the Church that we should keep a *Sabbath* still, though the day be changed; and that we are obliged to do it by the Fourth Commandment. Assuredly, they who so conclude, conclude against the meaning of the book, and of them that made it. Against the meaning of the Book: for if the Book had so intended, that that ejaculation was to be understood in a literal sense, according as the words are laid down *in terminis*, it then must be the meaning of the Book that we should pray unto the Lord to keep the Sabbath of the Jews, even the seventh day precisely from the world's creation, and keep it in the self-same manner as the Jews once did; which no man, I presume, will say was the meaning of it. For, of the changing of the day, there is nothing said, nor nothing intimated; but the whole law laid down *in terminis*, as the Lord delivered it. Against the meaning also of them that made it: for they that made the Book, and reviewed it afterwards, and caused these passages and prayers to be added to it—Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Ridley, Bishop of London; and certain others of the prelates, then and there assembled—were the same men by whose advice and counsel the Act before remembered, about keeping holy days, was in the self-same Parliament drawn up and perfected; they which confirmed the Book by them so contrived, the self-same Lords and Commons which had consented thereunto; and he by whose most supreme power it was authorised, the very same which in his regal Injunctions, five years before, and those continuing still

acted *consistently* in classing the Sabbath with the other Jewish ceremonies, but to have felt themselves *compelled* so to class it, by those notable passages in St Paul's Epistles, which are so pitifully evaded by most Sabbatarians (see *ante*, pp. 56–59), and which Dr Hetherington, who must know how prominently the Reformers have, in their discussions, put forward the passages referred to, has thought fit, after the usual fashion, to ignore.

* "1 Eliz. cap. 2."

† "Cap. 1."

in force, had absolutely determined of the Lord's Day that it was not founded on the Fourth Commandment. And is it possible we should conceive so ill of those reverend, wise, and sacred persons, as that they would erect a Sabbath in the one Act, and beat it down so totally in the other: to tell us in the Service-Book that we are bound to keep a Sabbath, and that the time and day of God's public worship is either pointed out in the Fourth Commandment, or otherwise ordained by Divine authority; and in the self-same breath to tell us, that there is neither certain time, nor definite number of days, prescribed in Scripture, but all this left unto the liberty of the Church? I say, as formerly I said, it is impossible we should think so ill of such reverend persons: nor do I think that any will so think hereafter, when they have once considered the *non sequitur* of their own conclusions. As for the prayer there used, we may thus expound it, according to the doctrine and the practice both, of those very times; viz., That their intent and meaning was, to teach the people to pray unto the Lord to 'incline their hearts to keep that law,' as far as it contained the law of nature, and had been entertained in the Christian Church; as also to have mercy on them for the neglect thereof in those holy days, which by the wisdom and authority of his Church had been set apart for God's public service. Besides, this prayer was then conceived when there was no suspicion that any would make use thereof to introduce a Jewish Sabbath, but when men rather were inclined to the contrary error, to take away those certain and appointed times, Lord's Days, and other holy days, which by the wisdom of the Church had been retained in the Reformation. The Anabaptists were strongly bent that way, as before we shewed; and if we look into the Articles of our Church, we shall there find what special care was taken to suppress their errors in other points, which had took footing, as it seems, in this Church and kingdom. Therefore the more likely is it, that this clause was added to crush their furious fancies in this particular of not hallowing certain days and times to God's public service. Yet I conceive withal, that had those reverend prelates foreseen how much their pious purpose would have been abused, by wresting it to introduce a *Sabbath*, which they never meant, they would have cast their meaning in another mould."*

This I look upon as a conclusive answer to those who, disregarding the silence of the Catechism of the Church of England in regard to Sabbath-observance, point to her Liturgy as evidence that Sabbatarianism is a part of her doctrine.

In the original Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church of Scotland, drawn up by Knox, the only duties mentioned *in connection with* the fourth and previous commandments (for the duties do not seem to be there *founded* upon them) are, as we formerly saw, merely "to have one God, to worship and honour him; to call upon him in all our troubles; to reverence his holy name; to hear his word; to believe the same; to communicate with his holy sacraments." These, says the Confession, "are the works of the First Table."†

Both in England and Scotland, the general practice of the people

* Heylin, Part II., pp. 238-241.

† Quoted *ante*, p. 123.

was in accordance with these views. Plays were performed on Sundays at court in Elizabeth's reign;* and "I find," says Heylin, "that in the year 1580, the magistrates of the City of London obtained from Queen Elizabeth, that plays and interludes should no more be acted on the Sabbath-day within the liberties of their city: As also that, in '83, on the 14th of January, being Sunday, many were hurt, and eight killed outright, by the sudden falling of the scaffolds, in Paris Garden. This shews that interludes and bear-baitings were then permitted on the Sunday; and so they were a long time after, though not within the City of London: which certainly had not been suffered, had it been then conceived that Sunday was to be accounted for a Sabbath; at least for such a Sabbath as some now have made us."† The accident at Paris Garden was, of course, turned to great account by the Puritans, who believed, and in that superstitious age found no difficulty in persuading others to believe, that it was a divine judgment against Sabbath-breakers; and the event must thus have strongly tended to the spreading of Sabbatarian opinions. In a letter written on the following day by the Lord Mayor to Lord Burghley, we read: "It giveth great occasion to acknowledge the hand of God for such abuse of the Sabbath-day, and moveth me in conscience to beseech your Lordship to give order for redress such of contempt of God's service."‡ Fleetwood the Recorder, who was in the habit of transmitting to Lord Burghley, at intervals, a diary of the proceedings in the City, on this occasion wrote as follows:—"Upon the same day" (Sunday, Jan. 13, 1582-3), "the violators of the Sabothe were punished by God's providence at Paris Garden; and as I was writing of these last words before, is a book put down upon the same matter." The book to which he alludes is a small tract, in 12mo, by "John Field, minister of the Word of God," of which the following is the title:—"A Godly Exhortation, by occasion of the late judgment of God shewed at Paris Garden, the 13th day of January, where were assembled by estimation above a thousand persons, whereof some were slain, and of that number, at the least, as is credibly reported, the third person maimed and hurt. Given to all estates for their instruction concerning the keeping of the Sabboth day."§

It appears from evidence adduced by Mr Collier, that in 1581 (a year later than that mentioned by Heylin), the Privy Council prohibited the acting of plays within the city of London (p. 249). After the accident at Paris Garden, the regulation, he thinks, was probably made general (p. 254).

Fleetwood the Recorder, who was at the same time a member of the House of Commons, sent to Lord Burghley an account of the proceedings there from the 2d to the 29th November 1584. He states that a bill was brought in, read a first and second time, and committed, "for the due observation of Sundays." In the committee all the

* D'Israeli, quoted *ante*, p. 144.

† History of the Sabbath, Part II., p. 249.

‡ Lansdown MSS., No. 73; quoted in Mr J. Payne Collier's History of English Dramatic Poetry, &c., vol. i., p. 252. London, 1831.

§ Collier, *loc. cit.*—An account of Field, who is styled by Mr Collier, "a busy puritanical preacher," will be found in Brook's Lives of the Puritans, vol. i, p. 318.

young members attended ; and he complains that, as twenty talked at once, nothing could be done with the measure.* “ No doubt,” adds Mr Collier, “ the young members attended to defeat the bill.”

In October 1587, the inhabitants of Southwark complained that plays and interludes were still represented on the Sabbath, especially within the liberty of the Clink, and within the parish of St Saviour's. “ On the 29th of that month, therefore, (as appears by the registers,) the Privy Council wrote to the Magistrates of Surrey and Middlesex, requiring them to take strict order for the prevention of such an occurrence in future. Nevertheless on Sunday, 11th June 1592, a riot took place in Southwark, headed by the servants of the Feltmakers' Company and others, for the purpose of rescuing a person who had been committed to the Marshalsea ; and the Lord Mayor (William Webbe), in a letter to Lord Burghley, dated on the following day, asserts that ‘ the said companies assembled themselves by occasion and pretence of their meeting at a play, which, besides the breach of the Sabbath day, giveth opportunity of committing these and such like disorders.’† In 1592, therefore, plays were still performed on Sunday.”‡

In *A Sermon preached at Pawle's Crosse on Sunday the ninth of December 1576*, by T. W., printed in 1578, the following description is given of the manner in which the Sunday was at that time spent by many of the citizens of London. “ Assuredly we come nothing near the Jews in this point, for on our Sabbathes all manner of games and plays, banquetings and surfeitings, are very rife. If any man have any business in the world, Sunday is counted an idle day ; if he have none, then it is bestowed in other pleasure. *Trahit sua quæque voluptas*—every man followeth his own fancy. And the wealthiest citizens have houses for the nonce : they that have none make shift with alehouses, taverns, and inns, some rowing on the water, some roving in the field, some idle at home, some worse occupied : thus what you get evilly all the week is worse spent on the Sabbath day, according to the proverb—ill gotten, ill spent. Blame not your servants if they follow your example, for your prodigality makes them unthrifty. But what account ? how answer you ? is this the Lord's day or no ? If it be, how intolerable, nay, how accursed and most condemnable, are these outrageous Bacchanalia, Lupanaria—I cannot tell what to call them—such as heathen men were ever ashamed of (I am sure), and therefore practised better matters, although profane exercises ; but ours savours so of Venus' court, and Bacchus' kitchen, that it may rightly be entitled an abominable and filthy city : and without doubt London shall justify her elder sister Hierusalem, if in time she turn not to the Lord.”§

So far as the Puritan preachers directed such invectives against drunkenness and profligacy on the Sunday, good men of all persuasions must have approved of their intentions : but in the sermon just quoted, there is a strong appearance of exaggeration in that respect ; and whatever the sober truth may have been, I cannot but think that had

* Lansdown MSS., No. 41 ; referred to by Collier, p. 254.

† “ Lansdown MSS., No. 71.”

‡ Collier, pp. 278-9.

§ Quoted by Collier, vol. i., p. 229.

the healthful recreations of country walks, rowing, and so forth, against which this worthy preacher is so eloquent, been put an end to, the *real* vices of the people would have been vastly augmented by what the Puritans would have called an increase of godliness.

We learn from Strype that Aylmer, who became Bishop of London in 1576, used to play at bowls on Sunday: indeed, adds the biographer, "it was the general custom, both at Geneva and in all other places where Protestants inhabited, after the service of the Lord's Day was over, to refresh themselves with bowling, walking abroad, or other innocent recreations; and the Bishop followed that which, in his travels abroad, he had seen ordinarily practised among them."* Other Sunday practices which were common in Elizabeth's reign, will by and by appear from Heylin's account of the objections brought against them by the Puritans.

In 1603, and even so late as 1625, we still find clear traces of the performance of plays and other public entertainments on Sundays. Heylin records that on the 7th of May 1603, King James so far yielded to the Puritans as to issue a proclamation, that "whereas he he had been informed that there had been in former times a great neglect in keeping the Sabbath-day; for better observing of the same, and for avoiding of all impious profanation of it, he straitly charged and commanded that no bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, or other like disordered or unlawful exercises or pastimes, be frequented, kept, or used at any time hereafter upon any Sabbath-day." Of this proclamation Heylin speaks approvingly, as intended to remedy "many things which were indeed strong avocations from God's public service. . . . Not," says he, "that the King's purpose was to debar himself of lawful pleasures on that day, but to prohibit such disordered and unlawful pastimes, whereby the common people were withdrawn from the congregation: † they being only to be reckoned for common plays, which at the instant of their acting, or representing, are studied only for the entertainment of the common people, on the public theatres. Yet did not this, though much, content them. And therefore in the Conference at Hampton Court (A.D. 1604), it seemed good to Dr Reynolds (who had been made a party in the cause) to touch upon the profanation of the Sabbath (for so he called it), and contempt of His Majesty's proclamation made for the reforming of that abuse; of which he earnestly desired a straiter course, for reformation thereof: to which he found (as the compiler of it tells us) a general and unanimous assent. Nor was there an assent only, and nothing done. For presently in the following Convocation, it pleased the prelates there assembled to revive so much of the Queen's Injunction, before remembered, as to them seemed fitting, and to incorporate it into the Canons then agreed of; only a little alteration, to make it more agreeable to the present times, being used therein. Thus then they ordered in the Canon, for due celebration of Sundays and holy days, viz.,—'All manner of persons within the Church of England shall from henceforth celebrate and keep the Lord's Day, com-

* Strype's Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of Bishop Aylmer, 1701, p. 216. See also p. 294.

† In Lancashire, as we have already seen (*ante*, p. 142), Sunday recreations continued to be practised in 1618.

monly called Sunday, and other holy days, according to God's holy will and pleasure, and the orders of the Church of England, prescribed in that behalf, *i.e.* in hearing the Word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offences to God, and amendment of the same, in reconciling themselves charitably to their neighbours, where displeasure had been, in oftentimes receiving the communion of the body and blood of Christ, using all godly and sober conversation.' The residue of the said Injunction, touching work in harvest, it seemed fit unto them not to touch upon, leaving the same to stand or fall by the statute of King Edward VI., before remembered. A canon of an excellent composition; for, by enjoining godly and sober conversation, and diligent repair to church, to hear the Word of God and receive the Sacrament, they stopped the course of that profaneness which formerly had been complained of. And by their ranking of the holy days in equal place and height with Sunday, and limiting the celebration of the same unto the orders in that case prescribed by the Church of England, shewed plainly their dislike of those Sabbath doctrines which had been lately set on foot, to the dishonour of the Church, and diminution of her authority, in destinating other days to the service of God than their new Saint Sabbath.

“ Yet did not this the Church's care either so satisfy their desires, or restrain the follies of those men who had embraced the new Sabbath-doctrines, but that they still went forwards to advance that business, which was now made a part of the common cause; no book being published by that party, either by way of catechism or comment on the Ten Commandments, or moral piety, or systematical divinity (of all which these last times have produced too many), wherein the Sabbath was not pressed upon the consciences of God's people with as much violence as formerly with authority upon the Jews. And hereunto they were encouraged a great deal the rather, because in Ireland, what time his Majesty's Commissioners were employed about the settling of that Church, *anno* 1615, there passed an Article which much confirmed them in their courses, and hath been often since alleged to justify both them and their proceedings. The Article is this:—‘The first day of the week, which is the Lord's Day, is *wholly* to be dedicated to the service of God; and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business, and to bestow that leisure upon holy exercises, both private and public.’—(*Art.* 56.) What moved his Majesty's Commissioners to this strict austerity, that I cannot say; but sure I am, that till that time, the Lord's Day never had obtained such credit as to be thought an Article of the Faith, though of some men's fancies. Nor was it like to be of long continuance, it was so violently followed; the whole book being now called in, and in the place thereof the Articles of the Church of England confirmed by Parliament in that kingdom, *anno* 1634.” *

In 1625, immediately after the accession of Charles I., an act was passed for the better observance of the Lord's Day; and from its preamble we learn that interludes, &c., still continued to be performed. The words are:—“ Forasmuch as there is nothing more acceptable

* Heylin, Part II., pp. 257-9.

to God than the true and sincere service and worship of Him according to His holy will, and that the holy keeping of the Lord's Day is a principal part of the true service of God, which in very many places of this realm hath been and now is profaned and neglected by a disorderly sort of people in exercising and frequenting bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, and other unlawful exercises and pastimes upon the Lord's Day; and for that many quarrels, bloodsheds, and other great inconveniencies have grown by the resort and concourse of people going out of their own parishes to such disordered and unlawful exercises and pastimes, neglecting Divine service both in their own parishes and elsewhere; be it enacted, &c., that there shall be no meetings, assemblies, or concourse of people out of their own parishes on the Lord's Day, within this realm of England or any the dominions thereof, for any sports and pastimes whatsoever; nor any bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, or other unlawful exercises and pastimes, used by any person or persons within their own parishes;" under the penalty of 3s. 4d. for every offence.* This, it will be observed, is only a partial prohibition of Sunday recreations.

After relating how Sabbatarianism was introduced into England and took root there, Heylin proceeds to mention some of the theological fruits which grew from this Jewish plant. "Some that built on their (the Puritans') foundations, and ploughed with no other than their heifers, endeavoured to bring back again the Jewish Sabbath, as that which is expressly mentioned in the Fourth Commandment; and abrogate the Lord's Day for altogether, as having no foundation in it, nor warrant by it. Of these, one Thraske declared himself for such, in King James his time; and therewithal took up another Jewish doctrine about meats and drinks: as, in the time of our dread sovereign now being (Charles I.), Theophilus Bradborne, grounding himself on the so-much applauded doctrine of the morality of the Sabbath, maintained that the Jewish Sabbath ought to be observed, and wrote a large book in defence thereof, which came into the world 1632. For which their Jewish doctrines, the first having received his censure in the Star Chamber, *anno* 1618, was set on the pillory at Westminster, from thence whipt to the Fleet, and there put in prison; and about three years after, writ a recantation of all his former heresies and schismatical opinions. The other was proceeded with in the High Commission; and hath since altered his opinion, which he renounced in the open Court, being misguided only by the principles of some noted men, to which he thought he might have trusted. Of these, I have here spoke together, because the ground of their opinions, so far as it concerned the Sabbath, was the very same; they only making the conclusions which of necessity must follow from the former premises." †

Bradborne's book is entitled, *A Defence of the most Ancient and Sacred Ordinance of God, the Sabbath-day*. It is dedicated to Charles I.; by whose command, and under the direction of Archbishop Laud, it was answered by Dr White, Bishop of Ely, in *A Treatise of the Sabbath-day, containing a Defence of the Orthodoxal Doctrine of the Church*

* Act 1 Car. I., c. 1.

† Heylin, pp. 259-260.

of England, against Sabbatarian Novelty, 1635. In this production, which is dedicated to Laud, the Bishop says of Bradborne:—"This man was exceedingly confident in his way, and defied his adversaries, loading them with much disgrace and contempt. He dedicated his book to the King's Majesty himself, and implored his princely aid to set up the ancient Sabbath. He likewise admonished the reverend bishops of the kingdom, and the temporal state, to restore the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue to its original possession. He professed that he would suffer martyrdom, rather than betray such a worthy cause, so firmly supported by the common principles of all who have in preaching or writing treated of the Sabbath. While he was in this heat, crying in all places where he came, *victory, victory*, he chanced to light upon an unkind accident: which was to be convened and called to an account before your Grace (meaning Laud) and the honourable Court of High Commissioners. At his appearance, your Grace did not confute him with fire and fagot, with halter, axe, or scourging; but according to the usual proceedings of your Grace, and of that Court, with delinquents who are overtaken with error in simplicity. There was yielded unto him a deliberate, patient, and full hearing, together with a satisfactory answer to all his main objections.

"The man perceiving that the principles which the Sabbatarian dogmatists had lent him, were not orthodox; and that all who were present at the hearing approved the confutation of his error; he began to suspect that the holy brethren who had lent him his principles, and yet persecuted his conclusion, might perhaps be deceived in the first, as he had been in the last. Therefore, laying aside all his former confidence, he submitted himself to a private conference; which by God's blessing so far prevailed, that he became a convert, and freely submitted himself to the orthodox doctrine of the Church of England, concerning both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day."*

Mr J. Payne Collier has published for the first time, from MSS. in the Library at Lambeth Palace, a statement that so late as 1631 the *Midsummer's Night's Dream* was privately performed on Sunday, 27th September, in Bishop Williams's house in London.† If such an event really took place, it is surprising that it did not figure prominently in the controversies of the day.

On the manner of spending the Sunday in Scotland, between the date of the Reformation and the accession of James VI. to the English throne, considerable light has been thrown by Principal Lee, in his evidence before Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee in 1832. "During the earliest times of the Church of Scotland after the Reformation," says he, "the Sabbath was not observed with the same strictness that it was at a period somewhat later. It is very commonly believed, that at the Reformation in Scotland, the leading individuals proceeded in general to an extreme as opposite as possible to the practices of the Church which had previously existed, and became righteous over much. I find this was by no means the case; in

* White's Treatise of the Sabbath-day; quoted in Brook's Lives of the Puritans, vol. ii., p. 363.

† Hist. of English Dramatic Poetry, &c., vol. ii., p. 30.

reality, the change was so gradual, and in some respects so imperfect, that at so late a period as the year 1574, about three years after the death of Knox, the practice of performing comedies on the Sabbath had not been altogether discontinued; and that it was occasionally allowed to proceed, under the countenance and approbation of some of those church-courts that might have been expected to be the most rigid in refusing to allow any encroachment on the sanctity of the Lord's Day. I shall, with the leave of the committee, state one instance. On the 21st of July 1574, this minute is inserted in the record of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews:—‘The said day, anent the supplication given by Mr Patrick Auchinlek, for procuring license to play the comedy mentioned in St Luke's Evangel, of the Forlorn Son (the Prodigal Son), upon Sunday the 1st day of August next to come, the seat (that is the session) has desired, first, the play to be revised by my Lord Rector Minister (the minister of the parish), Mr John Rutherford, Provost of St Salvator's College, and Mr James Wilkie, Principal of St Leonard's College, and if they find no fault therewith, the same to be played upon the said Sunday the 1st of August, so that playing thereof be not occasion to withdraw the people from hearing of the preaching at the hour appointed, as well after noon as before noon.’ I may add, that the services of the Church of Scotland at that period were not nearly so tedious as has been commonly imagined. The general practice was at first to have a short sermon in the forenoon, and to catechise the people during the afternoon. Soon afterwards, the practice was introduced of having two separate services, and generally there was catechetical instruction communicated in the evening. About the period to which I have referred, some very salutary regulations of a stricter character were introduced in the church-courts. I find in particular, in the record of the same Kirk-Session, that in the year 1574, a practice was introduced, of which the following account occurs:—‘For good order to be observed in convening to hear the Word of God upon the Sabbath-day, and other days in the week when the Word of God is preached, as well of the students within colleges as inhabitants of this city, and others in the parish, the seat (or session) has ordained captors (afterwards named searchers) to be chosen to visit the whole town, according to the division of the quarters, and to that effect every Sunday there shall pass a baillie (that is a magistrate) and elder, two deacons, and two officers armed with their halberds, and the rest of the baillies and officers to be in attendance, to assist to apprehend transgressors, to be punished conform to the acts of the Kirk.’ This practice was soon afterwards universally observed throughout all the towns of Scotland, and continued to be observed, I believe, with scarcely any interruption for 150 years.” Dr Lee is here asked, “Have you reason to believe that those comedies acted upon the Lord's Day were accompanied with the usual profligacy and desecration of sacred things which is generally characteristic of them?”—To which he answers, “I have no reason to think so with regard to this comedy; on the contrary, I believe it was intended to be a very sober kind of pastime, approaching somewhat to a religious observance; probably it was expected to be edifying to the people.”

—“The subject which was chosen being of a religious nature?”—
 “Yes.”*

The “salutary regulations” here quoted by Dr Lee from the record of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews, relate merely to attendance at public worship, and do not seem to have been directed against the liberty of the people to indulge in recreations while no church-service was going on. This refinement of ecclesiastical tyranny was not introduced till a somewhat later date. At the time under consideration, the mass of the clergy seem to have had no objection to Sunday-sports; and there were instances of ministers countenancing, by their own practice, what Dr Cook, with a strange affectation of puritanical sourness, calls “riotous amusement,” in going with their people on the Sunday evenings “to the bow-butts, and the sinful exercise of shooting with bow and arrow.” These words are quoted by Dr Cook, apparently from Wodrow; and he adds that “there is in the mass of the community more religion than existed then.”† Doubtless this is a fact; but much better evidence of it might have been given, than the abstinence of the present generation of Scotchmen from the aforesaid “sinful exercise” in which our forefathers indulged. The younger Dr M’Crie treats the ministers of those days in a much more genial spirit; and so, I doubt not, did his father before him. In his *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, the former observes:—

“The puerilities of James VI., his fond conceit of arbitrary power, and his ridiculous passion for intermeddling with Church affairs, have not escaped the notice of historians; but as an offset to these failings, some are fond of painting, in the most gloomy colours, the fanaticism and puritanic severity of the Presbyterians. That the Church courts did, in some instances, carry their notions of discipline to an excess bordering on intolerance, can hardly be denied; and considering the rude materials with which they had to deal, it is not at all surprising. But our forefathers were far from being morose ascetics, or foes to innocent amusement. Military exercises, athletic games, archery, and music, were commonly studied and practised, even by the gravest ministers.‡ Nor did they object to a little merriment, even in the midst of their most solemn assemblies. The commissioners of the Church having met at St Andrews to protest against the inauguration of Adamson as archbishop, one came in and told them, that ‘there was a corbie crouping’ on the roof of the church. ‘That’s a

* Q. 4087–8–9, pp. 267, 268.

† *History of the Church of Scotland*, by George Cook, D.D., vol. ii., p. 43. Edinburgh, 1815.

‡ “Speaking of John Dury’s week-day exercises, James Melville says,— ‘The gown was na sooner aff, and the byble out of hand fra the kirk, when onged the corslet, and fangit was the hagbot, and to the fields.’—*Diary*, p. 26. Of himself, honest James says,— ‘I lovit singing and playing on instruments passing weel, and wald gladly spend time where the exercise thereof was in the college; for twa or three of our condisciples played fellow weill on the virginals, and another on the lute and githorn. I had my necessars honestly enough of my father for archery and goff; but nocht a purse for catchpull and tavern.’ Private, or rather academic theatricals, of an innocent description, were likewise very common.”

bad omen,' said David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline; 'for inauguration is from *avium garritu*; the raven is *omnimodo* a black bird, and therefore ominous; and if we read rightly what it speaks, it will be found to be, *Corrupt! corrupt! corrupt!*'* A little of this hearty spirit might with advantage be borrowed by some of our present race of clergy, from these old worthies—whose superiority in learning † and good sense to their Puritanical successors, gives them a much better title to our respect and imitation (if we *must* imitate), than the narrow-minded Covenanters whom the people of Scotland are accustomed to idolize.

To the English Puritans about the close of the sixteenth century is attributable the effectual introduction of what is now reputed

* Sketches, 3d edit., p. 119; Edinburgh, 1844. Andrew Melville also, had much "good-humoured hearty pleasantry;" Life by M'Crie, vol. ii., p. 464.

† See extract from the Edinburgh Review, *ante*, p. 135; and Dr M'Crie's Life of Andrew Melville, vol. i., p. 98 *et seq.*, and vol. ii., pp. 273 *et seq.*, 311, 335; Edinburgh, 1819. Dr M'Crie shews that between the years 1590 and 1610, a number of foreigners, chiefly engaged in the cultivation of theology and the branches of learning connected with it, studied in the Scottish universities, especially that of St Andrews. These were Danes, French, Belgians, Germans, and Poles.—(Vol. ii., pp. 290, 490.)

Sir William Hamilton, in his Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, pp. 335, 337, 379 (reprinted from the Edinburgh Review, vol. lxiv., pp. 112–114, and vol. lix., p. 225), inquires into the causes of the low state of learning among the Scottish clergy of later times. He says:—"Though perhaps the country in Europe where religious interests have always maintained the strongest hold, *Scotland, in the history of European Theology, has, for nearly two centuries, no name, no place.*" [The italics are his own.] "For nearly two centuries, the home-bred clergy of Scotland, established and dissenting, among their countless publications of a religious character, some displaying great and various talent, have, with two" [Sir William here corrects the word to "*one*," which refers, I presume, to Dr Campbell] "not illustrious exceptions, contributed not a single work to the European stock of theological erudition; and for an equal period, they have not produced a single scholar on a level with a fifth-rate philologer of most other countries. In these respects, many a dorf in Germany or Holland has achieved far more than the broad realm of Scotland." (P. 379.) The *Sabbatarian* literature of Scotland is a prominent example of this melancholy truth—a truth which, to learned foreign theologians who visit us (as Tholuck did a few years ago), must seem strangely out of harmony with our custom of publicly thanking God for the extraordinary effulgence of Gospel light enjoyed by this favoured corner of His vineyard, in comparison with other lands. If the pious tourist who records with sorrow that in Utrecht, on the Sunday evenings, "all the genteel families go to their gardens in the vicinity of the town, where they indulge in every kind of amusement,"* had repeated to any village pastor in Holland what he adds in his book, viz., that "the Dutch seem to forget the Fourth Commandment," the reply would have been, that they remember not only the Fourth Commandment, but likewise a very important fact which *the Scotch* "seem to forget," viz., that the law to which the Gentile Christians are subject, is not the Mosaic but the Christian law.

I would not be understood to approve of the practice of *working* on the Sunday, which prevails to some extent in Holland; but I know nothing either in the Bible or in the law of nature, that makes it sinful to spend the Sunday evenings in an agreeable and refreshing manner, in suburban gardens.

* The Memoirs of Alex. Leith Ross, p. 238, quoted in Lorimer on the Sabbath, p. 20.

among "evangelical Christians" the orthodox doctrine in regard to the Sabbath. It is well known how strongly that earnest class of men objected to the hierarchy, ceremonies, and holidays of the Church, and how severely they suffered for disobedience to tyrannical laws made for the enforcement of conformity to the established mode of worship. Their highly justifiable resistance to what was then erroneously considered by churchmen to be a proper exercise of authority on the part of the Sovereign, caused them to be treated as rebels; while the barbarous usage they received, not only excited them the more to undermine by every practicable means the foundations of the Church that oppressed them, but enlisted on the side of them and their doctrines the sympathy of many who, though not of their body, regarded with favour every form of resistance to that arbitrary system of government which roused a wide-spread discontent among the best of the English people, and at length led to the subversion, for a time, of both Church and State.* The Puritans denied the Church's power to appoint *any* holiday to be kept; but they also knew the importance of the Lord's Day, and were deeply attached to it themselves. Any plausible mode, therefore, of providing for it a scriptural foundation on which *no other holidays* could be based, was sure to find a most favourable reception. The doctrine of the perpetual and universal obligation of the Decalogue was precisely what they needed: this was as eagerly swallowed by the multitude as it was confidently maintained by their leaders; and, to meet the obvious objection that not the first but the seventh day of the week is appointed by the Fourth Commandment to be kept holy, the theory of a change of the day by Christ and his apostles was for the first time formally propounded in England.

Heylin's narrative of these proceedings, though tinged with party spirit, appears to be a correct representation of the facts, and as such has been accepted by later historians.

"In the year 1595," says he, "some of that faction which before had laboured with small profit to overthrow the hierarchy and government of this Church of England, now set themselves on work to ruinate all the orders of it; to beat down at one blow all days and times which by the wisdom and authority of the Church had been appointed for God's service, and in the stead thereof to erect a Sabbath of their own devising. These Sabbath speculations and Presbyterian directions, as mine author calls them, they had been hammering more than ten years before, though they produced them not till now; and in producing of them now, they introduced, saith he, 'a more than either Jewish or Popish superstition into the land, to the no small blemish of our Christian profession, and scandal of the true servants of God, and therewith doctrine most erroneous, dangerous, and antichristian.'—(Rogers, in *Preface to the Articles*.) Of these, the principal was one Dr Bound, who published first his Sabbath

* "The English Reformers," says Coleridge, "evidently took the same view of the day as Luther and the early Church. But, unhappily, our Church, in the reigns of James and Charles the First, was so identified with the undue advancement of the royal prerogative, that the puritanical Judaizing of the Presbyterians was but too well seconded by the patriots of the nation, in resisting the wise efforts of the Church to prevent the incipient alteration in the character of the day of rest."—*Table Talk*, vol. ii., p. 316.

Doctrines, *anno* 1595, and after with additions to it, and enlargements of it, *anno* 1606; wherein he hath affirmed in general over all the book, that the commandment of sanctifying every seventh day, as in the Mosaical Decalogue, is natural, moral, and perpetual; that where all other things in the Jewish church were so changed that they were clean taken away, as the priesthood, the sacrifices, and the sacraments, this day, the Sabbath, was so changed, that it still remaineth, p. 91; that there is great reason why we Christians should take ourselves as straitly bound to rest upon the Lord's day as the Jews were on their Sabbath; for being one of the moral commandments, it bindeth us as well as them, all being of equal authority, p. 247. And for the rest upon this day, that it must be a notable and singular rest, a most careful, exact, and precise rest, after another manner than men were accustomed, p. 124. Then for particulars: no buying of victuals, flesh or fish, bread or drink, 158; no carriers to travel on that day, 160; nor packmen or drovers, 162; scholars not to study the liberal arts, nor lawyers to consult the case and peruse men's evidences, 163; serjeants, apparators, and sumners, to be restrained from executing their offices, 164; justices not to examine causes for preservation of the peace, 166; no man to travel on that day, 192; that ringing of more bells than one that day is not to be justified, p. 202; no solemn feasts to be made on it, 206; nor wedding dinners, 209; with a permission, notwithstanding, to lords, knights, and gentlemen (he hoped to find good welcome for this dispensation), p. 211; all lawful pleasures and honest recreations, as shooting, fencing, bowling (but bowling, by his leave, is no lawful pleasure for all sorts of people), which are permitted on other days, were on this day to be forborne, 202; no man to speak or talk of pleasures, p. 272, or any other worldly matter, 275. Most magisterially determined; indeed, more like a Jewish rabbin than a Christian doctor. Yet, Jewish and rabbinical though his doctrine were, it carried a fair face and show of piety, at the least in the opinion of the common people, and such who stood not to examine the true grounds thereof, but took it up on the appearance; such who did judge thereof, not by the workmanship of the stuff, but the gloss and colour. In which it is most strange to see how suddenly men were induced, not only to give way unto it, but without more ado to abet the same; till in the end, and that in very little time, it grew the most bewitching error, the most popular deceit, that ever had been set on foot in the Church of England. And verily I persuade myself, that many an honest and well-meaning man, both of the clergy and the laity, either because of the appearance of the thing itself, or out of some opinion of those men who first endeavoured to promote it, became exceedingly affected towards the same, as taking it to be a doctrine sent down from heaven for increase of piety. So easily did they believe it, and grew at last so strongly possessed therewith, that in the end they would not willingly be persuaded to conceive otherwise thereof than at first they did, or think they swallowed down the hook when they took the bait. An hook indeed which had so fastened them to those men who love to fish in troubled waters, that by this artifice there was no small hope conceived amongst them to fortify their side, and make good that

cause which, till this trim deceit was thought of, was almost grown desperate.”*

“By inculcating to the people,” he continues, “these new Sabbath speculations—teaching that that day only was of God’s appointment, and all the rest observed in the Church of England a remnant of the will-worship in the Church of Rome—the other holy days in this Church established were so shrewdly shaken, that till this day (1636) they are not well recovered of the blow then given. Nor came this on the by, or besides their purpose, but as a thing that specially was intended from the first beginning, from the first time that ever these Sabbath doctrines peeped into the light. For Doctor Bound, the first sworn servant of the Sabbath, hath, in his first edition, thus declared himself: that he sees not where the Lord hath given any authority to his Church, ordinarily and perpetually to sanctify any day, except that which he hath sanctified himself (p. 31); and makes it an especial argument against the goodness of the religion in the Church of Rome, that to the seventh day they have joined so many other days, and made them equal with the seventh, if not superior thereunto, as well in the solemnity of divine offices as restraint from labour (p. 32). So that we may perceive by this, that their intent from the beginning was to cry down the holy days as superstitious Popish ordinances, that so their new-found Sabbath being placed alone (and Sabbath now it must be called) might become more eminent.”†

“It is almost incredible,” says Fuller, “how taking this doctrine was, partly because of its own purity, and partly for the eminent piety of such persons as maintained it; so that the Lord’s day, especially in corporations, began to be precisely kept, people becoming a law to themselves, forbearing such sports as yet by statute permitted; yea, many rejoicing at their own restraint herein. On this day the stoutest fencer laid down the buckler; the most skilful archer unbent his bow, counting all shooting beside the mark; May-games and morris-dances grew out of request; and good reason that bells should be silenced from jingling about men’s legs, if their very ringing in steeples were adjudged unlawful. Some of them were ashamed of their former pleasures, like children, which, grown bigger, blush themselves out of their rattles and whistles. Others forbore them for fear of their superiors; and many left them off out of a politic compliance, lest otherwise they should be accounted licentious.

“Yet learned men were much divided in their judgments about these Sabbatarian doctrines. Some embraced them as ancient truths consonant to Scripture, long disused and neglected, now seasonably revived for the increase of piety. Others conceived them grounded on a wrong bottom; but, because they tended to the manifest advance of religion, it was pity to oppose them, seeing none have just reason to complain, being deceived into their own good. But a third sort flatly fell out with these positions, as galling men’s necks with a Jewish yoke, against the liberty of Christians; that Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, had removed the rigour thereof, and allowed men

* History of the Sabbath, Part II., pp. 249-252.

† *Ib.*, pp. 254-5.

lawful recreations ; that this doctrine put an unequal lustre on the Sunday on set purpose to eclipse all other holy days, to the derogation of the authority of the Church ; that this strict observance was set up out of faction to be a character of difference, to brand all for libertines who did not entertain it.”*

After some delay, during which the new doctrine spread thus rapidly, attempts were made by Archbishop Whitgift in 1599, and by Lord Chief-Justice Popham in 1600, to call in and suppress Bound's book ; “ yet all their care,” says Fuller, “ did but for the present make the Sunday set in a cloud to arise soon after in more brightness. As for the Archbishop, his known opposition to the proceedings of the Brethren rendered his actions more odious ; as if out of envy he had caused such a pearl to be concealed. As for Judge Popham, though some conceived it most proper for his place to punish felonious doctrines (which robbed the Queen's subjects of their lawful liberty), and to behold them branded with a mark of infamy ; yet others accounted him no competent judge in this controversy. And though he had a dead hand against offenders, yet these Sabbatarian doctrines, though condemned by him, took the privilege to pardon themselves, and were published more generally than before. The price of the doctor's book began to be doubled ; as, commonly, books are then most called on when called in, and many who hear not of them when printed inquire after them when prohibited ; and though the book's wings were clipped from flying abroad in print, it ran the faster from friend to friend in transcribed copies ; and the Lord's Day in most places was most strictly observed. The more liberty people were offered, the less they used it ; refusing to take the freedom authority tendered them. For, the vulgar sort have the actions of their superiors in constant jealousy, suspecting each gate of their opening to be a trap, every hole of their digging to be a mine, wherein some secret train is covertly conveyed, to the blowing up of the subject's liberty : which made them almost afraid of the recreations of the Lord's Day allowed them ; and, seeing it is the greatest pleasure to the mind of man to do what he pleaseth, it was sport for them to refrain from sports, whilst the forbearance was in themselves voluntary, arbitrary, and elective, not imposed upon them. Yea, six years after, Bound's book came forth, with enlargements, publicly sold ; and scarce any comment, catechism, or controversy was set forth by the stricter divines, wherein this doctrine (the diamond in this ring) was not largely pressed and proved ; so that, as one saith, the Sabbath itself had no rest. For now, all strange and unknown writers, without further examination, passed for friends and favourites of the Presbyterian party, who could give the word, and had anything in their treatise tending to the strict observation of the Lord's Day.”†

Jeremy Collier, also, relates these transactions, and adds—“ It seems some of the party run the doctrine to a scandalous extremity, and delivered frightful paradoxes in the pulpit. They were so hardy as to say, ‘ That to do any servile work or business on the Lord's Day, was as great a sin as to kill a man, or commit adultery.’ In Somersetshire, ‘ That to throw a bowl on the Lord's Day, was as

* Fuller's Church History, Cent. XVI., B. ix., § 21.

† Ibid, § 22.

great a sin as to kill a man.' In Norfolk, 'That to make a feast or dress a wedding-dinner on the same, was as great a sin as for a father to take a knife and cut his child's throat.' And in Suffolk, 'That to ring more bells than one on the Lord's Day, was as great a sin as to commit a murder.'**

In Scotland, where Knox and his party, following the lead of Geneva, suppressed all holy days but Sunday, (which, as we have seen, they wisely retained for its use in affording weekly opportunities of publicly worshipping God, hearing his Word preached, and communicating with his holy sacraments—as well as for the benefit of rest, recreation, and social enjoyment,) the change, it appears, although unaccompanied with Puritanical rigour, was displeasing to many of the people, insomuch that the two principal feasts of Easter and Christmas continued to be extensively observed during the remainder of the sixteenth century.† “As for the Lord's Day in that kingdom,” says Heylin, “I find not that it had attained unto the name or nature of a Sabbath-day, until that doctrine had been set on foot amongst us in England. For in the Book of Discipline set out *anno* 1560, they call it by no other name than Sunday; ordaining that upon four Sundays in the year, which are therein specified, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be administered to the people; and in the year 1592, an act of King James the Third, about the Saturday, and other vigils to be kept holy from evensong to evensong, was annulled and abrogated; which plainly shews that then they thought not of a Sabbath. But when the Sabbath doctrine had been raised in England, *anno* 1595, as before was said, it found a present entertainment with the brethren there, who had before professed in their public writings to our Puritans here, that ‘both their causes were most nearly linked together’ (Davison, p. 20); and thereupon they both took up the name of Sabbath, and imposed the rigour.”‡

That this new order of things had already obtained a footing in Scotland appears from the evidence of Dr Lee; who, in continuation of his answer to Q. 4089, in the Report of Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee (*ante*, p. 299), says, that soon after the time when the comedy was performed on a Sunday (1574),§ “such amusements as dramatic performances were not only discountenanced, but altogether prohibited on that day. I may here mention a specimen of the manner in which these profane amusements were denounced. On the 2d of March following, this minute is inserted: ‘The minister is ordained on Sunday next to charge all persons, speciallie young men, not to presume to violate the Sabbath-day by using of plays and games publiclie, as they were wont to do, contrefating the playis of Robin Huid, ex-

* Collier's Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain, 1714, vol. ii., p. 644.

† See Heylin, Part II., pp. 264–6.

‡ *Ib.*, pp. 266–7.

§ The date is so given in Dr Lee's evidence, but it must be a misprint, probably for 1594; for the Act of Parliament referred to was not passed till 1579, nor was the name “Sabbath-day” even then applied *in it* to the Sunday. In the extracts from the St Andrews Records, however, the word “Sabbath” appears in 1570, 1571, and 1572; but here also there may be some error of dates or transcription. As the Act of Parliament itself was unwarrantably altered in the seventeenth century (as we shall presently see), this Record may have undergone a like vitiation.

presslie forbidden by Act of Parliament.* I find in the same record, in the year 1595, ‘John Ross, master of the Song School, on his knees asked God mercy for using and playing a part of a comedy and play in St Leonard’s College, at the time of the last Batchelor Act. Mr John Echlin, regent to the Batchelors, and Mr John Douglas, pedagogue to my Lord Buchan, confessed, in presence of the session, that it was against their wills that the said play was played, and promised hereafter to stay and withstand all such things at their power, and never to do the like in time coming.’

“4090. Have you any reason to know what the character of the performance was, for the acting of which on the Lord’s Day that penance was undergone?—I have no reason to know; but I know that not long afterwards such performances were prohibited altogether. Thus, October 1st, 1598: ‘An Englishman having desired liberty of the session to make ane public play in this city, it was voted and concluded that he sal not be permitted to do the same.’”

In answer to Q. 4093, Dr Lee adds:—“I find that at those times kirk-sessions occasionally made regulations themselves, some of which I cannot ascertain to have been authorised by any Acts of Parliament; regulations in virtue of which *they not only imposed pecuniary fines,*

* The following is the Act referred to, which was passed in 1579 by the sixth Parliament of James VI. “His Majestie, and his three Estaites, in this present Parliament statntis and ordainis, that there be na Mercattes nor Faircs halden upon the Sabboth-day, nor zit within Kirkes or Kirk-zairdes that day or ony uther day, under the paine of escheitring of the guddes, to the use of the pure within the Paroche. And sik-like, that na handie-labouring, nor woorking, be used on the Sabboth-day, nor na gamming and playing, passing to Tavernes and Aile-houses, or selling of meat or drink, or wilful remaining fra their Paroche Kirk, in time of Sermon or Prayers on the Sabboth-day, be used, under the paines following: That is to say, of everie person, for the handie-labouring and woorking, commonly used be the purest sort, ten schillings, and for gamming, playing, passing to Tavernes and Aile-houses, selling of meat and drink, and wilful remaining from their Paroche Kirk, in time of Sermon or Prayers on the Sabboth-day, of everie person *twentie schillings*, to be applied to the helpe and reliefe of the pure of the Parochin. And in case of the refuse or inability of ony person offending in the premisses, to pay the saids paines *respectivè*, presentlie and indelaiedlie, upon their apprehension or conviction, after lauchful tryal, he or she *sal be put and halden in the stoks, or sik uther engine, divided for publick punishment, be the space of twenty-foure houres*. And for execution heirof, the Kingis Majesties commission of Justiciarie, sal be granted to some persone in every Parochin, best affected and maist abill to performe the same, *at the request of the Minister*.”—(*Acts of the Scottish Parliament*, collected by Sir Thomas Murray of Glendook, 1681, p. 207; or Alexander’s *Abridgement of the Acts*, p. 54.) This law was doubtless suggested, as its successors generally were, by the clergy. See Dr Lee’s evidence, Q. 4086.

The circumstance that “*the Sabboth-day*,” and not “*Sunday*,” is the phrase used in this Act, seems to refute Heylin’s notion that in Scotland the Lord’s Day did not acquire the name of the Sabbath till the Puritans gave it that title about ten years afterwards. Had this objection been urged fifty years ago, it would have been unanswerable; but the publication of Mr Thomas Thomson’s carefully-edited collection of the Acts of the Scottish Parliament from the original records, has since revealed the fact that Sir Thomas Murray took the liberty to adapt the Act to the public taste by changing “*Sunday*” (which is the word in Mr Thomson’s edition, vol. iii., p. 138) to the more acceptable phrase “*Sabboth-day*.” Mr Alexander, who copies the Act from Murray, has very properly adverted to the discrepance in a note.

and to a large amount, but likewise placed the offenders in close and rigorous confinement, and also occasionally inflicted corporal punishment. Thus I find in the book of the session of St Andrews, May 31, 1649, the following minute:—‘ James Allen, for breaking of the Sabbath, TO BE SCOURGED IN THE TOLBOOTH by one of the town officers, at the sight of the magistrates.’

“ 4094. Do you find in any part of the same period any protest against such infliction of punishment, in consequence of the regulations under which they inflicted that punishment not being supported by civil enactments?—No, I find no such instances; but it is proper to remark, that the kirk-sessions in towns, in those times, in all cases I believe, included a proportion of the magistrates, so that it might be under that mixed jurisdiction of a court composed of members partly ecclesiastical and partly possessed of civil authority, that those proceedings took place.* It is proper to add, however, that the kirk-session of Crail, though in this predicament, incurred the disapprobation of the Presbytery for exceeding their powers; and the Presbytery, in 1650, appointed them ‘ to refer to the civil magistrate the enjoining of corporal punishments or pecunial mullets.’ The moderator of the kirk-session at this time was Mr James Sharp (afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews), a man of an arbitrary disposition.”—(P. 269.)

In the Appendix to the same Report, pp. 299–306, are published some curious extracts made by Dr Lee from the Records of sundry Church Courts in Scotland, shewing how the laws against Sabbath-breaking were administered from 1570 to the beginning of the reign of George II. The following are specimens of the proceedings of the kirk-sessions during that period:—

St Andrews, June 6, 1599.—David Wemis, in Raderny (accused of dancing on Trinity Sunday), was “ ordained to be imprisoned in the steeple till he find caution to make repentance. He said that he never saw that dancing was stayit before, and that custom was kept in Raderny ere one of the session was born,” &c.

“ June 10, 1599.—David Wemis confessed his fault in dancing and profanation of the Sabbath.”

“ Aug. 24, 1600.—It is thought meet that the elders of landward advert that nane of the landward break the Sabbath in shearing, leading, or labouring of their corns in this harvest season approaching.”

“ Nov. 18, 1641.—Archibald Russell, in Wester Balrymont, and his servant woman, for leading corn on the Sabbath evening, were ordained to crave God mercy on their knees before the session, and to pay 40s. penalty, which was given to ane Gordon, a distressed woman come from Ireland.”

I may here mention that in the year 1590, the kirk-session of Glasgow, following the law of Moses (Lev. xxiii., 32), ordained that the Sabbath should be “ from sun to sun;” which they afterwards explained to mean that “ no work should be done from light to light in winter, and betwixt sun and sun in summer.”† Dr Lee gives some extracts from their records:—

* Dr Lee seems to overlook the fact, that magistrates had no power to exercise civil authority while acting as members of kirk-sessions.

† Wodrow’s Biographical Collections, printed for the Maitland Club, vol. ii.

Glasgow, Feb. 6, 1592.—“The Presbyterie has fund William Craig, at Walkmill of Partik, *to have been absent fra his kirk this lang time bygane*, and thairby to have contravenit his obligations, quhairin he obligat him, under the pane of ten merks, to keep his kirk on Sunday to heir God’s word, *is decernit to pay to the thesaurer of his kirk the said ten merks*, and to make his repentance in his kirk for absence fra his kirk the twa Sundays next to come, and that he be not absolved till he shew evident tokens of repentance, and *that he find suretie, under the pain of ten pundis, to be present to hear God’s word on the Sunday in tymes coming.*”

“May 7, 1594.—The Presbyterie of Glasgow statutes and ordenis that gif Mungo Craig sall playe on his pypes on the Sondaye fra the sun rising till the sun going to in ony place within the bonds of this Presbyterie, that he incontinent therafter sall be summarlie excommunicat. Lykwise statutes that upon the Sondaye in the said time, nane gif themselfis to pastimes and profane games within the said bonds, under the pain of the censures of the kirk; and this to be intimat furth of pulpit the next Sondaye be everie minister within this Presbyterie, and specialie be the minister of Ruglen.”—(P. 299.)*

Pittenweem, July 18, 1594.—“Because of the contempt of the Word, and evil keeping of the Sabbath, the session ordains, that the maister and maistress of every house, and sa mony as are of years and judgment (except when need requireth otherwise), *sall be present in the kirk in due time every Sabbath to hear the sermon before and after noon, under pain of 12d. the first, 2s. the second, and for the third 5s., also 5s. toties quoties thereafter*; as also for the third fault, to be debarred fra the benefits of the kirk till they make repentance as the session sall enjoin.”—(P. 300.)

Maclerty, June 26, 1625.—“It is ordained by the ministers and elders, that no banquet be in any brewster’s upon ane Sunday, under the pain of 40s.”—(Ib.)

An abstract is given of cases of Sabbath-breaking, found in the Record of the Session of St Cuthbert’s, Edinburgh. In 1587, David Dugall is censured for going to Cramond on the Lord’s Day morning with shoes—a delightful walk, by which he must have been greatly refreshed, and probably was enabled to visit his relations: repeating the offence in 1595, he is publicly rebuked, and obliged to find surety that he shall never be guilty of a similar offence, *under a penalty, for the first transgression, of 20s.; for the second, of 40s.; and for the third, of banishment from the parish.* In 1598, several persons in West Port, Potterrow, and Water of Leith, for profaning the Sabbath by “May games,” were referred to the bailies

part ii., p. 35.—Fifty years afterwards (August 18, 1640), “the session make a very strict act against profaning the Sabbath, and declare it to be from 12 on Saturday’s night to 12 on Sunday’s night.”—(Ib.) The Jewish way of reckoning still prevails in Massachusetts; see Combe’s Notes on the United States, vol. i., pp. 94, 116.

* In 1609, the town-piper of Aberdeen was admonished by the Moderator in presence of the kirk-session, to play no more on his pipes on the Sabbath-day; and a fiddler was at the same time prohibited from making *his* music on that holy day.—(*Selections from the Records of the Kirk-Session, &c., of Aberdeen*, printed for the Spalding Club, 1846, p. 68.)

of their respective districts. In 1599, five persons, for drinking in the country on the Lord's Day, were admonished, and obliged to find security for their good behaviour in future, under a penalty of 40s. In 1602, David Ochiltree, "for fishing on Sabbath, *and other crimes,*" was delivered over to the civil magistrate. In 1605, David Knipper was "*set at the pillar*" for *playing at bowls on Sabbath*. In 1610, three individuals were referred to the session for Edinburgh, for playing at the "penny stones" on Sabbath. In 1614, *several were fined 20s. each for playing at football on that day*. In 1619, Robert White, *for going to see the "May games," was fined 20s.* In 1620, this penalty was imposed upon two women for "flyting" (scolding) on the Lord's Day; and in 1625, upon three men for selling bread, one of whom was "imprisoned because he could not pay his fine." In 1630, several persons were fined 20s. *for taking "laverocks" (larks) on Sabbath*. In 1631, several, *for fishing on Sabbath,* were "fined 20s. each, *and imprisoned.*" In 1652, John Coutts and others were fined 40s. each "*for selling milk on the Lord's Day.*" In 1656, John Stevenson was fined and rebuked "for carrying beer to his house on Sabbath morning." In 1696, Elizabeth Thom, *for persisting to carry in quantities of milk to Edinburgh on the Lord's Day,* was publicly rebuked; and in 1698, Hugh Gray, *for sending his servant to Edinburgh with milk to sell on the Lord's Day,* was both rebuked and fined. There are also sundry cases of punishment for drinking, selling drink and bread, carrying water, shearing (reaping), fighting, keeping mills at work, and so on.—(Pp. 301–3.)

Considerable extracts are given likewise from the books of the "General Sessions," the "Six Sessions," and the "Five Sessions," of Edinburgh, exhibiting equally tyrannical encroachments by these spiritual courts upon the liberty of the people. In 1644, a fine of eight merks was exacted from John Walker, "for transgressing the Sabbath *in taking up webs in open view of the people,*" and the carrying of water from the Craig well through the college yard was prohibited. In the same year "the Six Sessions ordain public intimation to be made, that no person, man nor woman, *sal be found vaging, walking, and going upon the streets upon the Lord's Day after the afternoon's sermon,* keeping idle, and entertaining impertinent conferences. Nources and insolent gignets playing, jesting, sporting, and profanely spending the Lord's Day; with certification if hereafter they do not abstain, neither will be restrained, there shall be particular notice taken of some particulars, and these to be censured and punished to the example of others. *Item,* ordaines ilk elder and his deacon to visit by course the hail particular quarter whereof he is elder, and carefullie to observe that na taverns, ale cellars, or baxters' booths be kept open, but only to sell necessaries for present necessitie, and close up all again; and the delinquents to pay 12s. for the first fault, and to make public repentance for the second fault."—(P. 303.) Next year (1645), "it is appointed by the Six Sessions, that the magistrates, attended by the ministers by course, shall go up and down the streets upon the Lord's Day after the afternoon sermon, and cause take particular notice of such as shall be found foorth of their houses vaging abroad upon the streets, and cause cite them before the session to be rebuked and censured. *Item,* that some be appointed to observe, at Leith, the Abbey kirkyard, the Castlehill, and other places. *Item,* that the ballives of Cannogate and

Leith be requested to censure and punish vagers, and such as sal be found to transgresse in that sort the Lord's Day."* Shortly after-

* Similar ordinances against "vaging" or strolling, (which were sometimes even more stringent than the above,) continued to be proclaimed from time to time by the kirk-sessions till the end of George the First's reign. One of them was formerly quoted (p. 149); and among the extracts given by Dr Lee from the records of the "Five Sessions" I find the following, dated June 9, 1724: "It was represented to this meeting by several of the reverend ministers and other members, that IMMORALITY was grown to a very great height, particularly the profanation of the Lord's Day, by people crowding upon the streets to the Castlehill, the Greyfriars' churchyard, the High School yard, and other places, in time of divine service, as well as other times in the day; which being considered by this meeting, they named the following members, viz., the Rev. Mr William Mitchell, &c., as a committee to wait upon the honourable magistrates upon Tuesday next, to concert proper measures that may most effectually suppress IMMORALITIES, particularly the profanation of the Lord's Day. The meeting also recommended to the Moderator to speak or write to the Honourable Brigadier-General Preston, that he would be pleased to give necessar and proper order for preventing people's walking on the Castlehill upon the Lord's Day, especially in time of divine service."—(P. 305.)

I repeat that if such regulations as these of our pious kirk-sessions had been in force at Jerusalem at the beginning of the Christian era, our Lord himself, for walking through the corn-fields on the Sabbath—and even the Pharisees who were walking there when they met him—might have been marked for punishment by the perambulating "magistrates, attended by the ministers," or by "an elder or a deacon, with a beadle and officer!" In those days the gates of Jerusalem certainly were not shut on the Sabbath, to prevent all egress of the inhabitants; but our Six Sessions urged the addition of this to the other means of spiritual improvement of Edinburgh. "It is thought necessar," they say, August 5, 1646, "that the ports (gates) of Edinburgh sall stand closed from Saturday at night till Sunday at six o'clock at night, and none of them to be opened all the while, save only one of the south ports, to give way for watering of horse at morning and evening, at which time they must be attended by some faithful honest man, for restraining the people's forthbreaking, and thereafter to be closed. It is no less necessar that the magistrates of the Cannogate be careful to see that no back gates nor posterns or obscure passages be neglected or left open to give way to the people's outbreking."—(P. 304.) These suggestions were acted upon by the magistrates in 1650, when they ordered the gates to be regularly closed from Saturday at 10 P.M., till Monday at 4 A.M., except for an hour in the morning and another at night, for watering of horses; while vaging in the streets or repairing to the Castlehill was forbidden on pain of imprisonment, and farther punishment at the will of the magistrate.—(*The Coltness Collections*, printed for the Maitland Club, p. 368.) Nevertheless, the people still refused to have godliness thrust upon them within the walls; for we find that on 12th June 1655, public intimation was appointed to be made from the pulpits, "that all such as sall be found to profane the Lord's Day by vaging after sermon, going up and down the streets, some to the Castlehill, some to Yester's Kirk, and places thereabout, gardens and void places, for their sport and pastyme, throwing the cannon-stone, and such like unlawful pastimes and recreations on such days, sal be condynly censured and punished as efferis."—(*Report of Committee*, p. 304.) In 1656, it is announced that "persons vaging upon the streets upon the Lord's Day, chiefly in time of sermon, sal be apprehended and committed to prison by the authoritie of the magistrates, and severely punished."—(Ib.) On 5th April 1658, "the magistrates is to cause some English souldiers goe along the streets, and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold upon both young and old whom they find out of their houses or out of the church."—(P. 305.) So much for Edinburgh. At Glasgow likewise the gates were ordered to be closed, but only during certain hours of the Sabbath.—(*Wodrow's Biographical Collections*, printed for the Maitland Club, vol. ii., part ii., p. 36.) The effect of these

wards a widow, named Margaret Dickson, was accused of "trausgressing the Lord's day, *having spits and roasts at the fire in time of sermon.*" Having acknowledged the sin, she was ordained to pay two thalers (eight merks), "with certification that if she be found guilty of the like hereafter she shall be made to pay double, as likewise to be brought before the congregation to make public satisfaction."—(P. 304.)

From the Session Records of other parts of Scotland, we learn that measures similar to those above noticed were extensively employed for the promotion of Sabbath-observance. In Aberdeen, which has already been briefly referred to, an elder or deacon of the Church, if absent from the preaching, incurred a penalty of "twa shillings;" for "others honest persons of the town," the fine was sixpence. Nov. 24, 1575, it is ordained that "all persons being absent fra the preaching on the Sunday, without lawful business, and all persons gauging in the gait, or playing in the links [downs], or other places, the times of preaching or prayers on the Sunday, and all persons making mercat

stringent measures upon the morals of the people will be inquired into in a subsequent Note.

During the period referred to, the captors or searchers continued to ply their unpopular vocation on Sundays, not only in Edinburgh, but extensively throughout Scotland—instances of which appear in *Selections from the Records of the Kirk-Session, &c. of Aberdeen*, pp. 26, 27 (8th May 1603, and 7th May 1609); as well as in the Perth and Ayr Registers quoted below, and in Wodrow's *Biographical Collections*, vol. ii., part ii., p. 36. Dr Lee says he had not been able to ascertain that the custom of perambulating the streets in quest of Sabbath-breakers continued later than the year 1736 (Q. 4117, p. 273); but at Perth it survived at least till 1775 (see *The Spottiswoode Miscellany*, vol. ii., p. 244; Edinburgh, 1845); and in the West of Scotland (where fanaticism has always, since the Reformation, kept a firmer hold of the people than in other Lowland districts) it lingered till the beginning of the present century. This we learn from the evidence of the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan of Renfrew before the same committee. "It is an old Scottish practice," says he, "which I have heard often spoken of by those who lived a generation before me, and of which I have also heard much from the members of my own church, when I was a minister in one of the suburbs of Glasgow. Elders of our churches were, at the period to which I refer, accustomed to walk the streets in towns, two and two in turns, during the hours of divine service, to take notice of children or disorderly persons strolling about, and to attempt, by moral suasion, to induce them to go to their houses, or to go to church; and if those means were inefficient, *they were handed over to the civil magistrate.* This practice continued till, from an increase of population, an increase of vice," [an increase, he might have added, of men's knowledge of their rights, and respect for those of each other,] "and a growing want of support on the part of the magistrates" [who doubtless had better learned the limits of civil jurisdiction], "it was gradually given up; and I am not aware at this moment whether any society of the description now given exists in Scotland; but I believe, from the accounts I have had, that they did continue to exist till within a dozen years ago. I ought to have added, that this was not confined to the elders of the church, but that well-disposed individuals associated with them, took turn with them, and carried into effect those objects."—(Q. 3693, p. 229.) He adds (Q. 3700, p. 230), "It was in consequence of legislative enactments not being fully carried into effect, that the associations to which I referred gradually ceased to operate; the persons who went round to repress Sabbath abuse were often insulted, and being unsupported by the magistrates, gradually gave up acting as they did formerly, it having been voluntary and gratuitous." The practice is alluded to by Sir Walter Scott in the twentieth chapter of *Rob Roy*.

merchandise on Sunday within the town, . . . shall be secluded fra all benefit of the kirk unto the time they satisfy the kirk in their repentance, and [the] magistrate by ane pecunial pain."* Nov. 28, 1602, "the wife of James Bannerman, for working on the Sabbath-day [is] unlawit in 6s. 8d." "The same day, the session ordains that nae baxters within this burgh work nor bake any baken meat in time coming on the Sabbath-day." Four Aberdeen citizens were, Jan. 16, 1603, "unlawit, ilk ane of them, in 3s. 4d. for their absence fra the sermons on Sunday last, confessit by themselves."† On 8th November 1608, the citizens were dreadfully alarmed by an earthquake, on account of which a day of fasting and humiliation was appointed by the magistrates and clergy. The particular sin for which this scourge was thought to have been sent, was the custom of salmon-fishing on Sunday; and accordingly the proprietors of salmon-fishings were called before the Session and rebuked. Some, says the record, 'promieist absolutelie to forbear, both be thame selfis and thair servandis, in tyme cumming; utheris promieist to forbear, upon the condition subsequent; and sum plainlie refusit anyway to forbear, and sum wer not yit throughlie resolved.'‡ From the record of a previous "dealing" with these salmon-fishers, in 1606, we discover the grounds of the contumacy of some of them on this occasion: for "Maister Thomas Mengzies [one of those who "plainlie refusit to forbear"], being exhorted be the moderatour to sanctifie the Lordis Saboth, in abstening from the working of his salmound fischingis thairon, ansuerit, Quhen ane law sal be maid in parliament, or in ane conventioun of estates, prohibiting vniversallie throw this hail kingdome ony working of salmound fischingis on the Saboth day, he shall then obey the law; bot till the law be maid vniversallie, be autoritie and consent of the estates, [he] refusit to abstene from working of his fischingis on the Saboth day, alledging it wes lauchfull to him to fische thairon, according to vse and wount past memorie of man, till ane common law suld be maid in the contrar; and, farder, that it wes no prophanatioun nor brak of the Saboth to fische thair watteris thairon."§ Eight other independent fishers, who understood their rights, and were not disposed to let the clergy encroach upon them, gave the same reply; and as not even a threat against them is recorded, it would appear that the Session found their reasons unanswerable. Salmon-fishing, it is evident, was not considered by either party as falling under the prohibition of "handy-labouring or working" in the Act of Parliament passed in 1579. Even the awful warning of the earthquake had no effect on several of these unimpressible Aberdonians, who perhaps were so unreasonable as to desire some better evidence than the Kirk-Session's announcement, of its connexion with the practice complained of.¶ In

* Selections from Records of Kirk-Session, &c., p. 21.

† *Ib.*, p. 24.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 64.

§ *Ib.*, p. 51.

¶ "In a rude state of society, all great calamities are regarded by the people as judgments of God on the wickedness of man. Thus, in our own time, the priests persuaded a large part of the population of Chili, and perhaps believed themselves, that the fatal earthquake of 1822 was a sign of the wrath of Heaven for the great political revolution just then consummated in South America. In like manner, [in] the account given to Solon by the Egyptian priests,

1641, salmon-fishing on Sunday was forbidden from the pulpit at Old

of the submersion of the island of Atlantis under the waters of the ocean, after repeated shocks of an earthquake, we find that the event happened when Jupiter had seen the moral depravity of the inhabitants. (Plato's *Timæus*.)—(Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, 7th ed., p. 11.)

In the Kirk-Session Register of Perth, we read of “a fearful inundation of waters” which happened there on 16th October 1621, “compassing the same in all parts, so that thereby the brig of Tay was haily dung [thrown] down, except only one bow [arch] thereof standing.” The cause of this deluge was long-continued heavy rain, along with “a great tempestuous wind at the east.” “The like fearful inundation of waters was never seen at Perth in no living man's remembrance, which put the people in such fear that they looked for nothing but to have been destroyed; whereupon Mr John Malcolm, minister, powerfully endued with God's Spirit, caused ring the preaching bell on Sunday at seven hours in the morning [the flood having risen rapidly a few hours before], and the hail inhabitants came to the kirk. And there he exhorted them to repent for their sins, which had provoked the said judgment of God to come upon the city; assuring them that if they were truly penitent therefor, and would avow to God to amend their lives in time coming, God would avert His judgment, and give them deliverance. Whose powerful exhortations moved the people to cry to God with tears, clamours, and cries, and to hold up their hands to God [that they would] amend their lives, and every one of them to abstain from their domestic sins. The like humiliation both of men and women has not been seen within Perth before. Fasting, preaching, and prayers, continued all that week. Our pastor with great magnanimity insisted in exhorting the people to true repentance and amendment of their lives. The waters began somewhat to decrease after noon on Sunday; but after daylight passed there arose a greater tempest of wind and rain than at any time before, which so affrighted the people that night, that they looked for nothing but [that] the waters should have arisen to greater height nor they were before. Notwithstanding thereof miraculously, through the mercy of God, by [beyond] all men's expectation, the waters greatly in the meantime decreased, which in the morning moved the people in the kirk and all other places to give most hearty thanks to God for his mercy towards them.”—(*Spottiswoode Miscellany*, vol. ii., pp. 298–300.)

The Rev. John Parker Lawson, in his prefatory remarks to the Extracts from the Register just quoted, gives (*lib. cit.*, pp. 229–231) a far from flattering account of the Scotch Kirk-Sessions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. “The power of those Kirk-Sessions,” says he, “which are now private assemblages in whose meetings and proceedings the public take no interest whatever, is defined to be the cognisance of parochial matters and cases of scandal; but in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially during the Covenanting reign of terror after the outbreak of the civil war against Charles I., the Kirk-Sessions of Scotland were the sources of excessive tyranny and oppression—were arbitrary, inquisitorial, and revengeful, to an extent which exceeds all belief. It is truly stated by the author of the *Memoirs of Locheill*—‘Every parish had a tyrant, who made the greatest Lord in his district stoop to his authority. The kirk was the place where he kept his court; the pulpit his throne or tribunal from whence he issued out his terrible decrees; and twelve or fourteen sour ignorant enthusiasts, under the title of Elders, composed his council. If any, of what quality soever, had the assurance to disobey his orders, the dreadful sentence of excommunication was immediately thundered out against him, his goods and chattels confiscated and seized; and he himself being looked upon as actually in the possession of the devil, and irretrievably doomed to eternal perdition, all that convened with him were in no better esteem.’—(*Memoirs of Sir Ewen Cameron of Locheill*, 4to. Edin. 1842, printed for the Abbotsford Club, p. 87, 88.) They assumed and exercised the power of fining and imprisoning in the most capricious, unrelenting, and dogmatical manner, dictating to the municipal authorities, and conducting themselves as if they were infallible. . . . Another peculiarity of the Presbyterian Kirk-Sessions

Aberdeen, by direction of the General Assembly, under pain of eccle-

was, that they had no idea of toleration, and we accordingly find that they spoke and acted on the assumption that no other religion was ever to be allowed in the kingdom except that which they professed. *Persons who refused or wilfully delayed to communicate were summoned before the Kirk-Sessions, and fined or imprisoned.* Whoever was not of their way of thinking was branded by them as an enemy of the 'Evangel,' or they brought forward their usual, and at all times convenient, charge of Popery. All persons who were avowed or alleged Roman Catholics were expected to be punished by exile and forfeiture of their property. In minor matters, the preacher and his Kirk-Session took cognisance of almost every occurrence, whether frivolous or important. Those who played games on certain long-observed holidays were summoned before them, and imprisoned for contumacy if they refused to appear. Scolding and malicious scandal were also punishable, and absence from the preachings finable. It is not surprising, therefore, that multitudes even of the peasantry beheld the legal suppression of Presbyterianism in Scotland, soon after the accession of James VI. to the English Crown, without regret, and evinced no opposition to the establishment of the Episcopate. This was particularly the case with the citizens of Perth, as appears from these selections, and the only objectors appear to have been some of their ministers, who, however, merely opposed a few of the minor ecclesiastical arrangements. The worthy burgesses of the 'Fair City' unanimously conformed to Episcopacy."—(Pp. 229-231.)

As the foregoing observations are from the pen of an Episcopalian, the Presbyterian reader may suspect them to be highly coloured. In that case I recommend the perusal not only of the Records to which they are prefixed, but also of the minutes of the other Kirk-Sessions whose proceedings are referred to in the preceding pages. It may be well also to look at certain ordinances passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1642, 1646, and 1648, against Papists and other obnoxious persons; printed in the *Acts of the Assembly*, pp. 56, 141, 194. (Edin. 1843). By these ordinances the Roman Catholics were prohibited in a most tyrannical and cruel manner from the exercise of their religion, from instructing their children in what they themselves (who had the sole right to judge in the matter) regarded as religious truth, from associating with friends or priests of their own persuasion, and even from retaining any Papist in their service!

It is difficult to imagine by what perverse logic Dr Hetherington has been able to convince himself "that intolerance, in the right sense of the word, never was the characteristic of the Presbyterian Church. Expressions," says he, "of a severe aspect against that toleration which included all kinds of blasphemous and immoral licentiousness may be found in the writings of our fathers, and may be warped and misinterpreted by party writers; and we may even admit that they were not at all times sufficiently guarded in their language; but if anything like a fair allowance be made for the spirit of the times, and the peculiar circumstances amidst which they acted and wrote, THEY WILL STAND COMPLETELY VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF INTOLERANCE AND SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM."—(*History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 341.) The "fair allowance" here claimed must be large indeed: even in our own times of comparative freedom, a very considerable allowance is needed for the vindication of some of the Scottish clergy from the charge. As for Dr Hetherington's insinuation that the hostility of our fathers to the toleration advocated by the Independents was excited only by demands (made by fanatics and madmen) for the toleration of "all kinds of blasphemous and immoral licentiousness," this is amply refuted by facts already adduced. (See pp. 150-152.) I do not say that the Presbyterians were *peculiar* in their intolerance; but how any man who knows their writings, and understands what intolerance is, can deny that they *were* intolerant to a high degree, I am quite unable to understand. Why, even in the beginning of the eighteenth century, we find the General Assembly strictly prohibiting all persons to preach or disseminate any doctrine at variance with the Confession of Faith; and opposing almost frantically the giving of liberty to all sects to meet for public worship.—(*Acts*, pp. 329, 469, 502.) To

siaistical punishments. Spalding says that "this Assembly Act made

take an additional instance: Was it not an act of "spiritual despotism" to prohibit, as the minister of Perth did in 1595, a merchant of that town from visiting Popish countries in the course of his business? For on the 22d of December in the year mentioned, one Alexander Lawrie was, we find, interrogated by the minister of the Fair City, "if, in his last being out of this country, he had been in Spain: [he] answered, that he was in Portugal, but was never present at mass, neither gave reverence to any procession, and that he was never demanded by any concerning his religion. The said Alexander being removed and censured, *it was thought good by the Session that he should be admonished not to travel to these parts again, except that they were otherwise reformed in religion!*"—(*Spottiswoode Miscellany*, vol. ii., p. 274.) Three years before, namely in 1592, the ministers of Edinburgh (without, of course, at all becoming liable to "the charge of intolerance and spiritual despotism") prohibited the merchants there from "haunting and resorting to Spayne," alleging that they "could not make voyage to Spain without danger of their sauls;" in other words, that Protestant truth could not stand an encounter with Popish error. The merchants however paid no attention to this edict, and being cited before the Session were ordered by that tolerant body to yield all due obedience to the command. Upon this they complained to the king, who took them under his protection and gave them liberty to travel; "whereat the ministers were sa grieved, that they boasted [threatened] the merchants with excommunication. But the Provost and Council of Edinburgh Spanyards were addebted, whilk wad never be repayit unless they went themselves to make count and reckoning with them; and sicklike divers of them were owing to creditors there, and in that respect till their counts were perfyted and ended, they could not abstene from travelling. . . . Sa that for thir respectis the ministers had patience for that time, otherwise this matter had turned to a great popular scisme." The ministers were at the same time defeated in an attempt which they made to abolish the Monday's weekly market, on the plea that all who came to it "did address themselves to their journey upon Sunday, whilk day sould be sanctified and keepit holy. But," says the historian, "among many great unfallible reasons, it was funden that the maist part of the mercat folks did never address themselves to journey while [until] Monday morning, and therefore the mercat sould not cease; and as to these that came far off, it became the pastors of their parochin to hinder them. And beside all this, that mercat day was authorised to the town by the princes of ancient time, and therefore it became not a subject to consent to the abolition thereof, unless the matter were moved in presence of the three estates of Parliament."—(*Historie of King James the Sext*, printed for the Bannatyne Club, pp. 254-6.)

These particulars may recal to the memory of some a foolish attempt made in September 1850, through the influence, it is said, of certain Free Church ministers and other Sabbatarians, to alter from Monday to Tuesday the commencement of the Falkirk Tryst (our greatest sheep and cattle market, held thrice a-year in autumn); on which occasion many dealers resisted the change, and the business of the market was thrown into the utmost confusion. So great was the public inconvenience and indignation, that but for the restoration of the established practice, which was conceded with a bad grace in the following year, the market would in all likelihood have been destroyed for ever. "I heard," says a correspondent of the *Scotsman*, 14th Sept. 1850, "many cattle-dealers from England and other places declare that if the day were changed they could not attend the Tryst, as it would interfere with other markets. In fact, the general opinion of all present seemed to be that this important market would be ruined, and many and deep were the execrations uttered against the bigots who had interfered with it. I hope you will exert your pen against these follies, and give the Free Kirk clergy a lesson not to interfere with things quite out of their province." In the same paper an indignant "Stirlingshire Farmer" shews that such a change as the one attempted would not diminish, but

some obedience with great difficulty, for it was thought no sin to fish upon the Sabbath-day before.”*

By a stern act of the Aberdeen Town-Council, passed in 1598, a severe tariff of fines was ordained for various ranks of people on their staying away from Sunday and week-day services in the churches, every husband to be answerable for his wife, and every master for his servants. A burghess of guild or his wife was to pay thirteen shillings and fourpence for absence on Sunday. “Likewise, following the example of other weel reformat congregations of this realm, [the Council] statutes and ordains that the wives of all burghesses of guild, and of the maist honest and substantial craftsmen of this burgh, sall sit in the midst and body of the kirk in time of sermon, and not in the side ailes, nor behind pillars, to the effect they may mair easily see and hear the deliverer and preacher of the word; and sicklike ordains, that the women of the ranks foresaid sall repair to the kirk, every ane of them having a clock, as the maist decent and comely outer garment, and not with plaids as has been frequently used; and that every ane of them likewise sall have stoules, sa mony as may commodiously have the same, according to the decent form observed in all reformat burghs and congregations of this realm.”†

At Perth, Jan. 8, 1582-3, “it was ordained that an elder of every quarter [district] shall pass through the same every Sunday in time of preaching before noon, their time about, and note them that are found in taverns, baxters’ booths, or on the gaits, and dilate them to the Assembly, that every one of them that is absent from the kirk may be poinded for twenty shillings (Scots), according to the Act

might increase, the amount of Sunday travelling, and thus entirely disappoint the hopes of its promoters. “The Sunday travelling,” says he, “which was formerly near the Tryst, will take place at a day’s journey farther off, and the annoyance, if any, is shifted from your own door to your neighbour’s. In fact, the effect is more likely to be, that many who like their stock to go fresh into market, and who formerly travelled during the week that they might rest on the Sunday in the neighbourhood of the market, will now travel on Sunday and rest on Monday. Such is the result which this paltry meddling is likely to bring about. So ignorant are the clerical wire-drawers of the most common details of the business by which men earn their bread, that when they bring their theological erotehets to bear on them, they produce an effect directly the reverse of their object. . . . In a word, this obtrusive and meddling spirit of the Sabbatarians cannot be borne with much longer. Their false pretensions we could laugh at, and their offensive cant we could shut our ears to, but this deranging of the business-relations of life is not to be endured. In fact the influence of priestcraft is greater among us than our social well-being admits, or our pride will permit us to acknowledge. It has grown great, is growing, and must be diminished. As a quiet farmer hinted to me on the Tryst ground, if they go much farther we shall require a second Cromwell to put the house in order.”

Our free press is a better protection than either a King James or a Cromwell; and through it I am here contributing such aid as I can, to the difficult enterprise of driving back the indiscreet portion of the clergy to their appropriate sphere of usefulness, where plenty of much more creditable occupation may be found by them.

* Spalding’s History of the Troubles in Scotland, printed for the Bannatyne Club, vol. i., p. 306.

† Aberdeen Council Records, printed for the Spalding Club, vol. ii. p. 166.

of Parliament.”* Soon after, a married woman, named Hunter, is fined three pounds for her absence from church during the bygone year, and other three pounds for her absence during the time of fasting.—(P. 246.) In September 1585, tavern-keepers are subjected to a fine of 20s. for selling wine and ale in time of sermon.—(Pp. 251.) In 1587, the Sunday penalties are extended to the Thursday sermon.—(P. 257.) July 31, 1598, “Andrew Robertson, chirurgeon, being accused for breaking of the Sabbath by polling and razing of the Laird of _____, declared that he did it quietly at the request of the gentleman, without outgoing.”—(P. 276). He was ordained to make repentance, and warned for the future. It will be understood that under the designation of chirurgeon both surgery and the functions of the barber were embraced.—The Session also exerted itself to prevent Highland reapers from sauntering on the streets on Sunday, waiting to be hired (August 1593); and took strong measures to put an end to the practice of cadgers departing from the Saturday market on Sunday morning (March 1599). Four persons were rebuked in November of the latter year for “playing at golf on the North Inch in the time of the preaching after noon, on the Sabbath,” a sport which is not now indulged in upon Sunday in any part of Scotland.

Similar extracts from the Session Records of Ayr, are published in the Wodrow Society’s Biographies, vol. i., p. 45. In 1604 certain Sabbath-breakers were “ordanit to be put into the thefis hoal;” and in 1611, “it is ordayned be the Session that quhasoever beis found either upon ye hye gait, or on the hills, be the searchers, after that ye text be read be ye minister on ye Sabboth-day, they sal be committit as breakers of ye Sabboth, and sal satisfie accordinglie; and also that nane leave ye kirk befor the preaching be say’d, under ye kirk pains.”†

Dr Cook, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, gives the following account of King James’s Book of Sports, and the circumstances attending it. After recording the abortive attempts made by that “most dread sovereign,” whilst visiting Scotland in 1617, to establish there a conformity in worship and ceremonies with the Church of England, and to vest in his own person the whole ecclesiastical powers of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, he proceeds:—“Soon after this James left Scotland, mortified by the display of that spirit of resistance with which he had often struggled in his earlier days, but which he probably flattered himself had been extinguished; and disappointed that all which he had expected to accomplish by his presence was yet to be obtained. It was on his progress to London, when he was passing through Lancashire, that, perhaps to console himself for having been thwarted in making ecclesiastical regulations for Scotland, he declared it to be his pleasure, that his good people should not, after divine service, be discouraged from taking any lawful recreations; and in the following year (18th May 1618) he issued a proclamation, in which he enumerated these recreations. In this strange ordinance,

* Extracts from the Kirk-Session Register of Perth, in the Spottiswoode Miscellany, vol. ii., p. 243.

† Wodrow Society’s Biographies, vol. i., p. 47.—For cases in the Synod of Fife, see Selections from its Minutes, printed for the Abbotsford Club, pp. 17, 18, 21, 23, 29, 30, 32, 40, 126, 128, 131, 133, 137, 152, 158, 165, 181.

he commanded that his subjects should not be prevented, upon the Lord's Day, from dancing, archery, leaping, or vaulting,—from having May-games, Whitson-ales, morrice-dances,—in short he protected, by his royal authority, what would have rendered the religious services of the Lord's Day useless, and would have made that day a day of rioting and debauchery. Yet, that he might seem to be actuated by pious motives, he employed this indulgence, so shocking to a truly religious mind, as a means to insure attendance upon divine worship : for the amusements which he countenanced were to be enjoyed only by such as had been present in their own parish churches.*

“This act of his Majesty was regarded with much uneasiness by many of the English clergy, who dreaded that it would be extended to the whole kingdom. Numbers resolved that they would disobey, and the Lord Mayor of London even arrested the King's carriages, which, upon a Sunday, were passing through the city. His Majesty was at length induced not to persist in setting his authority in opposition to sound reason, and to the practice of the purest times of the Catholic Church ; and little more attention was paid to this matter till it was unhappily revived in the time of Charles, and increased the discontent, which every conscientious sacrifice should have been made to remove.† The intelligence of the King's proclamation was soon conveyed to Scotland, and it could not fail to impress the ministers who had resisted the pretensions of James, with the conviction, that, in doing so, they had indeed served the cause for which, in the love of truth, they contended and suffered.”‡

I have inserted this narrative of events formerly related at greater length (see pp. 144 *et seq.*), for the purpose of commenting on several points which it is difficult to pass over in silence. The reader who remembers what was said concerning the Book of Sports in a previous part of this volume, will be struck with the ingenious and not very candid colouring which Dr Cook has here given to the whole affair. In the first place, he gives us no intimation of the fact mentioned in the document itself, that the people of Lancashire had complained to the King of the obstruction of their accustomed recreations on Sunday by the Puritans—a reasonable complaint, which loudly called for redress. This representation of theirs, which, as we saw, naturally found a willing seconder in James's own deliberate opinion of the utility of popular recreations, is studiously kept out of view by Dr Cook ; and instead of it he substitutes his own mere *conjecture*, that “*perhaps* to console himself for having been thwarted in making ecclesiastical regulations for Scotland,” he declared his pleasure in the manner referred to.—Secondly, it is foolish or unfair to confound, as Dr Cook does, such healthful and innocent recreations as the Declaration specifies, with that “rioting and debauchery” which in fact they were *expressly intended to supersede* ; for one of the inconveniences spe-

* “Collier's Eccl. Hist., vol. ii., p. 711, 712. Rapin's Hist. of England, vol. ii., p. 194, 195. Calderwood's History, p. 686. Wodrow's MSS., vol. iii., in Life of Spottiswoode, p. 69.”

† “Collier and Rapin, as last quoted. Note by Tindal to p. 198 of Rapin's second volume. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 114, 115.”

‡ History of the Church of Scotland, by George Cook, D.D., vol. ii., pp. 281–283. Edinburgh, 1815.

cified in the Declaration, and thereby proposed to be removed, is, "that this prohibition (by the Puritans) barreth the common and meaner sort of people from using such exercises as may make their bodies more able for war when His Majesty or his successors shall have occasion to use them, *and in place thereof sets up tippling and filthy drunkenness*, and breeds a number of idle and discontented speeches in their ale-houses: For when shall the common people have leave to exercise, if not upon the Sundays and holy-days, seeing they must apply their labour and win their living in all working-days?" Whether such exercises as the King favoured, or tippling and filthy drunkenness, or even the political discussions which he disliked in the ale-houses, were most calculated to "render the religious services of the Lord's Day useless," I leave to the judgment of the reader.—Thirdly, Dr Cook ascribes to the King a base hypocritical motive, for which there is not a shadow of pretext: it was, forsooth, in order "that he might seem to be actuated by pious motives," that James "employed this indulgence as a means to insure attendance upon Divine worship." I cannot think that had so sensible a writer as Dr Cook perused with care the Declaration itself, he could have written so unfairly; for its words shew that this part of the measure was dictated by what must be allowed to have been the very natural desire to discourage *sectaries* from deserting the services of the Church of which the King was legally the Head. He barred from the liberty given to others "*all known recusants* who abstained from coming to Divine service, being therefore unworthy of any lawful recreation after the service, that would not first come to the church and serve God;" and as for those "who, though conform in religion, had not been present in the church at the service of God, before their going to the said recreations," and to whom the recreations were "in like sort prohibited," is it an overstretch of charity to believe that James thought the service of God as excellent an employment for one part of Sunday, as recreations were for another? The recreations, no doubt, are "shocking to a truly religious mind" which has been trained to regard them as sinful, but to *other* religious minds are not more shocking than the desecration of *Christmas* or *Good Friday* (so offensive to the generality of "truly religious minds" in England), is to religious minds in Presbyterian Scotland. Dr Cook thinks that in these proceedings the King was "setting his authority in opposition to *sound reason*:" this is a matter of opinion, about which it is allowable to differ. His statement that the King acted in opposition to "the practice of the purest times of the Catholic Church," raises two questions: When *were* those purest times? and what harm was there in acting contrary to the practice of even the purest times, if he had, as some think, *good reason* to do so? If the first three centuries of the Christian Church are to be reckoned the purest, it might have puzzled Dr Cook to prove that the recreations protected by King James were excluded from "the practice" which then prevailed. If proof exists, let those bring it forward who can. I wish, moreover, that somebody would throw light upon the story—borrowed by Dr Cook from Rapin's annotator, who adduces for it only the miserable authority of Arthur Wilson (concerning whom see *ante*, p. 146-7) in Kennet's collection, vol. ii., p. 709—about the Lord Mayor arresting the King's

carriages when passing through London on a Sunday. By virtue of what law could the Lord Mayor of London prevent the King's carriages from travelling at any time along the King's highway?*

The republication of the Book of Sports by Charles I., and the proceedings consequent upon that measure, occasioned a flood of theological controversy about the Sabbath, in the course of which a vast

* Dr Hetherington, speaking of the revival of the Book of Sports by Charles I., says that "notwithstanding the employment of both power and guile, the people, in a great many instances, refused to turn God's appointed times of holy rest into periods of Popish or heathen saturnalia."—(*The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 283.) When, where, and by whom were the people required to engage in Sunday sports on the occasion referred to? The evidence formerly adduced on the subject (pp. 146–148) appears to shew conclusively, that the object of the Declaration called the Book of Sports was not the imposition of sports upon the people, but merely the protection of such as were themselves desirous to enjoy their accustomed Sunday recreations, against the lawless and oppressive interference of the Puritans; and since the pages referred to were printed, I have had the satisfaction of observing that Southey, who had taken what seems to be the very rarely taken trouble to read the Book of Sports (for I find a considerable extract from it in his *Common-Place Book*, 1849, p. 18), regards the matter precisely as my own researches had led me to do. In his *Book of the Church*, ch. xvii, p. 447, 4th ed., writing of Archbishop Laud, he says:—"At the same time he was loudly arraigned for profaneness, because the King, as his father had done before him, published a Declaration authorising lawful sports on Sundays, in opposition to the Sabbatarian notions with which the Puritans were possessed. These factious people, although impatient of any observances which the institutions of their country enjoined" [for which I do not blame them, whatever Southey may have done], "were willing to have imposed upon themselves and others obligations far more burthensome: they would have taken Moses for their lawgiver, so ill did they understand the spirit of the Gospel; and they adopted the rabbinical superstitions concerning the Sabbath, overlooking or being ignorant that the Sabbath was intended to be not less a day of recreation than of rest.

"The motives for this Declaration were unobjectionably good; but the just liberty which in happier times, and under proper parochial discipline, would have been in all respects useful, proved injurious in the then distempered state of public feeling. It displeased the well-intentioned part of the Calvinised Clergy, and it was abused in officious triumph by those who were glad of an opportunity for insulting the professors of a sour and dismal morality."

An illustration of this concluding remark is afforded by an extract from Baxter, inserted *ante*, p. 143.

In reference to the exposure formerly given of some gross misrepresentations in Wilson's *History of the Life and Reign of King James I.*, and in order to put modern compilers further on their guard against believing too readily the party writers of the reign of Charles I., I shall here extract the account given by Rushworth in the preface to his first volume, of the tricks which then abounded. "Posterity," says he, "should know that some durst write the truth; whilst other men's fancies were more busy than their hands, forging relations, building and battering castles in the air; publishing speeches as spoken in Parliament which were never spoken there; printing Declarations which were never passed; relating battles which were never fought, and victories which were never obtained; dispersing letters which were never writ by the authors; together with many such contrivances, to abet a party or interest. *Pudet hæc opprobria.* Such practices, and the experience I had thereof, and the impossibility for any man in after-ages to ground a true history, by relying on the printed pamphlets in our days which passed the press whilst it was without control, obliged me to all the pains and charge I have been at for many years together, to make a great collection; and whilst things were fresh in memory, to separate truth from falsehood, things real from things fictitious or imaginary."—(P. iii.)

diversity of opinions were maintained. The leading varieties are stated in a tabular form by Fuller;* and Dr Owen presents the following instructive summary of the debated questions, in his *First Exercitation concerning the Day of Sacred Rest*:—

“The controversies,” says he, “about the Sabbath (as we call it at present for distinction’s sake, and to determine the subject of our discourse), which have been publicly agitated, are universal as to all its concerns. Neither name nor thing is by all agreed on; for whereas most Christians acknowledge (we may say all, for those by whom it is denied are of no weight, nor scarce of any number), that a day on one account or other in the hebdomadal revolution of time, is to be set apart to the public worship of God, yet how that day is to be called, is not agreed amongst them. Neither is it granted, that it hath any name affixed to it by any such means, that should cause it justly to be preferred to any other that men should arbitrarily consent to call it by. The names which have been, and amongst some are still in use for its denotation and distinction, are the seventh day, the Sabbath, the Lord’s day, the first day of the week, Sunday; so’ was the day now commonly observed called of old by the Grecians and Romans, before the introduction of religious worship into it. And this name some still retain, as a thing indifferent; others suppose it were better to let it fall into utter disuse.

“The controversies about the thing itself are various, and respect all the concerns of the day inquired after. Nothing that relates to it, no part of its respect to the worship of God, is admitted by all uncontented about. For it is debated amongst all sorts of persons—

“1. Whether any part of time be naturally and morally to be separated and set apart to the solemn worship of God; or which is the same, whether it be a natural and moral duty to separate any part of time in any revolution of it, unto divine service. I mean, so as it should be stated and fixed in a periodical revolution; otherwise to say, that God is solemnly to be worshipped, and yet that no time is required thereunto, is an open contradiction.

“2. Whether such a time supposed, be absolutely and originally moral, or made so by positive command, suited unto general principles, and intimations of nature. And under this consideration also, a part of time is called moral metonymically from the duty of its observance.

“3. Whether on supposition of some part of time so designed, the space or quantity of it have its determination or limitation morally; or merely by law positive or arbitrary. For the observance of some part of time may be moral, and the *quota pars* arbitrary.

“4. Whether every law positive of the Old Testament were absolutely ceremonial, or whether there may not be a law moral positive, as given to, and binding on all mankind; though not absolutely written in the heart of man by nature; that is, whether there be no morality in any law, but what is a part of the law of creation.

“5. Whether the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath was from the beginning of the world, and before the fall of man, or whether it wore first appointed when the Israelites came into the

* Church History, B. xi., Cent. xvii., § 33.

wilderness. This in itself is only a matter of fact ; yet such, as whereon the determination of the point of right, as to the universal obligation unto the observance of such a day, doth much depend ; and therefore hath the investigation and true stating of it, been much laboured in and after, by learned men.

“ 6. Upon a supposition of the institution of the Sabbath from the beginning, whether the additions made, and observances annexed unto it at the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, with the ends whereunto it was then designed, and the uses whereunto it was employed, gave unto the seventh day a new state distinct from what it had before ; although naturally the same day was continued as before. For if they did so, that new state of the day seems only to be taken away under the New Testament ; if not, the day itself seems to be abolished ; for that some change is made therein, from what was fixed under the Judaical economy, cannot modestly be denied.

“ 7. Whether in the fourth commandment, there be a foundation of a distinction between a seventh day in general, or one day in seven ; and that seventh day which was the same numerically and precisely from the foundation of the world. For whereas an obligation unto the strict observance of that day precisely, is, as we shall prove, plainly taken away in the Gospel ; if the distinction intimated be not allowed, there can be nothing remaining obligatory unto us in that command, whilst it is supposed that that day is at all required therein. Hence,

“ 8. It is especially inquired, whether a seventh day, or one day in seven, or in the hebdomadal cycle, be to be observed holy unto the Lord, on the account of the fourth commandment.

“ 9. Whether under the New Testament all religious observance of days be so taken away, as that there is no divine obligation remaining for the observance of any one day at all ; but that, as all days are alike in themselves, so are they equally free to be disposed of, and used by us, as occasion shall require. For if the observance of one day in seven be not founded in the law of nature, expressed in the original positive command concerning it ; and if it be not seated morally in the fourth commandment ; it is certain that the necessary observance of it is now taken away.

“ 10. On the other extreme, whether the seventh day from the creation of the world, or the last day of the week, be to be observed precisely under the New Testament by virtue of the fourth commandment, and no other. The assertion hereof supposeth that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath,* hath neither changed nor reformed any thing in or about the religious observance of a holy day of rest unto the Lord ; whence it follows, that such an observance can be no part or act of evangelical worship properly so called, but only a moral duty of the law.

“ 11. Whether on the supposition of a non-obligation in the law unto the observance of the seventh day precisely, and of a new day to be observed weekly under the New Testament, as the Sabbath of the Lord, on what ground it is so to be observed—

“ 12. Whether of the fourth commandment as unto one day in

* Here a *proper* use is made of the phrase “ Lord of the Sabbath ;” very differently from the practice of our modern Sabbatarians, adverted to *ante*, pp. 160, 247.

seven, or only as unto some part or portion of time, or whether without any respect unto that command as purely ceremonial. For granting, as most do, the necessity of the observance of such a day, yet some say, that it hath no respect at all to the fourth decalogical precept, which is totally and absolutely abolished with the residue of Mosaical institutions; others, that there is yet remaining in it an obligation unto the sacred separation of some portion of our time unto the solemn service of God, but indetermined; and some that it yet precisely requires the sanctification of one day in seven.*

“ 13. If a day be so to be observed, it is inquired, on what ground, or by what authority, there is an alteration made from the day observed under the Old Testament, unto that now in use; that is, from the last to the first day of the week: whether was this translation of the solemn worship of God made by Christ and his apostles, or by the primitive church. For the same day might have been still continued, though the duty of its observance might have been fixed on a new reason and foundation. For although our Lord Jesus Christ totally abolished the old solemn worship required by the law of commandments contained in ordinances, and by his own authority introduced a new law of worship according to institutions of his own, yet might obedience unto it in a solemn manner have been fixed unto the former day.

“ 14. If this were done by the authority of Christ and his apostles, or be supposed so to be, then it is inquired, whether it were done by the express institution of a new day, or by a directive example, sufficient to design a particular day, no institution of a new day being needful. For if we shall suppose that there is no obligation unto the observance of one day in seven indispensably abiding on us, from the morality of the fourth command, we must have an express institution of a new day, or the authority of it is not divine; and on the supposition that that is so, no such institution is necessary, nor can be properly made, as to the whole nature of it.

“ 15. If this alteration of the day were introduced by the primitive church; then it is inquired, whether the continuance of the observance of one day in seven be necessary or not. For what was appointed thereby, seems to be no farther obligatory unto the churches of succeeding ages, than their concernment lies in the occasions and reasons of their determinations.

“ 16. If the continuance of one day in seven, for the solemn worship of God, be esteemed necessary in the present state of the church, then, whether the continuance of that now in general use, namely the first day of the week, be necessary or not; or whether it may not be lawfully changed to some other day. And sundry other the like inquiries are made about the original institution, nature, use, and continuance of a day of sacred rest unto the Lord.

“ Moreover, amongst those who do grant that it is necessary, and that indispensably so, as to the present church-state, which is under

* How completely and happily we are delivered from the necessity of attending to these scholastic subtilties about the degree of efficacy still remaining in the Fourth Commandment, by the plain dictate of common sense, that the Mosaic Law, having been promulgated to the Jews only (*ante*, p. 164), is not, and never was, obligatory on the Gentiles!

an obligation from whence-ever it arise, neither to alter nor omit the observance of a day every week for the public worship of God, wherein a cessation from labour, and a joint attendance unto the most solemn duties of religion, are required of us; it is not agreed, whether the day itself, or the separation of it to its proper use and end, be any part in itself of divine worship, or be so merely relatively, with respect unto the duties to be performed therein. And as to those duties themselves, they are not only variously represented, but great contention hath been about them, and the manner of their performances, as likewise concerning the causes and occasions which may dispense with our attendance unto them. Indeed herein lies secretly the *μῆλον ἔριδος*,* and principal cause of all the strife that hath been, and is in the world about this matter. Men may teach the doctrine of a Sabbatical rest on what principles they please, deduce it from what original they think good, if they plead not for an exactness of duty in its observance; if they enjoin not a religious careful attendance on the worship of God, in public and private, on the consciences of other men; if they require not a watchfulness against all diversions and avocations from the duties of the day; they may do it without much fear of opposition. For all the concernments of doctrines and opinions which tend unto practice are regulated thereby, and embraced or rejected, as the practice pleaseth or displeaseth that they lead unto.

“Lastly: On a precise supposition that the observance of such a day is necessary upon divine precept or institution, yet there is a controversy remaining, about fixing its proper bounds as to its beginning and ending. For some would have this day of rest measured by the first constitution and limitation of time, unto a day from the creation; namely from the evening of the day preceding unto its own; as the evening and the morning were said to be *יום אחד* ‘one day,’ Gen. i. 5. Others admit only of that proportion of time, which is ordinarily designed to our labour on six days of the week; that is, from its own morning to its own evening, with the interposition of such diversions as our labour on other days doth admit and require.”†

Among all these perplexing varieties of opinion, *one* had the good fortune to be preferred by the divines who assembled at Westminster; and to this chance the Scottish Presbyterians have ever since been indebted for the advantage or disadvantage of regarding *that* variety as God’s truth.‡ But to those who think themselves as competent

* The apple of discord.

† Preliminary Exercitations to Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ed. 1840, pp. 603–606; Exerc. xxxvi., § 4, 5, 6.—The Exercitations on the Sabbath were originally published *separately*, in 1672. See remarks upon them in Orme’s Life of Owen, pp. 267–270.

‡ The doctrine of the Westminster Confession about the Sabbath is as follows:—“As it is of the law of nature that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God, so in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath to be kept holy unto him, which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord’s Day, and is to be continued to the

judges of the teaching of Scripture about a Day of Sacred Rest as the Puritan divines of the seventeenth century were, and who have found reason to interpret it differently, it cannot but seem preposterous to be imperiously told at railway meetings (as we half-yearly are in Scotland), that in opposing the Sabbatarian notions of those divines, which are nowise the more infallibly true because they are held also by the Puritans of the present day, the standard of rebellion is raised against the Supreme Being himself. They will agree with Dr Owen in thinking that "nothing is more nauseous than magisterial dictates in sacred things, without an *evident* deduction and confirmation of assertions from Scripture testimonies. Some men," says he, "write as if they were inspired or dreamed that they had obtained to themselves a Pythagorean reverence. *Their writings are full of strong authoritative assertions arguing the good opinion they have of themselves, which I wish did not include an equal contempt of others. But any thing may be easily affirmed, and as easily rejected.*"*

Is it possible for any impartial person who can and does *think* upon the subject, to believe that if Jesus Christ had intended to impose upon his disciples the duty of observing the first day of the week either as a Sabbath or as a day of worship, *he would not have enjoined this observance, and taken care that his injunction should be recorded?* Would he have left room for endless disputations among even the most learned and truth-loving of his followers, about a matter so important to all, and respecting which the illiterate as well as the learned might have expected to find no difficulty in ascertaining the truth? Yet the acute Dr Owen, unstaggered by the absence of a recorded command, or by St Paul's express sanction of the esteeming of every day alike, †

end of the world as the Christian Sabbath. This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs before-hand, do not only observe a holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations, but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy."—(*Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. 21, sections 7 and 8. See also the Larger Catechism, Q. 115–121, and Shorter Catechism, Q. 57–62.)

"This account," says Dr Cook, "of the obligation of the Christian Sabbath, and of the mode of keeping it, is founded altogether upon the idea that, with the exception of the change of day, the Fourth Commandment is binding upon Christians; and the passages of Scripture which the framers of the Confession adduce in support of their views, are those which were applicable to the Jewish Sabbath, none, indeed, being contained in the New Testament, the notion which they are urged to support not having, as has been observed, appeared in the Christian Church till a considerable period after the introduction of Christianity."—(*General and Historical View of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 316.)

* Op. cit. p. 607, § 8.

† The only passage in which Dr Owen recognises the existence of Rom. xiv. is this:—"We have the like common consent that whatever in the institution and observance of the Sabbath under the Old Testament, was peculiar unto that state of the Church, either in its own nature, or in its use and signification, or in its manner of observance, is taken away by virtue of those rules, Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16, 17."—(*Exerc. xxxix.*, § 29, p. 723.) After what was said formerly about Rom. xiv. 5 (see p. 58), it is hardly necessary to state that I consider Dr Owen's omission to look this passage fairly in the face, as a tacit avowal that he could not encounter it, and a proof that he had too much honesty and self-respect to substitute bluster for argument.

—and after coming to the conclusion “that the Mosaic Sabbath and the manner of its observance is under the gospel utterly taken away,”*—finds it possible to deduce from the ordinary fanciful grounds (such as, that “on this day our Lord Jesus Christ *rested from his works* in and by his resurrection,” and that this “indication of the gospel day of rest and worship was embraced by the apostles”), the conclusion that the observance of the weekly Sabbath, which he maintains to be an institution founded on “the law of our creation, reinforced in the Decalogue, the summary representation of that great original law,” is “*a moral duty, which by divine authority is translated unto another day.*”†

Just a year before the publication of Owen’s work on the Day of Sacred Rest, Baxter produced his Treatise on the same subject, mentioned in a previous page.‡ In the preface he mentions that the reason of his writing it “was the necessity and request of some very upright, godly persons, who are lately fallen into doubt or error, in point of the Sabbath-day; conceiving, that because the fourth commandment was written in stone, it is wholly unchangeable, and consequently the Seventh-day Sabbath in force, and that the Lord’s-day is not a day separated by God to holy worship. I knew,” says he, “that there was enough written on this subject long ago; But, 1. Much of it is in Latin. 2. Some writings which prove the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, do withal treat so loosely of the Lord’s-day, as that they require a confutation in the latter, as well as a commendation for the former. 3. Some are so large, that the persons that I write for, will hardly be brought to read them. 4. Most go upon those grounds, which I take to be less clear; and build so much more than I can do on the fourth commandment and on many passages of the Old Testament, and plead so much for the old sabbatical notion and rest, that I fear this is the chief occasion of many people’s errors; who when they find themselves in a wood of difficulties, and nothing plain and convincing that is pleaded with them, do therefore think it safest to stick to the old Jewish Sabbath. The friends and acquaintance of some of these persons importuning me to take the plainest and nearest way to satisfy such honest doubters, I have here done it according to my judgment: not contending against any that go another way to work, but thinking myself that this is very clear and satisfactory; viz. to prove, 1. That Christ did commission his apostles to teach us all things which he commanded, and to settle orders in his church. 2. And that he gave them his Spirit to enable them to do

* Op. cit. p. 706; Exerc. xxxviii., § 18.

† *Ib.*; and Exerc. xxxix. § 9, 10.—It is startling to find a writer so eminent and so modern as Dr Owen characterising the Copernican System as “the late hypothesis fixing the sun as in the centre of the world, *built on fallible phenomena, and advanced by many arbitrary presumptions*, AGAINST EVIDENT TESTIMONIES OF SCRIPTURE, and reasons as probable as any which are produced in its confirmation.”—(Exerc. xxxvi., § 16, p. 636.) These remarkable words were published thirty years after the death of Galileo, and as many after the birth of Newton, who for three years had been lecturing at Cambridge as the successor of Dr Isaac Barrow!

‡ See *ante*, p. 121. Its title is “The Divine Appointment of the Lord’s Day, proved; as a Separated Day for Holy Worship, especially in the Church-Assemblies: and consequently the Cessation of the Seventh-day Sabbath. 1671.”

all this infallibly, by bringing all his words to their remembrance, and by leading them into all truth. 3. And that his apostles by this Spirit did *de facto* separate the Lord's-day for holy worship, especially in church-assemblies, and declared the cessation of the Jewish Sabbaths. 4. And that as this change had the very same author as the holy Scriptures (the Holy Ghost in the apostles), so that fact hath the same kind of proof, that we have of the canon and the integrity and uncorruptness of the particular Scripture-books and texts: and that, if so much Scripture as mentioneth the keeping of the Lord's-day, expounded by the consent and practice of the universal Church from the days of the apostles, (all keeping this day as holy, without the dissent of any one sect, or single person, that I remember to have read of), I say, if history will not fully prove the point of fact, that this day was kept in the apostles' times, and consequently by their appointment, then the same proof will not serve to evince that any text of Scripture is canonical, and uncorrupted; nor can we think that any thing in the world, that is past, can have historical proof.*

The third proposition here enumerated is evidently the one on which the whole question turns; and although Mr Orme pronounces it to be satisfactorily established by Baxter, the first half of it is one which, as we have seen, cannot be so easily defended as confidently uttered.†

* Baxter's Works, vol. xiii., p. 365. See also *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, Part iii., p. 74.

† "I am fully satisfied," says Mr Orme, "that the ground taken in Baxter's work is the only scriptural and satisfactory ground of the divine obligation of this sacred day. It places it correctly on the footing of a New-Testament ordinance; while it does not deprive it of all that support from the analogy of the original appointment of a day of rest, and of the Mosaical institution, which it may properly have. Unless we reason from the recorded example of the apostles and primitive Christians, and regard that example as not less binding than apostolic precept, we shall find very little authority for most of the ordinances of Christianity."—(*Life of Baxter*, p. 570.)

The principles here assumed, —1. That the apostolic precepts, to whomsoever and in what circumstances soever given, are universally binding on Christians; and, 2. That the example of the apostles is as binding as their precepts,—are in my opinion erroneous, and must lead into endless perplexity those who consistently hold and practise them. With Ostervald I believe, that "it is a great fault not to expound the Scripture according to the true scope of it, and to apply all that it contains to all sorts of persons without distinction" (*ante*, p. 166); and with Bishop Watson, "that the apostles might, for the sake of gaining the Jews to Christianity, have a respect in a great many particulars to the forms of the Jewish Synagogue, which are in no wise binding upon Christians of later ages" (*ante*, p. 129).—Bishop Taylor had previously taken up this ground, in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, Section xviii., § 23, where he says that "actions apostolical are not always rules for ever; it might be fit for them to do it *pro loco et tempore*, as divers others of their institutions, but yet no engagement past thence upon following ages; for it might be convenient at that time, in the new spring of Christianity, and till they had engaged a considerable party, by that means to make them parties against the Gentiles' superstition, and by way of pre-occupation to ascertain them to their own sect when they came to be men; or for some other reason not transmitted to us, because the question of fact itself is not sufficiently determined." Advice or precepts given to a particular Church in particular circumstances was no doubt very fit to be followed by those to whom it was addressed; but how far *we* ought to follow it—nay, whether we *may* do so with propriety—is a question for ourselves to judge

“ I much pity and wonder,” adds Baxter, “ at those godly men, who are so much for stretching the words of Scripture, to a sense that

of. Most of the recorded teaching of the Apostles was addressed to Jews, living under the Mosaic law; and the application to the Gentiles, of arguments and precepts grounded upon that law, has overlaid the religion of Christ with such a mass of corruptions that its lustre has been lamentably obscured, and sometimes wellnigh extinguished. As for the teaching of *Jesus*, every word of it was spoken to the Jews—and this by One who was himself a Jew, complying, as his hearers did, with the law of Moses (*ante*, p. 166), and enjoining upon them the punctual observance of its precepts, not only in their true and rational spirit, but even (it would seem) as interpreted by the living authorities whose personal character he was accustomed so freely to censure. “ The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.”—(Matt. xxiii. 2. 3.) Hence, if *Jesus* had enforced upon his countrymen the duty of keeping holy the Sabbath (which we have no account of his having ever done—the whole of his recorded teaching about Sabbath-observance being the inculcation of the fact that, as a *positive* or ceremonial duty, it ought to give place to *moral* duty whenever the two came into competition),—if, *Jesus* I say, had enforced obedience to the Sabbath-law upon his countrymen, no injunctions about it, given by him to men subject to the Mosaic law, would have been applicable to us, on whom, as I have shewn, that law is in no degree binding. And as for his custom of going into the synagogues to instruct the people who used to assemble there on the *seventh* day of the week for the purpose of hearing expositions of their law, and perhaps of worshipping together, how can that example tend to shew that we, who are *not* instructors like him, ought to resort to meeting-houses upon the *first* day of the week?

After the ascension of *Jesus*, his apostles, we know, continued, as Jews, to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, along with other Jewish ceremonies and customs, whether of Mosaic or of later origin. In the words of Dr Campbell, “ They punctually attended both the synagogue-worship (Acts ix. 20; xiii. 5, 14, &c.; xiv. 1; xvii. 1, 2, 17; xviii. 4), and the temple-service, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles (Acts ii. 46; iii. 1; xxi. 26; xxii. 17; xxiv. 18), notwithstanding that the nation had openly rejected and crucified the Messiah. . . . Nor does it appear that they desisted from this conformity, till the Jews, by a sentence of excommunication, compelled them to desist, as our Lord had predicted. (John xvi. 2).”—(Dr Campbell’s *Sermons*, ed. 1812, p. 48; sermon on the Spirit of the Gospel.) Must we then follow the “ example” of the apostles, by observing the Jewish Sabbath? or must we consider church-attendance to be our duty, *because* the apostles followed the custom (which, however useful, was not appointed by Moses,) of attending synagogue-meetings, where they found the same opportunities which their Master had taken advantage of, for preaching his religion to the Jews? With respect to the *first* day of the week, it is enough to repeat that in the whole compass of the New Testament there is not so much as a hint of their *preaching* or *worshipping* statedly, or with more than usual solemnity, on that day; and just as little of their observing it as a Sabbath, instead of the day appointed by the Fourth Commandment. As formerly mentioned (p. 59), the example of Paul gives countenance to travelling on Sunday, if my interpretation of Acts xx. 7–11 is correct. In that interpretation I have the concurrence of Dr Wardlaw, in his *Discourses on the Sabbath*, p. 93.

But although, upon these principles, we shall, as Mr Orme says truly, find in the New Testament “ very little authority for most of the ordinances of Christianity,” and none at all for the so-called Christian ordinance of a first-day Sabbath—and although *Jesus* gave his followers no commandment to engage, upon *any* day, in *public* or even *social* worship (*ante*, p. 230),—let us not be dismayed by the absence of a written law concerning this important branch of religious duty. Had a written law been needed, it undoubtedly would have been given: but by endowing mankind with religious, social, and æsthetical emotions, the all-wise Creator has amply supplied what is requisite to secure

other men cannot find in them, as that in the word *Graven Images* in the second commandment, they can find all set forms of prayer, all composed studied sermons, and all things about worship of man's invention to be images or idolatry; and yet they cannot find the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath in the express words of Col. ii. 16, nor the other texts which I have cited; nor can they find the institution of the Lord's-day in all the texts and evidences produced for it. But though Satan may somewhat disturb our concord, and tempt some men's charity to remissness, by these differences, he shall never keep them out of heaven, who worship God through Christ, by the Spirit, even in spirit and truth. Nor shall he, I hope, ever draw me to think such holy persons as herein differ from me, to be worse than myself, though I think them in this to be unhappily mistaken: much less to approve of their own separation from others, or of other men's condemning them as heretics, and inflicting severities upon them, for these their opinions' sake."*

It were well if all theological disputants regarded each other with such charitable feelings.

Baxter too, however, evades Rom. xiv. 5. His only allusion to the chapter is where he says that the Gentile converts were unwilling to offend the Jewish Christians; "being taught not to despise the weak that observed meats and days (Rom. xiv. xv.; Gal. ii. 4.)"—(Vol. xiii. p. 509.) Is not this deplorable?†

These treatises of Owen and Baxter seem to have furnished the non-judaical portion of the materials of most of the later pleas for the Lord's Day; not excepting those published by theologians who do not reject, as they do, the authority of the Fourth Commandment, and prefer to call the Christian festival "the Day of Sacred Rest," or "the Lord's Day," rather than "the Sabbath."‡

the permanent existence of institutions for impressing on their minds the sublime truth that "the Lord God omnipotent reigneth;" for the celebration of His glorious attributes; for the instruction of His worshippers in the duties which they owe Him, and are so deeply interested in performing; for the expression of their devout aspirations, and of their reverence for the laws through which His marvellous government of the universe is carried on.

* Works, vol. xiii., p. 367.

† In the Memoirs of Mr Robert Haldane, a well-known Scotch lay-preacher of the evangelical school, we read that in expounding at Geneva the Epistle to the Romans, "he took occasion, in connexion with the fourteenth chapter, to prove the obligation of the Lord's Day."—(P. 433; London, 1852.) Mr Haldane was a man of boundless self-reliance; and certainly, unless by "*connexion with*" we may here understand "*opposition to*," he displayed on this occasion a degree of heroic intrepidity rivalling even that with which (as we saw, *ante*, p. 101) Dr Eadie argues for the Divine inspiration of Moses from the miraculously correct geological knowledge exhibited in the first chapter of Genesis.

‡ "Give us," says Baxter, "the religious observation, and call it by what name you please. We are not fond of the name of the Sabbath." (Vol. xiii., p. 386; see also p. 369.)

And Owen says:—"It is the Lord's day, the day that he hath taken to be his lot, or special portion among the days of the week, *as he took AS IT WERE possession of it in his resurrection*. So his people are his lot and portion in the world, therefore called 'his people.' It is also, or may be, his day subjectively, or the day whereon his business and affairs are principally transacted, . . . his person and mediation being the principal subjects and objects of its work and worship. And it is, or may be called his, the Lord's day, because enjoined and

When the Puritans gained political ascendancy in England, they proceeded to legislate for the observance of the Sabbath, with quite as little regard to the principles of religious liberty as King Charles had exhibited in connexion with the Book of Sports. One of their Acts was quoted in page 149 (see also p. 46, note), and of others we have an account in Neal. In his narrative of the proceedings of Parliament in 1643 he writes as follows:—"The Parliament's affairs being low, and their counsels divided, they not only applied to Heaven by extraordinary fastings and prayers, but went on vigorously with their intended reformation. They began with the Sabbath, and on March 22, 1642-3, sent to the Lord-Mayor of the City of London, to desire him to put in execution the statutes for the due observation of the Lord's Day; his Lordship accordingly issued his precept the very next day to the aldermen,* requiring them to give strict charge to the churchwardens and constables within their several wards, that from henceforth 'they do not permit or suffer any person or persons, in time of divine service, or at any time on the Lord's Day, to be tipping in any tavern, inn, tobacco-shop, alehouse, or other victualling-house whatsoever; nor suffer any fruiterers or herb-women to stand with fruit, herbs, or other victuals or wares, in any streets, lanes, or alleys, or any other ways to put things to sale, at any time of that day, or in the evening of it; or any milk-woman to cry milk; nor to suffer any persons to unlade any vessels of fruit, or other goods, and carry them on shore; or to use any unlawful exercises or pastimes: and to give express charge to all inn-keepers, taverns, cook-shops, alehouses, &c., within their wards, not to entertain any guests to tittle, eat, drink, or take tobacco, in their houses on the Lord's Day, except inn-keepers, who may receive their ordinary guests or travellers, who come for the dispatch of their necessary business; and if any persons offend in the premises, they are to be brought before the Lord-Mayor, or one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace, to be punished as the law directs.' This order had a very considerable influence upon the city, which began to wear a different face of religion from what it had formerly done.† May 5, the book tolerating sports upon the Lord's Day was ordered to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman in Cheapside, and other usual places; and all persons having any copies in their hands were required to deliver them to one of the sheriffs of London to be burnt."‡

Again, treating of the year 1644, he says:—"Religion was the fashion of the age: the [Westminster] Assembly was often turned into a house of prayer, and hardly a week passed without solemn fasting and humi-

appointed to be observed by him, or by his authority over the Church. So the ordinance of the supper is called the supper of the Lord, on the same account. On supposition, therefore, that such a day of rest is to be observed under the New Testament, the name whereby it ought to be called is the Lord's day; which is peculiarly expressive of its relation to our Lord Jesus Christ, the sole author and immediate object of all gospel worship. But whereas the general notion of a Sabbatical rest is still included in such a day, a super-addition of its relation to the Lord Christ will entitle it to the appellation of the Lord's-day Sabbath; that is, the day of sacred rest appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ."—(*Exercitation xxxv.*, § 15, p. 616.)

* "Husband's Collections, p. 7."

† "Ib., p. 159."

‡ Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii., p. 36; ed. 1822.

liation, in several of the churches of London and Westminster; the laws against profaneness were carefully executed; and because the former ordinances for the observation of the Lord's Day had proved ineffectual, it was ordained, April 6, that all persons should apply themselves to the exercise of piety and religion on the Lord's Day, 'that no wares, fruits, herbs, or goods of any sort, be exposed to sale, or cried about the streets, upon penalty of forfeiting the goods. That no person without cause shall travel, or carry a burden, or do any worldly labour, upon penalty of ten shillings for the traveller, and five shillings for every burden.* That no person shall, on the Lord's Day, use, or be present at, any wrestling, shooting, fowling, ringing of bells for pleasure, markets, wakes, church-ales, dancing, games, or sports whatsoever, upon penalty of five shillings to every one above fourteen years of age. And if children are found offending in the premises, their parents or guardians to forfeit twelpence for every offence. That all May-poles be pulled down, and none others erected. That if the several fines above mentioned cannot be levied, the offending party shall be set in the stocks for the space of three hours. That the King's Declaration concerning lawful sports on the Lord's Day be called in, suppressed, and burnt. This ordinance shall not extend to prohibit dressing meat in private families, or selling victuals in a moderate way in inns or victualling-houses, for the use of such who cannot otherwise be provided for; nor to the crying of milk before nine in the morning, or after four in the afternoon.†"‡

Once more:—"Among the ordinances that passed this year (1647) for reformation of the Church, none occasioned so much noise and disturbance as that of June 8, for abolishing the observation of saints' days, and the three grand festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The ordinance says,

"'Forasmuch as the feast of the Nativity of Christ, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other festivals, commonly called holy-days, have been heretofore superstitiously used and observed; be it ordained, that the said feasts, and all other festivals, commonly called holy-days, be no longer observed as festivals; any law, statute, custom, constitution, or canon, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

"'And that there may be a convenient time allotted for scholars, apprentices, and other servants, for their recreation, be it ordained, that all scholars, apprentices, and other servants, shall, with the leave of their masters, have such convenient reasonable recreation, and relaxation from labour, every second Tuesday in the month throughout the year, as formerly they used to have upon the festivals; and masters of scholars, apprentices, and servants, shall grant to them respectively such time for their recreation, on the aforesaid second Tuesday in the month, as they may conveniently spare from their extraordinary necessary service and occasions; and if any difference arise between masters and servants concerning the liberty hereby granted, the next justice of peace shall reconcile it.'§

"The King was highly displeas'd with this ordinance; and therefore, while the affair was under debate, he put this query to the Par-

* "And for every offence in doing any worldly labour or work."—Ed."

† "Scobel's Collect. p. 68."

‡ Neal, vol. iii., p. 139.

"Scobel, p. 128."

liament Commissioners at Holmby House, April 23, 1647. 'I desire to be resolved of this question, Why the new reformers discharge the keeping of Easter? My reason for this query is, I conceive the celebration of this feast was instituted by the same authority which changed the Jewish Sabbath into the Lord's Day or Sunday, for it will not be found in Scripture where Saturday is discharged to be kept, or turned into the Sunday; wherefore it must be the Church's authority that changed the one and instituted the other; therefore my opinion is, that those who will not keep this feast may as well return to the observation of Saturday, and refuse the weekly Sunday. When anybody can shew me that herein I am in an error, I shall not be ashamed to confess and amend it; till when you know my mind.*
C. R.'

"Sir James Harrington presented his Majesty with an answer to this query, in which he denies that the change of the Sabbath was from the authority of the Church, but derives it from the authority and example of our Saviour and his apostles in the New Testament; he admits, that if there was the like mention of the observation of Easter, it would be of divine or apostolical authority; but as the case stands, he apprehends with great reason, that the observation of the Christian Sabbath, and of Easter, stands upon a very different foot."†

Whether Sir James Harrington and the Westminster Divines had the "great reason" which Neal thinks they possessed for believing that the obligation to observe the Sabbath was by Christ and his apostles made applicable to Sunday in place of Saturday, and with this alteration laid upon the Gentiles, is a question which has already several times attracted our notice, and will be farther considered with all due attention in Note R.

The progress of legislation in England concerning the Lord's Day, subsequently to the Act 1 Ch. I. c. 1, and besides the above-mentioned ordinances of the Puritans, has been as follows:—

"The 3 Ch. I. c. 1, enacts that no carrier, with any horse or horses, nor waggonman, carman, wainman, nor drovers, shall travel on the Lord's Day, under a penalty of 20s., and prohibits butchers from killing on that day. But the most important statute on the subject is 29 Ch. II. c. 7, which enacts (sect. 1) that no tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly labour, or business, or work of their ordinary callings on the Lord's Day (works of necessity and charity only excepted); and it prohibits the sale and hawking of wares and goods. Sect. 2 prohibits drovers, horse-courers, waggoners, butchers, higglers, and their servants, from travelling, and the use of boats, wherries, lighters, or barges, except on extraordinary occasions. By sect. 3, the dressing of meat in families, the dressing and selling it in inns, cookshops, or victualling-houses, and crying milk before nine and after four, are excepted from the operation of the Act. By sect. 6, persons are prohibited from serving or executing any process, warrant, &c. (except in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace) on the Lord's Day; the service, &c. is made void, and the person serving it is made liable to damages, as if he had acted without any writ, &c.

* "Relig. Car., p. 370."

† Neal, vol. iii., pp. 355–357.

“ By the 10 and 11 Wm. III. c. 24, mackerel are permitted to be sold before and after divine service on Sundays, and forty watermen are allowed to ply between Vauxhall and Limehouse. The 21 Geo. III. c. 49, enacts that no house, &c. shall be open for any public entertainment or amusement, or for publicly debating on any subject on Sundays.

“ The 7 and 8 Geo. III. c. 75, repeals that part of 29 Ch. II. which relates to travelling by water. By 34 Geo. III. c. 61, bakers are enabled, between nine and one o'clock on Sundays, to bake for persons things which are brought to their ovens. By 1 and 2 Wm. IV. c. 22, drivers of hackney carriages may ply, and are compellable to drive on Sundays. The 3 Wm. IV. c. 19, empowers the Court of Aldermen, or two justices, to regulate the route of stage-carriages, cattle, &c., on Sundays. These two statutes relate to London only. The 3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 31, provides that the election of corporate officers, &c., required to be held on any particular day, shall take place on Saturdays or Mondays, when the day specified in the Act happens to be a Sunday.”*

Dr Cook observes, that “ the restoration of Charles II. gave a new and a most unfortunate direction to the state of religious sentiment; for, in the ardour of loyalty which then was displayed, what was most estimable in those by whom the monarchy had been overthrown, was, from the influence of association, viewed with antipathy. The courtiers, with all who adhered to them, or who were influenced by their example, in a particular manner, departed from the rigid and austere maxims which the Puritans had professed, and which, no doubt, had often been employed to cover the most interested and insatiable ambition. In Scotland, however, the persecution of the Presbyterians, and the circumstances attending the introduction of Episcopacy, were so revolting, and exhibited such a melancholy contrast to the freedom and peace which, under the government of Cromwell, had been enjoyed, that they more firmly attached the great part of the community to all the opinions of the venerable men against whom the fury of an unprincipled and arbitrary sovereign was directed. At the Revolution, Presbytery being restored, there came with it those sentiments

* Penny Cyclopædia, vol. xxiii., p. 293; art. SUNDAY. A fuller summary of these and some less important statutes will be found in the Report of Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee on Sabbath Observance, p. 291, App., No. 1.— I observe that the 29th Ch. II., c. 7, not only prohibits labour, but enacts that “ all persons shall on every Lord's Day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately.” By 9th Geo. IV., c. 61, § 17, keepers of inns, ale-houses, and victualling houses, are prohibited to keep open house except for the reception of travellers, and to permit any beer or other exciseable liquor to be conveyed from their premises during the usual hours of the morning and afternoon divine service in the church or chapel of the parish or place. The 1st Will. IV., c. 64, enacts that no person licensed to sell beer by retail under that Act shall sell or suffer it to be drunk on the premises between 10 and 1, or between 3 and 5 o'clock on any Sunday, Good Friday, Christmas-day, or day of public fast or thanksgiving. By 1st and 2d Will. IV., c. 32, to kill or take game on a Sunday or Christmas-day, is made punishable by a fine not exceeding £5.

The Acts passed after 29th Ch. II. are police-regulations rather than laws professing to be for the advancement of piety and true religion.

of the Lord's Day which the original founders of the Presbyterian Church had adopted. Accordingly, at the conclusion of the seventeenth, and through a great part of the eighteenth century, the first day of the week was a day of extreme mortification and self-denial; there was a seriousness, or, rather, a gloomy gravity, cast over every religious family; all innocent recreation was proscribed; almost every domestic employment was suspended; and forgetting that it is impossible to keep the mind long fixed upon the sublime tenets of religion, the strictest often experienced that what should have been the most delightful exercise, degenerated into weariness and languor, and even sometimes involuntary disgust. These practices, however, gradually yielded to more enlarged and juster notions both of the nature of the Christian Sabbath and of the nature of man; and whilst the heart was moved with the sublime discoveries and the ennobling and blessed doctrines of the Gospel, there ceased to be any aversion to that degree of social intercourse, and that degree of relaxation, by which the efficacy of the Sabbath was, in fact, greatly increased.

“Of the profanation of this holy day, at all times too common, it does not fall within the purpose of my work to treat, because that is little connected with any opinion respecting it: but it may be observed, that of late there has been a tendency in many most sincerely religious persons throughout Britain to revive Jewish notions, and to distinguish the Lord's Day by the almost exclusive epithet of the Sabbath. Nevertheless, the general impression seems to be against the obligation of that complete rest, and that strict observance, which would assuredly be binding if the Fourth Commandment remained in all its force.”*

Dr Cook's work was published in 1822, and the tendency which he remarks, in many religious persons throughout Britain, to revive Jewish notions about the Sabbath, has ever since continued to increase. It took its rise sixty years ago, when the atrocities and follies of the French Revolution, and especially the abolition, for a time, of the hebdomadal festival of Christians, gave an impulse in this country to unwonted strictness in the observance of religious ordinances, and stimulated the clergy to inculcate zealously both the duty of keeping holy the Sabbath and that of giving ready obedience to the civil power. This occasion it was which drew forth, among many others, the three sermons of Bishop Horsley, quoted in a former page;† and, whatever may be thought of the theological basis on which he

* Cook's General and Historical View of Christianity, vol. ii., pp. 317–319.

† See p. 120.—Horsley's doctrine is, that the Fourth Commandment was an exclusively Jewish law, but that the Sabbath having been instituted at the creation, and observed by the patriarchs, it ought to be kept by us in obedience to the primæval law, in so far as *one day in seven* is concerned, but upon *the first day of the week* in memory of our Lord's resurrection. As to the alteration of the day, he ventures only to affirm that “it seems to have been made by the authority of the apostles;” but he immediately adds, with a degree of boldness all the more striking from the modesty of the preceding averment, that from the time of Christ's second appearance to his apostles after the resurrection, “the Sunday was the constant Sabbath of the primitive Church.”—(*Serm.* xxiii.) I do not class Bishop Horsley among the Sabbatarians (as that word is generally understood), because *they* build their so-called “Scriptural Sabbath” upon the Fourth Commandment, which *he* rejects; and because, while *they* conceive it to

there founds the duty of observing the Lord's Day, it will not be denied by any one who values, as highly as I do, the weekly day of rest, that the extent of needless and systematic travelling by the upper orders, and transport of goods by the lower, on Sundays—which he describes with so much animation—was an evil that required to be checked.* At the same epoch, and from the operation of the same

be the duty of Christians to employ themselves in religious exercises the whole day if possible, *he* thinks it enough that “the same proportion of the Sabbath, on the whole, should be devoted to religious exercises, public and private, as every man would spend of any other day in his ordinary business.”

* See Sermon xxiii. The passage may be found also in Knox's Family Lectures, p. 308, and the Quarterly Review, vol. ix., p. 35.—Of Bishop Porteus's exertions at this time to promote the observance of Sunday, an account is given in his *Life* by Hodgson, pp. 189, *et seq.*, where it appears that although he disapproved of public diversions, and professional concerts in private houses, he by no means advocated a puritanical or pharisaical observance of the day of rest. “I do not contend,” says he, “that it should be either to the poor, or to the rich, or to any other human being whatever, a day of gloom and melancholy, a day of superstitious rigour, a day of absolute exclusion from all society. No, it is on the contrary a festival, a joyful festival, to which we ought always to look forward with delight, and enjoy with a thankful and a grateful heart. It is only to those amusements, which partake of the nature and complexion of *public diversions*, on the Lord's Day, that I object; to large assemblies, for instance, and large concerts consisting of hired performers, where numerous parties are collected together, occasioning a great concourse of servants in one place, employing them at a time when they have a right to ease and rest, and producing much of that noise and tumult in the public streets, which are so opposite to the peaceful tranquillity that should prevail on that day—a day which the Almighty himself has distinguished with a peculiar mark of sanctity, and which he claims *as his own*. It is against these open infractions of the Lord's Day, that I think it my duty to remonstrate. But in hearing sacred music on the Sunday evening, confined to a small domestic circle of relations and friends, without any hired performers, I am so far from seeing any impropriety, that it appears to me a relaxation well suited to the nature of a Christian Sabbath, perfectly congenial to the spirit of our religion, and calculated to raise our minds to heavenly thoughts, and sublime and holy contemplations.” See also the Quarterly Review, vol. vii., p. 40.

In 1794 and 1795 two bills for enforcing the observance of the Sabbath were brought into the House of Commons without success. Mr Elliot, a supporter of the second, observed “that in the present year the building of great edifices was carried on openly, and in defiance of decency, on a Sunday. Another circumstance which was very offensive in the eye of decorum was the great number of public waggons which travelled the road on a Sunday. Some few years ago no such thing as a public waggon was seen on the road on the Sabbath-day, whereas nothing was now more common.”—(Knight's *Pictorial Hist. of England during the Reign of George III.*, vol. iii., p. 588.) Bishop Watson, in a letter to Mr Wilberforce, written in 1800, speaks of the travelling of waggons and stage coaches as “an evil which has increased very much, if it has not entirely sprung up in many places, within the last thirty years;” and suggests the passing of an Act of Parliament, “enacting the payment of a great additional toll at each turnpike gate which should be passed by such carriages, between the hours of six and six on every Sabbath-day. The avarice of commerce, I fear, would oppose the extension of such a law to mail-coaches; and the indifference of the opulent to religious duties, together with their fondness for travelling on a day when they experience the least obstruction on the road, would raise a cry against it, if it were proposed to extend it to all coaches and chaises.”—(*Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. ii., p. 113.) From all this it is evident that the Lord's Day is much better kept in England now than it was sixty years since.

and other causes (some of them, no doubt, of earlier date),* the religious education of children assumed a more puritanical character

* The influence of Wesley, Whitefield, Doddridge, Lady Huntingdon, and John Newton, will not be overlooked by the ecclesiastical historian of the eighteenth century; it is briefly noticed by Mr Taylor, in his able *Retrospect of the Religious Life of England*, chapter v., section viii. Towards the close of that century, the works of Wilberforce and Hannah More made a great impression on the upper and middle ranks, and the poems of Cowper certainly did much to deepen it. The writer of a "History of Religion" during the first twenty years of the present century, in Knight's *Pictorial History of the Reign of George III.*, after mentioning an Act passed in 1818, by which the sum of £1,000,000 was granted by Parliament "for building and promoting the building of additional churches in populous parishes" in England, observes that "the favour thus shewn by the legislature to the Church after a century of neglect, in so far at least as regarded the main point of enabling it to be what it professed to be, the Church of the nation, or of endeavouring to give an expansion to its power of religious instruction and superintendence in some proportion to the rate at which the increase of the population was going on, may be taken as indicating some change in the public feeling towards the Church in the closing years of the present period. And that, again, would imply something of a change of character in the Church, or clerical body, itself; for the change of public feeling would produce this, if it had not been produced by it:—most probably there had been a mutual action and reaction; or, at any rate, the clergy would be acted upon by the same causes and influences, whatever they were, which operated upon the general public. Howsoever it had been brought about, it is certain that a revolution, to a considerable extent, had been lately wrought in the spirit of the establishment; that, whether alarmed by the rapid growth of dissent, or struck with any other unaccustomed apprehensions as to the security of its position, or merely impressed by something in the general aspect of the times, and sharing the common thoughtfulness and earnestness that had succeeded an age of universal unbelief and indifference, it had been for some time casting off much of the carelessness or secularity in which it had contentedly passed the greater part of the preceding century, and was awakening to quite a new sort of existence. Perhaps the most distinct evidence of this increased zeal and activity is afforded by the progress during the present period of the several great schemes for the diffusion of religion by other means than the ordinary services of the Church, which were, either exclusively or to a great extent, supported and managed by the clergy and other members of the establishment."—(Vol. iv., p. 605.)

With respect to Scotland, Mr Combe says that while travelling in the United States in 1838–39–40, he was frequently asked how the great change in the spirit of the clergy of this part of the island, since the days of Robertson and Blair, had arisen. "The only account of it," says he, "which I could give was one which I had received, a few years ago, from an aged friend who was long an 'elder' of one of the churches in Edinburgh, and who himself had witnessed the alteration. Before the breaking out of the French Revolution, said he, the Scottish clergy were distinguished for the liberality of their religious sentiments, and public rumour mentioned the intention of their leaders even to propose a revival of the standards of the church. The men of property, the lawyers, and distinguished physicians, in general partook of the same spirit, and the people would have followed in their train without much hesitation. In this state of the public mind, the French Revolution broke out; the throne and the altar were overturned in France, and trampled under foot. The government and owners of property in Great Britain, became alarmed at the progress of French principles among their own people, and combined to resist them. Their great object was to rear bulwarks around the throne, for the protection, through it, of their private interests; and, viewing the altar as the principal pillar of the State, they became zealous supporters of religious institutions and observances. They patronized the church and courted the clergy: 'I then saw,' said the elder, 'individuals of great political influence in Edinburgh, who for many

than before—the fruits of which change were abundantly evident in the following generation, and are at this day; while the “serious” tendencies supposed to have characterised certain influential members of the British Government during the early part of the present century may have suggested to worldly and aspiring spirits among the clergy, that evangelical (including sabbatarian) preaching was the surest road to preferment as well as popularity in the Church.—In Scotland, the General Assembly, in May 1794, obtained from Mr Robert Blair, then the Solicitor-General, and afterwards Lord President of the Court of Session, an opinion that the old statutes for the observance of the Sabbath-day were sufficient for checking its profanation, and might be enforced at the instance of every parish-

years before had never entered a church door, ostentatiously walking up the High Street of Edinburgh, with Bibles in their hands, to attend public worship; and they did not stop there, but hired evangelical tutors for their sons, and evangelical governesses for their daughters, and used all their influence to induce every loyal subject of King George III. to follow their example. Their efforts were successful; the same spirit pervaded all classes of the community; a vast zeal was instantaneously evoked and put into action, and serious impressions were communicated to the young. This ardour originated in worldly motives, and its chief object was the security of property; but the children knew nothing of the designs of their parents; they received the impressions in all sincerity, and they now constitute the mass of modern society. I have lived to see some of these political supporters of the altar desert its shrines, and return to their habits of religious indifference; but their children not only did not fall away from the principles which had been instilled into them, but sometimes nearly broke the hearts of their parents by advancing into wild fanaticism, which the latter never contemplated without disgust. We are now in the midst of the re-action after the irreligious period of the French Revolution; and society must abide the maturity of another generation, or probably two, before reason will again exert any salutary influence over religious opinion in Scotland.’ As the French Revolution had taken place long before I was capable of observing public occurrences, I am not able to judge of the merits of this explanation; but it bears strong indications of truth.”—(*Notes on the United States of North America*, by George Combe, vol. iii., pp. 232-234.)

Bishop Watson, who advocated “a review of the doctrine and of the discipline of the Church of England, and a complete purgation of it from the dregs of opery and the impiety of Calvinism” (*Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. i., p. 168); who thought that missionaries (and of course many of the clergy at home), “instead of teaching a simple system of Christianity, have perplexed their hearers with unintelligible doctrines not expressly delivered in Scripture, but fabricated from the conceits, and passions, and prejudices of men” (p. 321); and who published in 1790 “*Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England, by a consistent Protestant*,”—mentions that at about the time when this pamphlet came out, he had “some conversation with the Duke of Grafton on the propriety of commencing a reform, by the introduction of a Bill into the House of Lords for expunging the Athanasian Creed from our Liturgy; and we had, in a manner, settled to do it; but the strange turn which the French Revolution took about that period, and the general abhorrence of all innovations, which its atrocities excited, induced us to postpone our design, and no fit opportunity has yet offered for resuming it, nor probably will offer itself in my time.”—(P. 392.) The Bishop died on 4th July 1816, without having seen any symptoms of the approach of the reform which he desired. On the subject of the subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles by clergymen and graduates in the universities, he published in 1772, under the designation of “A Christian Whig,” two Letters, which, like the *Considerations*, are included in the second volume of his *Miscellaneous Tracts*.

minister, kirk-session, or presbytery, or any person named by them. Thereupon was issued by the Assembly an "Admonition and Information" respecting this prevalent offence, containing copies of the opinion and the Acts, with instructions to the several Presbyteries of the Church to enforce the law "in such a prudent manner as shall seem best calculated for checking the further profanation of the holy Sabbath."* In a "Warning and Admonition to the

* Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, p. 1154; Edinburgh, 1843.—The Acts of Parliament, there inserted, are—1661, c. 18; 1672, c. 22; 1693, c. 40; 1695, c. 13; and 1701, c. 11. The first of these prohibits salmon-fishing; going of salt-pans, mills, or kilns; hiring of shearers (reapers), carrying of loads, keeping of markets, or using any sorts of merchandise on the Sabbath-day, under the penalty of £20 Scots for the going of each salt-pan, mill, or kiln, £10 for each shearer and salmon-fisher, and the same for any other profanation.—The second provides for the execution of the laws against all sorts of profaneness, including profanation of the Lord's Day; and directs how the fines shall be disposed of.—The third deplors "the profanity and immoralities that so much at present abound," and ratifies the former statutes.—The fourth recites that its immediate predecessor "has not taken the wished effect, through the negligence of the magistrates, officers, and others concerned to put the same in execution;" and orders them to do their duty, on pain of liability to a fine of £100 Scots, to be applied for behoof of the poor of the parish.—And the fifth, after enjoining the strict execution of the former acts against profaneness, provides that in case any person shall be excommunicated for not answering or obeying the Church when summoned before them for profaneness and immorality, or be declared by the Church contumacious, then, upon application made by a Presbytery, &c., to the Privy Council, the matter shall be represented to His Majesty, that he may be duly informed about the delinquent, as a person not fit to be employed or continued in any place of public trust, civil or military.—These and other Scotch Acts are printed in the Report of Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee, p. 294.

In 1705 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland passed an Act against Profanation of the Lord's Day; wherein, taking into their serious consideration the great frequency of the offence, "by multitudes of people walking idly upon the streets of the city of Edinburgh, Pier and Shore of Leith, in St Ann's Yards, and the Queen's Park, and in divers places of the West Kirk parish, and on the Links of Leith, and other places, especially about Edinburgh, and that by persons of all ranks, many whereof are strangers; . . . and being deeply sensible of the great dishonour done to the holy God, and of the open contempt of God and man, manifested by such heaven-daring profaneness, to the exposing of the nation to the heaviest judgments; therefore they do, in the fear of God, earnestly exhort all the reverend brethren, &c., to contribute their utmost endeavours, in their stations, for suppressing such gross profanation of the Lord's Day, by a vigorous and impartial, yet prudent exercise of the discipline of the Church, and by holding hand to the execution of the laudable laws of the nation against the guilty, in such way and manner as is allowed and required by law: And because the concurrence and assistance of the civil government will be absolutely necessary for the better curbing and restraining this crying sin, the General Assembly do hereby appoint their Commission to be nominated by them to address the Right Honourable the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council, that their Lordships may be pleased to give such orders, and take such courses for restraining those abuses, as they, in their wisdom, shall judge most effectual."—(*Acts of the Assembly*, p. 387.)

Was ever a more arrogant and intolerant spirit displayed by the clergy of any age or country? These men called themselves Protestants, and thereby asserted the right of every Christian to interpret the Bible for himself, and to act according to his interpretation, so long as he abstained from injuring his fellow-citizens. But if he could find in the Scriptures nothing that prohibited him to take a walk on Leith Pier or in the Queen's Park on a Sunday afternoon,

People of Scotland, by the Commission of the General Assembly, met at Edinburgh, March 1, 1798," the co-operation of the people with the British Government in carrying on the war with France is powerfully solicited, on the ground, among many others, that the French "have effaced from their calendar that day upon which Christians have, from the beginning, celebrated the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; and they are endeavouring to obliterate every memorial of the Christian religion."* Shortly afterwards, the "evangelical" phase of Christianity was ably and zealously recommended to the people of Scotland by Dr Chalmers, Sir Henry Moncreiff, Dr Andrew Thomson, and others both of the clergy and laity; whose adherents at length, about twenty years ago, gained the ascendancy in the Church, where, till the Disruption in 1843, they bore rule in the General Assembly.† In 1834 was issued by the Assembly a "Pastoral Admonition on the Sanctification of the Sabbath," to be read from every pulpit; inculcating respect for "that holy commandment which

and promenaded there accordingly for the benefit of his health and the refreshment of his spirits, straightway these lovers of Christian liberty are up in arms, denouncing him as one guilty of "heaven-daring profaneness," for which not only is the discipline of the Church to be employed against him, to the detriment of his comfort and reputation, but "the concurrence and assistance of the civil government" is to be earnestly sought, "for the better curbing and restraining this crying sin!"

* Acts of the General Assembly, p. 1159.

† In naming these three eminent clergymen, I do not wish to insinuate that they would have gone along with the Sabbatarians of Sir Andrew Agnew's school in all their measures. Dr Chalmers does not appear to have been very zealous in the cause; and if Sir Henry Moncreiff and Dr Thomson had still been at the helm, it is likely, from their practical sense, that they would have tried to check the extravagances of which our present Sabbatarians have been guilty. I have reason to believe that Sir Henry's notion of the extent to which the Lord's Day should be devoted to religious exercises, was not more Puritanical than that of Bishop Porteus. Of religious liberty, he was a consistent and most intelligent supporter; nor did he ever stoop to the too prevalent vice of making religion subservient to the aggrandisement of the clergy. "His religion," says a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, "as it was that of reason and freedom, was most abhorrent to all bigotry and all intolerance. Strong as his feelings were on sacred subjects, nothing ever revolted him that came in the shape of argument, and seemed to have truth for its object. Universal toleration was his principle; or if he would not so announce it, it was only because the term seemed to describe as a boon what was indeed an imprescriptible right. Civil disabilities for religious creeds—tests for worldly offices, taken from declarations of faith—he rejected with indignation, as the highest injustice towards men, and as the worst degradation of religion. But to prostitute the most awful mysteries of our faith, by making them the passport to the basest temporalities, he regarded with abhorrence as profane and impious. In all matters civil and religious, liberty found him her steady, undaunted, uncompromising champion. His zeal was tempered by sound practical information, admirable discretion, great knowledge both of man and of men; nor did his conversancy with the things of another world prevent him from bearing his part in administering the affairs of this, as far as his duty to God and man justified or required his exertions."—(*Edin. Rev.*, vol. xlvii., p. 247.) *O si sic omnes!* During the entire course of my boyhood I enjoyed the advantage and pleasure of listening to the pulpit-ministrations of this venerable man; and many years afterwards it was gratifying to me to learn that he had dedicated to Bishop Watson, in 1812, a sermon then preached and published for the benefit of the Edinburgh Lancasterian School. See Watson's *Anecdotes*, vol. ii., p. 427.

was first promulgated when the heavens and the earth were finished, 'and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it;' and which will continue to be binding on all the generations of men till the heavens and the earth shall pass away." The people were solemnly entreated "to bear in mind that this precept rests on an authority not to be challenged or explained away by human reason;" and reminded "that all violations of the Fourth Commandment are utterly inconsistent with the principles of the doctrine of Christ, which you are bound to adorn, and with the example of Christ, which it is your highest honour and interest to follow." "With deep concern," say the Assembly, "we have learned, that in various parts of the country there has been, for a number of years past, a great increase of unnecessary travelling on the Lord's Day, both for purposes of business and amusement; that shops have been kept open on that day for the sale of provisions and other articles of traffic; that multitudes, *forgetful of their most sacred duties and their immortal interests, have become accustomed* TO WANDER IN THE FIELDS, TO FREQUENT SCENES OF RECREATION, or to spend their time in riot and drunkenness, and other immoralities. . . . *As the Lord God has appropriated the Sabbath to himself, it is an impious encroachment on his inalienable prerogative to attempt to convert it either into a day of business or a day of idleness and pastime.* . . . Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we would persuade and adjure the hardened, by all that is bitter in remorse, by all that is intolerable in an awakened and unpurified conscience, by all that is fearful on the deathbed of impenitence, by all that is scorching in the frown of an unreconciled Judge, by all that is repulsive in the fellowship of accursed spirits, by all that is woefully agonising in the gnawing of the worm that dieth not, and in the fire that is not quenched, to awaken from the dream of guilty insensibility, and to flee from the wrath to come to the hope set before them in the Gospel."* The fervour with which the terrors of the Lord are here displayed to impenitent Sabbath-breakers, is little if at all inferior to that of any product of the lurid imagination of Dr Candlish.

But the most notable part of the recent history of Sabbatarianism

* Acts of the General Assembly, pp. 1163-5.—Whether the following remark of Dr Jortin may justly be applied to the authors and publishers of this address I shall not take it upon me to say:—"Perhaps no one thing has done more disservice to Christianity, than the unskilfulness and fanaticism of some of its defenders; who trample under foot, and set at defiance, Reason, Grammar, Logic, Language, Criticism, and Christian Antiquity."—(*Works*, vol. xiii., p. 515.) A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* observes, that "there is no end of substantial causes that have been sacrificed through the opposite injudiciousness of partisans, both in attempting to include within their limits a wider space than their forces could defend, and by taking up positions which they could never rightly have been called upon to defend at all. Meantime, unsound arguments excite suspicion as much almost as unfair ones. What Paley says of pious frauds and the detection of them, is true, in the next degree, of pious fallacies:—"Christianity has suffered more injury from this cause, than from all other causes put together." We have almost always found it to be the case with persons whom we have talked with, that they have been much less embarrassed by the logic of its enemies, than by the illogicalness and unreasonableness of its friends."—(Vol. 50, p. 288.) Think of the General Assembly bidding us follow Christ's example, and yet threatening us with hell-fire if we do so by walking in the fields on Sunday!

is the agitation by Sir Andrew Agnew and his adherents, which commenced about twenty-five years ago, and led to the appointment, in 1832, of a Select Committee of the House of Commons (of which Sir Andrew was chairman), for the purpose of inquiring into, and furnishing suggestions concerning, the subject of Sabbath-observance, so far as the legislature might be supposed to have any concern with it. Their Report, which was ordered on 6th August 1832 to be printed, contains a great body of interesting matter, of which, as the reader has seen, considerable use has been made in the present volume. The committee "regret to be under the necessity of stating, that the evidence which has been submitted to them exhibits a systematic and widely-spread violation of the Lord's Day, which, in their judgment, cannot fail to be highly injurious to the best interests of the people, and which is calculated to bring down upon the country the Divine displeasure."* Trading and marketing on Sunday morning is deplored as a prevailing evil in some districts, to be remedied by paying the wages of workmen earlier than on Saturday evening. The overworking of journeymen bakers is most properly adverted to as loudly requiring abatement; and the more difficult subjects of public-houses and Sunday travelling are recommended to attention. The "demoralisation" (in the Sabbatarian sense of the term)† consequent upon the arrival of numbers of people at Gravesend and Richmond, is lamented; and, on the whole matter, they are led to recommend an amendment of the law, especially in respect to the increase of penalties for the desecration of the Lord's Day by "the exercise of any worldly labour, business, or ordinary calling." They expect, however, less good from laws as such, than from "the moral support which these would receive as well from the highest authorities of the Church, its clergy, and ministers of all denominations, as from the example of the upper classes, the magistracy, and all respectable heads of families, and, it may be added, from the increasing conviction of all classes, derived from experience, of the value of the Day of Rest to themselves."‡ In this expectation I agree with them more unreservedly than in what they next lay down, namely, that "*the express commandment of the Almighty affords the plain and undoubted rule for man's obedience in this as in all other things; and the only question therefore is, in what particular cases should the sanctions and penalties of human laws be added to further and enforce this obedience to the Divine commandment; a question which should be approached with much seriousness of mind, when the obligation of legislators to promote, by all suitable means, the glory of God, and the happiness of those committed to their charge, is duly weighed.*"§ Here it is assumed that an "express commandment of the Almighty," enjoining the sanctification of the Christian Sabbath by resting from all manner of work and recreation, has been promulgated by Divine authority to the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, who ought therefore to obey it; whereas, as I have endeavoured to shew, no such promulgation can be proved to have taken place—and whether or not my attempt has been successful, at all events a Divine law cannot, in the divided state of opinion among

* Report, § 3, p. 3.

† Report, § 28, p. 9.

‡ See *ante*, p. 227.

§ Report, § 29, p. 9.

the learned respecting it, be modestly assumed as a ground for legislative measures. The Committee further express the Judaical notion, now generally exploded among all educated thinkers but the Puritans, that it is the duty of the *legislature* to promote “the glory of God,” as well as “the happiness of those committed to their charge.” The duty of glorifying God, however, is laid by the Christian law upon *individuals* alone; and most British legislators are now, I believe, pretty well convinced that by restricting their attention to the skilful performance of their proper duties—that is to say, to the business of securing and increasing, *by the means within their province*, the welfare of the people—they contribute, more effectually than they could in any other way, to the promotion of the glory of God. For it is by each of us acting in his own sphere according to the divine law—and not by shewing our piety, or promoting that of others, by means of public forms and ceremonies having the glory of God for their direct object—that we are taught by Jesus and his apostles to glorify our heavenly Father.*

* See Matt. v. 16; vii. 21–27; xxi. 28–31; John xiii. 35; xv. 21; Rom. xiv. 17, 18; 1 Cor. x. 31; 1 John v. 3; 2 John 6.

In the following extracts, the Puritanical and philosophical notions on this subject are exhibited in contrast:—

“The idea of the dissenters, that human laws ought not to extend to such subjects [as religious ordinances], appears to me virtually to exalt the second table above the first—the duty to man above the duty to God.”—(*Letter from the Hon. and Rev. Lyttelton Powys to Sir A. Agnew*; in *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, p. 157.)

“The legislator is himself essentially the *subject* of the community; and the jealousy of the body whose minister he is, though it allows, or even invites, his interference to restrain that ferociousness of individual liberty which would endanger peace or property, forbids his exercising any jurisdiction in cases where these are not concerned, or extending his power beyond absolute right, to moral duties. The authority delegated to the lawgiver for the public good emanates from the public itself: but no man gives another a title to regulate his thoughts, or prescribe the moral virtues which he shall exercise.”—(*Sumner’s Records of the Creation*, vol. i., p. 208–9. 2d ed.)

It is frequently a nice question, whether things proposed to be done by the Legislature fall within its province or not; but the general rule is plain, that whatever is directly or indirectly conducive to the protection of the rights of the people ought to be provided by the Government, unless it may be more usefully left to the care of individuals.

See the subject discussed in some clear and vigorous *Essays on Human Rights and their Political Guaranties*, by E. P. Hurlbut, lately one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York; Edinburgh edition, 1847, with Notes by George Combe; Notes B., S., and W.

Locke says:—“The fallacy in making it the magistrate’s duty to promote by force” (and the argument is the same if *favour* be substituted for *force*), “the only true religion” (and so the glory of God), “lies in this—that you allow yourself to suppose the magistrate, who is of your religion, to be well-grounded, attentive, and unbiassed, and fully and firmly assured that his religion is true; but that other magistrates of other religions different from yours are not so: which, what is it but to erect yourself into a state of infallibility above all other men of different persuasions from yours, which yet they have as good a title to as yourself?”—(*Fourth Letter for Toleration*, p. 395.) This is what Dr Hetherington styles “the language of scepticism” (*ante*, p. 152; see also pp. 151, 153, 189.) Even Tillotson halts on this point, in his 27th Sermon, vol. ii., p. 135.

“How many there are,” says Archbishop Whately, “who speak and reason concerning the *glory* of God (that being a phrase which occurs in Scripture), as if they supposed that the desire of glory did literally influence the Divine Mind,

“The objects to be attained by legislation,” the Committee proceed to say, “may be considered to be, first, a solemn and decent outward observance of the Lord’s Day, as that portion of the week which is set apart by Divine command for public worship; and next, the securing to every member of the community, without any exception, and however low his station, the uninterrupted enjoyment of that day of rest which has been in mercy provided for him, and the privilege of employing it, as well in the sacred exercises for which it was ordained, as in the bodily relaxation which is necessary for his well-being, and which, though a secondary end, is nevertheless also of high importance.”* Again: “Your Committee beg the House distinctly to understand, that they are very far from wishing that the Legislature should revert to the principle of the 14th section of the Act 1st, and the 5th section of the Act 23d of Queen Elizabeth, whereby ‘forbearing to repair to church, chapel, or place of common prayer,’ subjected the individual to heavy penalties. On the contrary, they are fully impressed with the truth of the remark given in evidence by the Bishop of London, that such provisions were ‘a mistake in legislation.’ But it is one thing to force the conscience of a man, and it is another to protect his civil liberty of worshipping God according to his conscience on the Lord’s Day from the avaricious or disorderly encroachments of his unconscientious neighbour.”†

Now, if, after due inquiry and consideration, the Legislature should be of opinion that, without reference to the question whether the Lord’s Day is a portion of the week set apart by Divine command for public worship, its solemn and decent outward observance by abstinence from labour is for the benefit of the State, the enactment, on *that* ground, of a law for enforcing its observance as a day of rest from

and as if God could really covet the admiration of his creatures: not considering, that the only intention of this expression is to signify merely, that God’s works are contrived in the same admirable manner as if He *had* had this object in view; and that we are bound to pay Him the same reverent homage, and zealous obedience, as if he were really and literally capable of being glorified by us. And yet it is chiefly from a literal interpretation of this phrase of ‘the glory of God,’ that some Calvinistic divines have undertaken to explain the whole system of divine Providence, and to establish some very revolting and somewhat dangerous conclusions.”—(*Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion*, 6th ed., p. 176.)

Bishop Watson says:—“It would be impious to suppose that our vices could disturb the Creator’s peace, or our virtues augment his felicity; this would be to make a God with the passions of a man, to render the infinite perfection of the Creator dependent on the imperfection of the creature.”—(*Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. ii., p. 137.)

These observations are but repetitions of what was preached by Paul to the Athenians:—“Then stood Paul in the midst of Mars-hill and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands: *neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing*, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things,” &c.,—(Acts xvii. 22-25.)

See, at greater length, on the subject of glorifying God, Wollaston’s *Religion of Nature Delineated*, Sect. V., pp. 211-218 of the 7th ed.

* Report, § 30, pp. 9-10.

† *Ib.*, § 36, p. 12.

such work as the necessities of the people do not require to be performed, is not only justifiable, but incumbent on the Legislature. The ancient heathen lawgivers established festival-days, which, the better to secure their observance, they appointed to be kept holy to the gods.* But an attempt to secure by law, “to every member of the community without any exception, the uninterrupted enjoyment of the day of rest,” is at once unnecessary and Utopian; unnecessary, because in this free country no man is obliged to engage in Sunday-work against his will; and Utopian, because, as all admit, universal cessation of labour is absolutely impossible.†

The Committee refer to what they call the “strongly stated” evidence of several witnesses, “that innumerable unhappy individuals, who have forfeited their lives to the offended laws of their country, have confessed that their career in vice commenced with Sabbath-breaking and neglect of religious ordinances.”‡ What value is to be attached to such confessions, has already been inquired;§ and, to do the witnesses justice, they are far from laying exclusive stress upon the cause alleged. Thus the Rev. David Ruell, chaplain of the New Prison, Clerkenwell, and formerly also chaplain of the House of Correction, Coldbath-fields, being asked what he knew of the strongest causes which first led the prisoners to crime, replied:—“I have had many opportunities of learning from them the course which has led them into crime; and have generally found that the neglect or gross violation of the Sabbath *has been one*. The usual process has been *impatience of parental restraint*, violation of the Sabbath, and the neglect

* See *ante*, pp. 225, 226.—Warburton, in his *Divine Legation of Moses*, B. II., Sect. II., illustrates the fact that in ancient times “the first step the legislator took, was to pretend a mission and revelation from some god, by whose command and direction he had framed the policy he would establish.” In B. IV., Sect. I., he maintains that the universal propensity of mankind “to listen to, and embrace, some pretended Revelation, in neglect of what is called, in contradistinction to it, the Religion of Nature,” is a proof of the necessity of a *true* Revelation. Nothing, he argues, could induce mankind to embrace any professing Revelation, but either a consciousness that they wanted a revealed will for the rule of their actions; or an old tradition that God had vouchsafed it to their forefathers. The false prophets of false religions were in fact, says he, “employed, wicked instruments as they were, and wickedly as they have been abused in dishonouring truth, to evince the high probability of God’s having actually given a revelation of his will to mankind.”

† Principal Lee, in his evidence before the Committee, expressed an opinion which seems to be greatly at variance with the principle that “the uninterrupted enjoyment of the day of rest should be secured to every member of the community.” He says:—“A very great evil has been experienced in Edinburgh, and I believe in many other large towns, *in consequence of the liberty of visiting and walking*, which is almost universally allowed to servants on Sundays by their masters and mistresses, who do not seem to recollect that that is a day which God has appropriated to himself, and which is not at the disposal of any human being.”—(Q. 4123, p. 276.) How, then, is it at the disposal of the masters and mistresses? Are *they* answerable to God for the sin (if sin it be) committed by their servants in walking and visiting their friends on the only day when they have an opportunity of doing what is so refreshing, agreeable, and beneficial to them? If such liberty has been bargained for, how can it be refused?

‡ Report, § 39, p. 12.

§ See *ante*, pp. 55, 56. Since writing the passage referred to, I have observed some animated remarks to the same effect in the *New Monthly Magazine*, vol. xxxviii., p. 210, June 1833.

of religious ordinances; *evil association, especially with abandoned females; drunkenness*, arising from attending public-houses, tea-gardens, &c.; *petty theft*; the want of character on leaving prison after the first conviction, and then a reckless course of confirmed guilt. I do not recollect a single case of capital offence where the party has not been a Sabbath-breaker; and in many cases they have assured me that Sabbath-breaking was the first step in the course of crime.”*

Mr John Wontner, keeper of Newgate, also testified:—“I have heard many of the prisoners express their regret that their crimes have originated with a breach of the Sabbath. . . . I have known them caution their relatives and friends to observe the Sabbath, tracing their own crimes to the non-observance or to the breach of the Sabbath.”† Being asked, however, “To what do they attribute the first step in their career of vice?” he answers, “I believe most frequently to *evil associations*, and being drawn out by *bad associates* to the breach of the Sabbath.”‡ He allows that many “*who have been habitual observers of the Lord’s day have been prisoners with me* ;”§ but adds, what nobody will be inclined to doubt, that probably nine-tenths of his inmates were persons who “did not value the Sabbath, or were not in the habit of attending a place of worship.”||

Mr Benjamin Baker, who for twenty years had been in the habit of visiting the prisoners in Newgate, was asked whether the prisoners consider neglect of the duties of the Sabbath as “a leading cause of their transgressions.”—“*I cannot*,” he replied, “*exactly say that they have expressed that* ; but I think that almost universally they have said that was the principal thing; that the deviation from the Sabbath led them on, step by step, into that degree of crime which had brought them there.”¶

Mr Joseph Sadler Thomas, Supt. of Police, Covent Garden Division, F., says:—“I know from experience that persons who are in the habit of attending a place of worship are more careful in their pecuniary transactions, they are more careful in their language, they are more economical in their arrangements at home, they are more affectionate and humane, and in every respect superior beings by far than persons of contrary habits. The others are directly the contrary; *drinking leads them into every description of vice*.”** Whether most commonly drinking leads to Sabbath-breaking, or Sabbath-breaking to drinking, is a question which he leaves untouched.

Lastly, the Report contains a letter from an unnamed clergyman of the Church of Scotland, on this subject; quoted by Principal Lee from a Report of the General Assembly on Sabbath-observance. Its writer’s good sense and honesty do him great credit, and it is to be wished that his example may induce certain of his brethren to abstain from making so much use as they do, in this matter, of the wretched fallacy, “*Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.” “It were perhaps,” says he, “difficult to trace directly to Sabbath-breaking any particular cases of pauperism, disease, or crime; but that all of them are often found IN CONNECTION with the neglect of the Sabbath duties is well known. *The want or weakness of*

* Report, p. 178, Q. 2821.

† Q. 2842.

¶ Ib., p. 181, Q. 2863.

§ Q. 2848.

† Ib., p. 180, Q. 2839, 2841.

|| Q. 2852.

** P. 89, Q. 1282, 1285.

moral principle, shewn by Sabbath-profanation, and the idling habits connected with it, must tend to the diminution of those energies on which health, industry, and virtuous character depend. The desertion of public worship prevents the most invigorating and rectifying applications of moral sentiment; hence an increased exposure to pauperism, disease, and crime; though it might be difficult to estimate the precise extent to which the augmentation of these evils is referable to Sabbath-profanation. That they have increased is without all doubt.”†*

The usual argument—“This man is a criminal; but he was also a Sabbath-breaker; therefore Sabbath-breaking was the cause of his crimes,” may be fairly met thus:—“The Quakers are distinguished by a charitable and peaceful spirit; but they do not esteem one day above another; therefore a want of reverence for the Lord’s Day is the cause of their charitable disposition.”

The Bishop of London also speaks sensibly, in the following passages:—“I feel some difficulty with respect to any legal enforcement of the devout observance of the Sabbath-day; I feel none as to measures which shall prevent gross violations of it without necessity; but with respect to travelling, I have not ever been able to make up my mind as to any legislative provision, which, while it prevented the unnecessary infraction of the rest of that day, should not, on the other hand, impose inconvenient and unnecessary restrictions in other quarters.”‡—“Does your Lordship conceive any provision for the suppression of Sunday travelling, depending on common informers, would be effectual, or the reverse?”—“I think we ought not to consider that any legal provision will depend on common informers. If all people would do their duty living under a civil government, there would be no such thing as common informers. I doubt whether, if temperate and reasonable laws were passed for the observance of the Sabbath, the enforcement of them would fall into the hands of common informers; because I think there is a very large body of serious, as well as reasonable, persons, who are so much interested in the proper observance of that day, with a view to the morality and happiness of the people, that they would take care not to allow such laws to fall into the hands of common informers, provided the laws were so discreetly framed as not to defeat their own purpose, by too rigorous an enactment of penalties, or by too minute an interference with the habits of the people.” §

* This remark can have reference only to cases where the sanctification of the Sabbath is believed to be incumbent. A *Sabbatarian* who profanes the Lord’s Day, does shew “a want or weakness of moral principle.”

† Report, p. 286.

‡ Report, Q. 3816, p. 243.

§ Q. 3824, pp. 243–244. — Sir Robert Peel’s opinion, expressed on the occasion of the introduction of Mr Poulter’s bill for Sabbath-observance into Parliament on 3d June 1835, is similar to the foregoing, though he went the length of declaring himself averse to further legislation on the Sabbath. “He always listened,” he said, “with great concern to discussions upon that subject. There was no man in the House who attached greater importance than he did to the proper keeping of the Sabbath-day. He thought no one had a right to shock the public feeling by desecrating it; but at the same time he entertained very serious doubts whether they could promote that object by legislation, and whether it would not be better to trust to the influence of manners and the increase of morality for the purpose of checking, by public opinion, the attempt at profana-

Dr Chalmers was asked to give evidence before the committee, but begged hard to be excused, being at the time closely occupied with his *Bridgewater Treatise*, and extremely averse to the interruption of his labours. "There is no subject," he added, in writing to Sir Andrew Agnew, "on which I feel myself less competent to offer you information or advice than the one on which you are sitting."*

The fruit of the committee's report was a bill for the better observance of the Lord's Day, brought by Sir Andrew Agnew into Parliament on the 20th March 1833. Its preamble, the first part of which is borrowed from the Act 1st Charles I., c. 1, and must have sounded strangely in the ears of modern statesmen (most of whom are by no means forward to assume the office of declaring what is acceptable to God, or what service of Him is *the true service*), runs as follows:— "Forasmuch as nothing is more acceptable to God than the true and sincere worship and service of Him according to His holy will, and that the holy keeping of the Lord's Day is a principal part of the true service of God, which, in very many places of this realm has been, and now is, profaned and neglected: And whereas it is the bounden duty of the legislature to protect every class of society against being compelled to sacrifice their comfort, health, religious privileges, and conscience, for the convenience, enjoyment, or supposed advantage of any other class, on the Lord's Day: And whereas the laws now in existence are found to be practically insufficient to secure the object for which they profess to provide," &c.†

In reference to the beginning of this preamble, Dr M'Crie says it is hard to see how there could be any legislation on the subject of Sabbath-observance, without a recognition, such as it contains, of the divine institution of the Sabbath—"as it is only from the law of re-

tion of the Sabbath, than to have recourse to new laws, which, he feared, in themselves would be difficult of execution; and which, as they might be perverted to purposes of individual vexation, would tend to bring the law itself into disrespect. He should say from his own short experience that the Sabbath was never better observed than at present; and that this was owing, not to legislation, but to the influence of manners and of public opinion."—(*Mirror of Parliament*, 3d June 1835; quoted in *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, p. 252.)

In treating of the connexion and limits of ethics and politics, Michaelis observes:—"It is the business of both to promote human happiness, and both alike admit this universal principle, from which all their particular precepts flow—*Endeavour to extend happiness as far as possible.* In the means, however, which they employ for this purpose, they materially differ. Some means of universal happiness remain, in all circumstances and countries, the same; and their contraries are always certain obstacles to it. Thus in any nation, however and wherever situated, theft and whoredom, if prevalent, and regarded as matters of indifference, will never fail to lessen the public happiness. The former will diminish the love of industry and gain, which always increases where property is secure: the latter makes children doubtful, hinders their education, propagates diseases, and so forth. In regard to such matters as these, the rule obviously belongs to ethics. But there is not the same certainty as to the effects of other means: of which, perhaps, there may, for one single point of happiness, be proposed a great variety; and then it comes to be a question, to the solution of which a greater reach of understanding is requisite, which of them all is the best? And this will be different in different circumstances."—(*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. i., p. 40.)

* *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, p. 141.

† *Ib.*, p. 151.

velation that we learn Sabbatical duty; and without it there could be no ground left for protecting society in the observance of the seventh any more than the seventieth portion of time, or of the first more than any other day of the week."* For my part, I see no difficulty in the matter. The observance of the first day of the week as a day of rest is an established custom of the country, admitted on all hands to be extremely conducive to the public welfare. The fact that this proportion of time is found by experience to be no greater than we require, would be a conclusive answer to any fool who should propose to substitute the seventieth day for the seventh; while the impossibility of making, without great public inconvenience, a purposeless transference of the day of rest to Monday or Saturday, would be an equally good reason for adhering to the observance of Sunday. With respect to the second part of the preamble, which declares it to be the bounden duty of the legislature to protect every class of society against *being compelled* to sacrifice their comfort, health, religious privileges, and conscience on the Lord's Day, this, I presume, is a principle which nobody will question; and the wonder is, that in a country where slavery has no existence, an act for protecting any class of Her Majesty's subjects against being compelled to do any thing which the law does not impose on them should be thought necessary by men in the position of legislators. Mr Plumtre, in supporting Sir Andrew Agnew, maintained that "the House is bound to protect those who cannot protect themselves;" and this, Dr M'Crie declares to "express the whole gist of Sir Andrew's legislation about the Sabbath."† Now, whose rights *are* infringed in cases of Sunday labour at present? Who are compelled to sacrifice their health? Where are the people that cannot protect themselves? There *can* be none but those whose civil liberty is violated, and whose oppressors are consequently liable to punishment by the criminal law. If it be said that a shopkeeper who trades on Sunday compels *virtually*, though not *in form*, the neighbouring shopkeepers to do so likewise, on pain of being ruined, I in the first place doubt the correctness of the statement,‡ and secondly, sup-

* Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew, p. 152.

† *Ib.*, p. 153.

‡ Two cases of shopkeepers, whose prosperity *increased* after they ceased to trade on Sunday, are mentioned in the Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew, pp. 230, 247. One of them is quoted from a speech of the Bishop of Chester (now Archbishop of Canterbury) at a "Lord's Day meeting" at Exeter Hall on 1st May 1834. He said he knew the case of a shopkeeper, who, when remonstrated with by his clergyman for not shutting his shop on the Sabbath, replied, "Why, I cannot afford it, for I sell more on the Sunday than all the other days of the week put together:" however, he was induced to make the trial, and afterwards confessed to the clergyman, "Sir, to tell you the truth, I have taken more money in the six months since I shut up my shop on the Sunday, than I did in any one year before, since I was in business." The other case, related by Sir Andrew himself, is that of a zealous London Sabbatarian whom he visited, and found living in elegant comfort. "On my remarking that he was surely more favoured than his neighbours, 'The Sabbath, sir,' he replied, 'has done it all; for while I traded on [the] Sabbath, I could make nothing. All my winnings were put into a *bag with holes*, but ever since I respected the Sabbath I have prospered.'" It is natural that a tradesman who observes so reputable an institution as the Lord's Day should gain the good will of excellent customers; and that he who then reposes from toil, who stimulates his moral, religious, and social emotions at church, and who improves his understanding by reading and thinking, should be more prosperous than if he acted otherwise: for

posing it to be true, I reply that Sunday-trading, so far as it is really prejudicial to the temporal welfare of the community, may *on that ground* be put a stop to by the legislature, and so the desired "protection" be incidentally given. For such *entire* protection as philanthropists desire to give the weak against the strong, the poor against the rich, and the honest reasonable man against the dishonest and unreasonable, human laws are inadequate. Improved education—especially in its moral department, which at present is but little attended to—is what we must chiefly rely upon for a diminution of oppression, whether of servants by masters, or of small sects of religionists by those which, from the number of their adherents, have the power of determining by a majority of votes that *they* are THE ORTHODOX, and of treating *heretical dissenters* with injustice and indignity.

Principal Lee is afraid that "a poor man, though firmly convinced that the Sabbath ought to be sanctified, by resting entirely from the secular pursuits and recreations which are lawful on other days, and by devoting the whole time to the exercises of devotion, the contemplation of Divine truth, and the enjoyment of Christian fellowship, might find, that unless he would consent to work on the Sabbath as on other days, he must lose his employment altogether. Choosing to obey God rather than man,* he might be dismissed by an inconsiderate or infidel master;† and he might be told, that by his disobedience he had forfeited all claim to a certificate of character. But even persons in comparatively independent circumstances," he continues, "might have their right of enjoying the rest of the Sabbath materially abridged, or almost nullified, by the perversity of turbulent neighbours, if there should be no tribunal before which a complaint might be brought. They might be incessantly disturbed by noisy labour or boisterous merriment; and while their personal tranquillity was thus interrupted by a succession of intolerable annoyances, they might have the mortification of observing that their children, whom they are anxious to train up with a veneration for sacred things, have become so familiarised to profanity, as to be in danger of having every serious impression obliterated from their minds; and yet, for this most grievous injury, so subversive of their comfort, and so cruelly destructive of their fondest hopes, is it reasonable to say that the civil power must be excused for refusing to yield any redress? It would indeed be a mistaken policy to enforce attendance on public worship (and under this mistaken view of public duty, oppression has sometimes been exercised in former times‡); but there can be no

alacrity, honesty, and intelligence, which such conduct promotes, are qualities well known to be highly conducive to success in business.

What need had these prosperous men, of "protection" from their Sunday-trading neighbours?

* That is, to obey what he *believed* to be the command of God.

† Or by a master who agreed with St Paul in preference to Sir Andrew Agnew. As to infidel masters, I have never observed them to treat their servants less kindly than other men do. It is probable that David Hume, Anthony Collins, Adam Smith, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, were above the average quality of masters.

‡ After all, then, and in spite of Dr Hetherington, the Presbyterians *were* intolerant!

danger of going too far, in providing that nothing shall be done on the Lord's Day, calculated either to outrage the repose of private families, or to frustrate the reasonable expectation of every man, however humble in station, that he shall be allowed without distraction to avail himself of the stated opportunities of attending public worship."*

Now, if any "inconsiderate or infidel master" should be so foolish as to dismiss a servant for refusing to work on Sundays as on other days, and so churlish as to refuse a certificate, he would do no more than he was legally *entitled* to do, if either the servant had engaged to work on Sundays when required, or the contract between them was terminable at the time of dismissal. A master is entitled to hire a servant to do what lawful work he thinks fit to be done on the Lord's Day, and to dismiss the servant for neglecting that work; nor does the law of Scotland compel masters to give to any servant a certificate of character. If a servant who has bargained not to work on Sunday is dismissed prematurely for refusing to work, the law of contracts sufficiently protects that servant against the injustice. Such cases, however, are very unlikely to happen.—As to the protection of people from the perversity of turbulent neighbours, I observe, that in all cases of "a succession of intolerable annoyances," the law of nuisance and the police-regulations of our cities afford protection in flagrant cases; while, in every case, the power of public opinion is an almost omnipotent check upon evil-doers. If the Christian principle of doing as we would be done to, were impressed upon the people as deeply as it ought to be, at school and at church, and if the advantages of acting upon it were duly taught to the young by precept and training, the danger of offensive conduct of any class of men towards their neighbours would be greatly diminished. The duty of not offending needlessly even the "weaker brethren," will never be neglected by any man of good feeling and good education; much less that of forbearing to diminish the comfort of brethren who are no weaker than himself. But if "weaker brethren" have their *rights*, they have also their *duties*; it is desirable they should see the impropriety of annoying other men, by officious interference with *their* rights, and hindering them from indulgence in such refreshing pursuits as they, in the exercise of their Christian liberty, may think proper to follow unobtrusively upon the Lord's Day. Should any Scotchman, for instance, find it beneficial to refresh himself by playing on the piano on a Sunday, a weak brother overhearing him from the street would have no good ground of complaint, however shocking the sound might be to his puritanical but unreasonable and most unscriptural prejudices.†

* Report of Committee, Q. 4157, p. 289.

† "The strong, violent, and firm persuasions of conscience in single persons, or in some communities of men, is not," says Bishop Taylor, "a sufficient indication of a moral law. The weak brother, of whom St Paul speaks, durst not eat flesh, but thought it an impiety next to unpardonable, but he was abused: and there are at this day some persons, some thousands of persons, against whose conscience it is to dress meat upon the Lord's Day, or to use an innocent permitted recreation. Now, when such an opinion makes a sect, and this sect gets firm confidants and zealous defenders, in a little time it will dwell upon the

To Sir Andrew Agnew's bill it was of course loudly objected, that the prohibition of *all* Sunday work, if fit to be enacted in one department of human affairs, was fit to be enacted in all; and that, as the labour of domestic servants was unprohibited, rich men's enjoyments would be exempt from the curtailment which those of the poor would suffer from the suppression of public conveyances on Sunday. To this charge of partial dealing Dr M'Crie replies, that when a master exacts work from his servant on Sunday, beyond what is necessary, "the offence comes under the category of *personal desecrations*, with which, though highly reprehensible, and of pernicious tendency, the law cannot deal, so long as they do not offend public decency or interfere with the interests of other classes of the community. It does not," says he, "appear to have been sufficiently observed, in the endless discussions on this subject, that the only form in which the law can interpose to protect those servants who are engaged in public trades, is by restraining the masters from competing with each other in the public market for gain; which cannot, of course, apply to the case of those who employ servants merely for their own convenience."* This, however, is mere sophistry: if additional "*protection*" is needed in the case of traders (which, as already intimated, I am unable to see), it is needed in the case of domestic servants too; and if, *for the purpose of securing rest* on the Sabbath to those traders who wish it, you may and ought to restrain all other traders from competing with them in the public market, why may and ought you not to secure, by such *other* means as will serve the purpose, the compulsory abstinence of the cooks, coachmen, lady's-maids, and other servants of the rich, from all Sunday work? Why is the poor man to be deprived of the means of conveyance to the country, on the only day when he is at liberty to refresh himself with rural air and exercise, while the rich man, who can obtain these and all other advantages at his pleasure, is allowed to drive about on Sunday as freely as at other times? Does the driving of a private carriage through the streets on Sunday, less "offend public decency" than the running of a railway train? Unless such questions can be satisfactorily answered, the charge of "gross partiality" from which Dr M'Crie endeavours to defend the bill, must be regarded as just. Sir Andrew said in Parliament, "I wish as much as any man that domestic servants were relieved from all unnecessary work on the Lord's Day, and I am happy to hear that the late discussions have led many to reconsider their family arrangements; and I trust the progress of public opinion and a paramount sense of duty will produce this effect more and more. But I am unwilling, by legislation, to assume any *inquisitorial power*, inconsistent with the genius of the British constitution. I am unwilling to encroach on the old English maxim, that 'Every man's house is his castle.'"† Well, suppose you must not enter the Englishman's castle in aid of those within it who require legal "*protection*," what prevents you, when he sallies forth in his chariot, and so enables you, without either invading his sanc-

conscience, as if it were a native there; whereas it is but a pitiful inmate, and ought to be turned out of doors."—(*Ductor Dubitantium*, B. II., ch. II., Rule vi., § 73; Works, vol. xii., p. 436.) See *ante*, p. 161.

* Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew, p. 155. See also pp. 173, 211, 251, 254.

† *Ib.*, p. 173.

tuary or exercising "inquisitorial power," to convict him of compelling his helpless coachman and horses to break the Fourth Commandment—what prevents you from pouncing upon *him* as conveniently as upon the railway engine-man? In Scotland, where men's houses are not their castles, the civil law once invaded the shop of a barber in Dundee, and "protected" his apprentice from the work of shaving customers on Sunday morning. In this case Lord Jeffrey decided that although the Act of 1579, prohibiting handicraft-labour on Sundays, was relaxed by the Confession of Faith in so far as "works of necessity and mercy" are concerned, (which Confession was in 1690 ratified by Parliament "as the public and avowed Confession of this Church, containing the sum and substance of the doctrine of the reformed Churches,") yet as people might without serious inconvenience be shaved on Saturday evening, the urgency was not such as to render the case exceptional, and the local civil authorities had therefore done wrong to "*enjoin* what they may have blamelessly *permitted*, and actually subject a man to penalties for not doing what the law has forbidden." On appeal to the Inner House (or court of review) of the Court of Session, a majority of the judges reversed the decision; but the case having been carried to the House of Lords, the apprentice obtained a final judgment in his favour.* The objection that it is unfair

* *Phillips v. Innes*, 20th Feb. 1837; Shaw and Maclean's Appeal Cases in the House of Lords, vol. ii., p. 465. The case is mentioned in the Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew, p. 294.

In 1828 an attempt was made to stop the plying, on Sundays, of the steamer between Dundee and Broughty Ferry, a bathing place much resorted to by the towns-people: but that attempt was repressed by the following admirable decision of the Sheriff of the county:—

"This action is laid solely and entirely on statutory law; but it has not been shewn that the statutes authorise the remedy of interdict, supposing the act complained of to amount to a profanation of the Lord's Day. It does not however appear to the Sheriff, looking to what is tolerated in other instances in both ends of the island, that there is any sufficient ground for that charge. In England, the plying of stage-coaches and all other land conveyances, as well as water conveyances, is permitted on Sundays as lawful. It is true that in Scotland there are particular statutes against the profanation of the Sabbath, some of which are here libelled on; but it is always a question what shall amount to a profanation of that day. It is not maintained by the pursuers that the running of the mail-coach with passengers to and from Dundee is a profanation of the Sabbath; or the using of hackney-coaches, post-chaises, gigs, and caravans of every description, saddle-horses, &c. The employment, too, of ferry-boats is sanctioned by universal practice as quite lawful on Sundays, and vessels with goods and passengers sail on that day of the week from the port of Dundee and other ports of Scotland, and (as it may happen) arrive there on Sabbath, and set ashore their passengers, without objection from any quarter.

"The steamboat in question does not sail till after the morning and afternoon service is over; and if those who use it are upon their necessary and lawful affairs, there can be no more blame on the part of the defender in hiring his vessel to them, than would attach to the owner of a passage-boat hired to go to Broughty Ferry. But it is impossible practically to ascertain and distinguish, among the whole passengers, those who embark from motives of duty and necessity, from those who go solely for pleasure and amusement. How can it, for example, be made to appear that many of those who are passengers have not come by land to Dundee that day, or the day preceding, for the purpose of attending divine service in Dundee, and are returning to their families and homes? On the other hand, it is believed, and may be assumed, that many of those who

to make railway servants work on Sundays for the benefit of others, is met by the principle formerly stated (p. 270), that another day of rest should be given them, to compensate for the Sunday when it is their turn to be deprived of repose. If this do not satisfy them, they are at liberty to quit the employment for one which will be more suitable to their wishes. When the service required is light, and occupies but a small part of the day, the hardship is not one that appeals strongly to the sympathies of the humane, or that needs to be specially compensated.

As already mentioned, Sir Andrew Agnew's bill was read a first time on 20th March 1833. The discussion of its merits was deferred till the second reading on 16th May; and in a speech then delivered, Sir Andrew shewed the utter unconsciousness which the Sabbatarians constantly display, of doubt whether the commandment to the Jews to keep holy *the Sabbath*, is a commandment to the Gentiles to keep holy *the Lord's Day*. "To discuss," said he, "the question of the observance of the Lord's Day in any assembly without alluding to *the command to keep it holy*, would be a solecism of which I would not willingly be guilty. *The Almighty has commanded us to keep the day holy*, to 'cease from all manner of work;' and the ordinance extends to 'the man, to his household, to his cattle, and to the stranger within his gates.' Such is the high authority on which I justify legislative interference on the subject. But as to the spiritual observance of the Lord's Day, as to how it is to be kept, the bill now before the House presumes not to dictate. . . . In reference to the preamble and first clause of the bill itself, did it contain merely the private opinion of the humble individual who now addresses the House, it had better

avail themselves of the privilege of going to and returning from Broughty by means of the defender's vessel, are hard-working people, employed in a sedentary occupation from Monday morning till Saturday night, and who, after attending divine service once or twice a day, make a sea-trip during a summer evening for the sake of health and recreation, and to enable them the better to resume their weekly labours, and thereby earn a subsistence for themselves and their families. It humbly appears to the Sheriff that there is no sufficient ground for charging persons acting in this way with profaning the Sabbath. Many cross and recross the Tay in the regular passage-boat on Sundays, merely for the sake of health and recreation, without being held guilty of profaning the Lord's Day. Neither would such a charge lie against them were they to transport themselves on a Sunday in any hired carriage, or on foot, from Dundee to Broughty, and thence back to Dundee; and it is difficult to draw the proposed line of distinction between crossing and recrossing the Ferry from Forfarshire to Fife in a steamboat for recreation and health, and going from Dundee to Broughty, and returning in the defender's steamvessel; neither sailing, from the like motives, during the time of divine worship. But if there be no profanity attachable to such passengers and travellers personally, how can that charge be made good against the Fife and Forfar Trustees, or against the defender, the owners of the vessels employed in transporting such passengers, more than against the proprietors of the carriages employed in conveying travellers by land from Dundee to Broughty Ferry? It may be said that the defender's vessel is to be assimilated to a Sunday stage-coach, which it is unlawful to run that day. But, besides that in some important particulars these two modes of conveyance are not equally calculated to give offence to persons of a more strict turn of mind, it is extremely doubtful whether it would be held to be a profanation of the Sunday, were one of the Leith stage-coaches to run once every Sunday from Edinburgh to Leith, and thence back again, after the service of the day was over."

This case was appealed to the Court of Session, which declined to interfere,

not have stood there; but regarding, as I do, the principle it declares in a much higher point of view, and having therefore placed it in that position, I would rather that you reject the whole measure than that you pass the whole and reject the first clause. And I thus speak simply because I feel and am persuaded that, without recognising the authority of God in this institution, the most perfect Sabbath Bill you could construct would prove nothing better than a beautiful edifice without a foundation, a castle in the air, a statute not binding on the conscience, and therefore inoperative, because it would not be in the power of the magistrate to carry it into execution.”* No wonder that a speech expressing such antiquated views of the functions of the legislature, and excluding so completely the notion that God’s truth and Sir Andrew Agnew’s truth *might* be two different things, should have been received both in and out of Parliament with general derision. The second reading of the bill was lost by a majority of 6, the votes being 79 to 73. In the debate which led to this division, Lord Althorp said with great good sense, “I should be one of the last men in the House who could wish to do any thing which would operate injuriously against the proper observance of the Sunday. I think it most desirable, not only in a religious, but also in a political and moral point of view, that it should be observed as a day of *rest*; but I think it far from desirable, in either point of view, that *recreation and amusement* should be prevented on that day.”† His Lordship, in short, was willing to promote by any *practicable* means a mode of observance of the Lord’s Day precisely resembling the mode of Sabbath-observance prescribed to the Jews by the Fourth Commandment—a law which prohibits *work*, but not *recreation or amusement*.‡ This, however, was “infidelity” and “heathenism” in the eyes of Sir Andrew Agnew and his followers, who, as I said before, and shall prove hereafter, go far beyond the Jews in what Calvin styles “the gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism.”

But no defeat could damp the zeal of Sir Andrew, who never for a moment doubted that he was engaged in a holy war which, either in his own hands or in those of some future champion, must ultimately be crowned with success by “the Lord of the Sabbath.” One of the weapons, says his biographer, on which “he placed considerable dependence during his campaign both in and out of Parliament, was that of *reiteration*. Superficial observers were struck by the frequency with which he repeated the same sentiments and arguments, and may have set this down to the barrenness and commonplace of the subject or of the man. But, in fact, this also was a piece of policy, and the re-

as having no jurisdiction in the matter. Two of the judges, however, incidentally touched upon the merits of the question; one of them (the Lord President) being of opinion that none of the Scottish statutes had any reference to the case, and the other (Lord Gillies, a judge of much ability) declaring that he regarded the bringing forward of such a case as “an ill-advised proceeding.” See *Jobson v. Lambert*, 29th Nov. 1828; *Shaw and Dunlop’s Reports of Cases in the Court of Session*, vol. vii., p. 83.

It is a fact worth mentioning, that in Glasgow, omnibuses regularly ply on Sundays between that pious city and the villages of Partick and Govan, and are extensively used by people going to and from church.

* *Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew*, pp. 172–175.

† *Ibid.*, p. 176.

‡ See Note R.

sult of deliberate intention. ‘*Non vi sed sæpe cadendo,*’ was the maxim on which Sir Andrew calculated for success. With an assiduity which more resembled the steady movements of mechanism than the intermittent efforts of human volition, he embraced every opportunity of reiterating the facts and principles which he sought to impress on the legislature and on the country. ‘By no other means,’ he said, ‘can the public mind be more effectually benefited, than by frequently reiterating that which is of admitted excellence. The reiteration is, at least, a proof of the publisher’s being himself convinced; and others, to whom the same arguments once carried home conviction, may be profitably reminded of the eternal truths.’”* The principle is sound; and *his* reiteration, like that of true political economy by the Anti-Corn-law League, would have led to complete success ere now, had his doctrines been as unassailable as theirs. But with views which are generally held by thinking and knowing men, Sir Andrew mingled his ultra-Judaism so plentifully, that the reiteration of his opinions for a thousand years must have failed to carry his point. That, in spite of the damage thus done to his cause, the *reasonable* part of his agitation produced some good effects by convince-

* “Letter to *Record*, June 25, 1838.” Memoirs, p. 288.

“He seems,” says Dr M’Crie, p. 313, “to have been raised up as a public witness for God’s truth” (observe the confident phrase), “a living remembrancer of his Sabbath, called to hold up *the requirements of his holy law* in an assembly which ‘desired not the knowledge of his ways.’—‘Be not afraid of their faces,’ was a favourite text of his, to strengthen himself against the looks and gestures that met him when he rose to plead *his Master’s cause*. And none can have looked into the House of Commons, or listened to its debates, without being struck with wonder how, in an atmosphere so uncongenial, the courage could have been given him to stand forth, as he did on all occasions, *in defence of the sacred rights of Heaven*. To the pertinacity of his opponents, who lost no opportunity of expressing their contempt for the day of God” (*i. e.*, for *his notions*, which were not theirs, of the right manner of employing what *he regarded*, but they did not, as the day of God spoken of in the Fourth Commandment), “he opposed the pertinacity of a zeal ever ready to ‘testify’ in its behalf. Let the following specimens, culled much at random from the recorded debates, suffice to illustrate what we refer to:—

“*Mr Wakley*—‘I cannot see any reason why the British Museum should not be open to the public on Sundays, for their amusement.’

“*Sir Andrew Agnew*—‘The honourable member may see the strongest reason he can require *in the commandment of God, which tells us to keep holy the Sabbath-day.*’

“*Mr Hawes*—‘I propose a bill prohibiting the opening of victualling-houses on the morning of Sunday till one o’clock.’

“*Sir Andrew* said—‘The proposition would have the effect of annihilating Sunday as a Sabbath from one o’clock, and he could not consent to such a proposition. The whole twenty-four hours of the Sabbath ought to be respected and guarded from desecration.’

“The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr Spring Rice*) said—‘He had been in the Zoological Gardens very often himself on Sundays.’

“*Sir Andrew* ‘considered *this a desecration of the Sabbath*. He had heard the opinion of the right honourable Chancellor of the Exchequer with surprise. It was one which he did not believe to be in conformity with the religious feelings of the great body of the people.’”

Whatever may be “the feelings of the great body of the people” in this respect, I for one believe most thoroughly, that the visits of *Mr Spring Rice* to the Zoological Gardens were not at variance with the letter or spirit of even the Jewish law, much less of the law of Christ.

ing many thoughtless people of the expediency of suspending on the Sunday all labour and commerce beyond what the public good really and fairly requires, seems highly probable, or rather is not to be doubted. I willingly give Sir Andrew Agnew this credit, and along with it a cordial expression of my respect for his character as a gentleman and a philanthropist.* But in public men the virtues of piety, kindness, conscientiousness, and unflinching resolution, inevitably miss the mark unless directed by wisdom and adequate knowledge; and in the case of Sir Andrew it is painful to behold so much zeal and activity expended in a cause which deserved, and has attained, so small a measure of success.

Two subsequent attempts to bring the bill to a second reading were in like manner abortive; but at the fourth trial of his Parliamentary strength, a step was made in advance. The first reading was carried on 4th May 1837 by a majority of 146 (199 to 53);† a result shewing how effective the agitation out of doors had been. But the grand debate was reserved for 7th June, when Sir Andrew moved the second reading. "On this occasion," says Dr M'Crie, "the discussion was opened with great effect by Mr Plumptre, who read several passages from Scripture, denouncing the judgments of God on NATIONS which despised his Sabbaths."‡ In what parts of Scripture such denunciations are contained, I have never been able to discover; although threats against the Jews may easily be found in abundance. The Sabbath was a "sign" of the covenant between them and their political Sovereign;§ and its profanation being an overt act of rebellion, and consequently a political offence of the deepest dye, the Jewish law enacting its capital punishment, and the threats recorded in the Jewish Scriptures against its desecrators, are as intelligible with respect to the Israelites, as they would be unintelligible in relation to nations of which the Deity did not condescend to be the temporal Sovereign. Dr M'Crie proceeds to say that Mr Plumptre's "references to the Decalogue called forth an expression of dissent, which proved at once how distasteful to many was the argument which went to place the Fourth Commandment on an equality with the rest." Here again I must observe that this equal ranking might not be so distasteful as is supposed; possibly not one of the dissentients had the slightest objection to place all the ten commandments "on an equality" as portions of the Jewish law, which they certainly are, and than which, in the opinion of many learned men as capable of judging as Mr Plumptre or Dr M'Crie, they are nothing else. The "distaste" may have been only for an argument which aimed at placing the duty of Sabbath-observance required of the Jews by the Fourth Commandment, on an equality with the duties enjoined in the nine other precepts of the Decalogue, and which are also enjoined by the law of nature and the law of Christ.

On this occasion the *second* reading of the bill was carried by 110 votes against 66; by which unprecedented success great rejoicing was occasioned among the Sabbatarians, and one pious journalist, whose

* In one particular, however, his conduct is open to censure: he countenanced the shabby practice of creating *one-share*-holding voters for the purpose of defeating the *bona fide* proprietors of the railways.

† Memoirs, p. 298.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 299.

§ See *ante*, p. 167.

words were formerly quoted, was moved to offer up thanks to "the Lord of the Sabbath," that "it had pleased Him so to order events" that such a measure (which proved to be its *final* measure) of success had been attained.*

In the same year Sir Andrew procured the insertion of a clause against Sunday-trains into the Glasgow, Paisley, and Ayr Railway; thus commencing in Parliament, says his biographer, "the campaign which he afterwards carried on without its walls, against this tremendous inroad on the peace and purity of the Sabbath." The proposed clause, however, was lost; as was also a motion which he brought forward on 15th June 1837, for leave to introduce a bill "to declare that the use of railways on the Lord's Day is contrary to the law of Scotland." But at this stage of his career it pleased "Him who is emphatically the Lord of the Sabbath," and to whose special interference Sir Andrew's former petty success was ascribed with a degree of confidence of which I am curious to know the grounds—"it pleased Him who governs the unruly wills of sinful mortals, so to order events" that the Parliamentary operations of the great champion of the holy cause were brought suddenly and for ever to a close. "In June 1837, William IV. died, and was succeeded on the throne by her present Majesty, Queen Victoria. This led to a dissolution of Parliament and a new election. Sir Andrew" (in what Dr M'Crie calls "the inscrutable providence of God") "failed in securing his return to Parliament; and none having succeeded to his mission, possessed of sufficient courage or perseverance to prosecute the measure, his bold and unflinching BILL, on which so much labour had been expended, and which had successfully buffeted the storms and breakers of five sessions, was left like a stranded vessel high and dry on the beach, where it may be considered as still lying—a monument, at once, of the impulsive zeal of its author, and of the receding tide of a nation's piety"†—or superstition.

Having thus ceased to be a legislator, Sir Andrew thenceforward devoted his whole energies to the task of diffusing his opinions among the people, and urging their practical adoption. In January 1839 he took the lead in founding at Edinburgh "The Scottish Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day;" on which occasion was read the letter of Dr Chalmers, quoted at p. 181 of this volume. According to Dr M'Crie, "the amount of personal labour performed by Sir Andrew at this period, in prosecuting the Sabbath cause, is almost incredible. His name appears first in the lists of the committees of *all* the auxiliaries of this Society, amounting, in 1840, to twelve. But this was no mere honorary connection. *These auxiliaries, in fact, owed their origin to his unremitting exertions, by correspondence and personal intercourse. He attended all their meetings, AND WAS THE MOVING SPRING OF ALL THEIR OPERATIONS.* He corresponded on behalf of the Society, using it as a vantage-ground from which he launched his missives in all directions."‡ In this eulogy of Sir Andrew, the vast superiority of his Sabbatarian zeal, in intensity, over that of the people he was rousing, is very apparent: *he*, and not their own horror at Sun-

* The *Record* newspaper, June 8, 1837; quoted *ante*, p. 160.

† *Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew*, pp. 315-317.

‡ *Memoirs*, p. 347.

day trains (which they had hitherto regarded without emotion as a reasonable and allowable accommodation), was the spring of the movement; and it is well known in Scotland to those who mingle in general society, that the small body of earnest followers who rallied around him, and who still go from meeting to meeting and give utterance to "the voice of the Scottish people," are, with all the show and noise that they make, just as little influential or formidable in themselves, as were the specious handful of Highlanders who, in the year 1746, scared Sir Andrew's distinguished ancestor and namesake from attacking them at Blair-Athole.* Even in puritanical Glasgow, it was a difficult

* The party of Jacobites to which these Highlanders belonged was stationed at Dalnaspidal, while Lieutenant-General Sir Andrew Agnew occupied Blair Castle with a Government force. The insurgents were commanded by Lord George Murray, and, notwithstanding the inexperience of most of them in military affairs, one night successfully executed, under his directions, the brilliant exploit of surprising and carrying thirty detached posts (some of them strong and defensible), all within two hours of the night, without the loss of a single man; and the different parties met at the appointed place of rendezvous, although their operations lay in a mountainous country, intersected by ravines and rivers. Lord George had himself marched to the Bridge of Bruar, with twenty-five men and a few elderly gentlemen, when he was informed that Sir Andrew Agnew was advancing with a strong force to reconnoitre. In the words of the author of *Douglas*—"It was daylight; but the sun was not up. Lord George, looking earnestly about him, observed a fold-dike (that is, a wall of sod or turf), which had been begun as a fence for cattle, but left unfinished. He ordered his men to follow him, and drew them up behind the dike, at such a distance one from another that they might make a great show, having the colours of both regiments flying in their front. He then gave orders to the pipers (for he had with him all the pipers, both of the Athole men and the Macphersons,) to keep their eyes fixed upon the road from Blair; and the moment they saw the soldiers appear, to strike up with all their bagpipes at once. It happened that the regiments came in sight just as the sun rose, and that instant the pipers began to play one of their most noisy pibrochs. Lord George Murray and his Highlanders, both officers and men, drew their swords and brandished them about their heads. Sir Andrew, after gazing a while at this spectacle, ordered his men to the right-about, and marched them back to the Castle of Blair. Lord George Murray kept his post at the bridge till several of his parties came in; and as soon as he had collected three or four hundred men, conscious of victory, and certain that his numbers would be greater very soon, he marched to Blair, and invested the castle."—(*Home's History of the Rebellion in 1745*, p. 205.) In a military point of view these incidents are held up to admiration by General Stewart of Garth, in his *Sketches of the Highlanders*, vol. ii., App., Note MM. The Sabbatarian Sir Andrew seems to have taken a lesson from the outwitted of his illustrious great-grandfather, so ludicrous a similarity is there between his tactics and those of Sir George Murray at the critical juncture in question. If Sir George ensconced himself at the bridge of Bruar behind a turf-dike, under shelter of which he could send forth his terrible bagpipe-screechings and appalling sabre-flashes, Sir Andrew with equal judgment took up his position behind the Scottish Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day—a position which, as his faithful biographer has recorded to his honour, served him admirably "as a vantage-ground from which he launched his missives in all directions." If Sir George, with twenty-five men and a few elderly gentlemen, contrived to make so terrible a figure by judiciously spreading them out, Sir Andrew with his troop became as formidable in the eyes of distant spectators, from the wide expanse of country which was made the sphere of his operations. If Sir George's bagpipes, by their combined and deafening blast, struck terror into the foe, the united voices of Sir Andrew and his body-guard seldom failed to excite, if not much alarm among the initiated, at least an exalted opinion of his strength

matter to blow up the flame. Having, at the suggestion of his friend Mr Bridges, bought in 1841 “*a share* in the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway stock,”* Sir Andrew opened a campaign on that new field; but at first “nothing could be more discouraging than the prospect before him and his friends,”† who had qualified themselves in the same judicious manner to vote against Sunday trains. Dr M’Crie records in the words of Sir Andrew himself, that at a half-yearly meeting of the Company, “there was *not a man* connected with the religious city of Glasgow who would come forward to help them. An appeal was made to religious men, and with very great difficulty they got at the next meeting a dozen.”‡ By and by, however, his agitation, with the strenuous aid of the clergy (who, as moving powers in society, hold a peculiarly high place in Glasgow,§ and, as we saw before,|| conceal most carefully from their flocks, that according to St Paul it is by no means incumbent upon Christians to esteem one day above another)—the agitation, with this effective aid, succeeded so wonderfully that “in the same city, where at first they could not get one individual to appear in their support, in the course of a few days 1300 gentlemen not only put their names to the memorial praying the directors to keep the railway absolutely closed on the Sabbath, but they published the memorial in the newspapers, with their names and addresses at full length.”¶ It may reasonably be doubted whether so many as 1300 persons in the rank of “gentlemen,” and therefore presumable to be educated persons, were prevailed upon to sign the memorial; but however this may be, we all know the vast difference which there is between subscribing a memorial at the request of “the minister” or some other influential individual, perhaps without reading a word of the document which is presented, and deliberately believing all that is set forth therein. Indifference is not so easily changed into fervour in the souls of “thirteen hundred gentlemen.”

In this new sphere of action, Sir Andrew, in spite of successive defeats, displayed all his usual perseverance. “Duly, at every half-yearly meeting, was the lance of our worthy knight couched, and a tilt made at Sunday traffic. But not satisfied with contending in person, it was his daily business *to prevail on others* to follow his example. With this view, *letters were despatched to all supposed to be friendly and influential. These, again, converted into printed circulars, were dispersed far and wide*; for Sir Andrew may be said to have been the publisher and distributor of his own productions. Even *handbills were put in re-*

among some to whom the report of his doings came. And lastly, if Sir George had the colours of two regiments distributed with good effect along his slender line, Sir Andrew, we shall see, availed himself most skilfully of “placards of large-lettered information on the walls of the most distant towns!” Were ever the plans of two generals more surprisingly parallel?

Dr M’Crie, who gives an amusing account of the military Sir Andrew Agnew in the first chapter of the Memoirs, strangely omits all mention of his retreat from the colours and bagpipes at the bridge of Bruar.

* Memoirs, p. 374.

† *Ib.*, p. 383.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 333.

§ See the complaints of Dr Chalmers in his Memoirs, vol. ii. pp. 21, 114.

|| *Ante*, pp. 56, 57. The reader will be good enough to remember my approval of Sir Andrew Agnew’s policy of *reiteration*.

¶ Sir Andrew’s speech at Manchester, January 1837; Memoirs, p. 383.

quisition, and through Sir Andrew's industry, THE WALLS OF THE MOST DISTANT TOWNS were placarded with large-lettered information, so that the most careless passer-by of the working classes might not remain ignorant of the REAL NATURE of the struggle that was going on.* Assuredly he was an adept at pulling the wires of this clattering show of intense and wide-spread Sabbatarianism!

His circulars to the proprietors of the Railway, soliciting their proxies in return for Sabbatarian tracts, elicited a host of replies. Some, of course, were favourable; but others, of which Dr M'Crie gives some amusing samples, were full of indignation and ridicule. One old lady was in horror at the very idea of Sir Andrew's notions being reduced to practice: "It would make it a fearful day to me. No, no, Sir Andrew; I wish to be in the open air, and to see the face of nature; then my devotional feelings are warmed."† Dr M'Crie ungallantly calls her "a cross old lady:" if she answered this description (a point on which the sentences quoted leave us in the dark), she certainly took an excellent way of lessening her crossness and improving her Christian character, by looking at the face of nature in the open air. There are "cross" Sabbatarians, old and young, who might become blander if they followed her example.

How the Sabbatarians on a sudden attained their object in regard to the Sunday trains between Edinburgh and Glasgow is so generally known, and Dr M'Crie himself mentions it so plainly,‡ that there is difficulty in understanding why it should have excited his amazement in the manner we shall see it did. The facts are briefly these. Some English holders of large amounts of the Company's stock had become greatly dissatisfied with the general policy and management of the Directors, and anxious to supersede them; but finding that even in combination with those Scottish men of business who likewise desired a change, they were not strong enough to accomplish it, they looked about for additional assistance, and without the slightest difficulty ascertained that the Sabbatarian shareholders (existing and that might easily be created) would be happy to join them for a consideration—the *quid pro quo* being an engagement to give seats at the Board to several adherents of Sir Andrew, and to discontinue the conveyance of passengers by the Sunday trains. A bargain was struck accordingly, and the allied forces were successful. It was on 15th November 1846 that the duty of the Sunday trains was restricted to the conveyance of letters, newspapers, and parcels, for the Post-Office. But the Directors, in subsequently reporting the measure to their constituents, took care to discountenance the idea that they had been influenced by their own theological opinions, the majority of the Board seeing no sin whatever in the Sunday trains; their motive, they said, was merely a wish to humour that general public desire which (with an easy credulity, real or affected) they held to be made manifest by the flood of memorials which the Sabbatarians had contrived to pour in upon them.§ By Sir Andrew and his

* Sir Andrew's speech at Manchester, January 1837; *Memoirs*, p. 383.

† *Memoirs*, p. 385.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 386.

§ The following is an extract from the Report of the Directors to the half-yearly meeting of shareholders held on 5th March 1847:—"In conclusion, your directors would advert to a subject which has given rise to much agitation—the

friends, however, the event was viewed in a much more solemn light. According to Dr M'Crie, in this great victory "the day was won for the Sabbath of Scotland, . . . and the eyes of all God-fearing people were turned, as if by common consent, from the agencies of man to the wonder-working hand of the Almighty."* For, of course, it is not to

discontinuance of Sunday trains. Your directors must declare, at once, that they had no wish whatever to coerce the public, or to force their own religious views upon the country. The fact is the very reverse—for a majority of the Board do not feel any objection on religious grounds to Sunday travelling; but they are unanimous in considering it to be their duty as directors rather to ascertain what is the law and custom of the country, than to arrogate to themselves the right to violate the feelings and opinions of the Scottish people. Keeping in view this principle, and seeing that the practice in Scotland has been not to run coaches, steamboats, or other public conveyances, nor, with the exception of this line, any railway trains, till the opening of the North British,—your directors thought themselves bound to adhere to it, and had little idea that they should be accused of attempting to tyrannise over that public whose customs and feelings they were desirous to respect. But, though much opposition has been raised by the supporters of those trains, from the fact that upwards of 1400 memorials have been presented to your Board against, and only eighteen in favour of them, your directors infer that the great majority of the public approve of their discontinuance; and would recommend that the trains should not be re-established till the general practice of Scotland authorises the change."

This paragraph, if written in good faith, must have emanated from one of the English directors, very ignorant (and allowed by his Scottish colleagues to remain so) of the law and practice of Scotland in regard to Sabbath-travelling. What these have long been, readers unacquainted with Scotland may learn from the Note by the Sheriff of Forfarshire, quoted *ante*, p. 353; what they are, may be inferred from the fact that the great majority of Scottish railway companies persist in carrying passengers on Sunday, notwithstanding the utmost half-yearly efforts of a little itinerant band of Agnewites at the meetings of the proprietors. Above all, in the Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway Company, where the number of the Scottish shareholders preponderates vastly over the others, the Sabbatarians are regularly defeated by overwhelming majorities—a fact sufficient of itself to indicate "the feelings and opinions of the Scottish people."¹ Of the Sabbatarian memorials, on which so much stress is laid, I shall speak at large in Note N.

As Sir Andrew and his troop of voters, qualified for the nonce by the acquisition of a share, mustered in great strength at the Glasgow meeting in March 1847, and of course had the co-operation of the new directors and their party, the suppression of the Sunday passenger-trains was approved of by a majority of 152 votes.

* Memoirs, p. 387.

¹ What took place at the half-yearly meeting of the Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway Company on 9th September 1850, will serve to exemplify the truth, as no proxies were used on the occasion. Mr M. Heriot moved "that there be no traffic on the railway on the Sabbath-day," assigning as his reason that "he considered the running of trains on the Sabbath-day to be contrary to God's law." The following was the state of the votes:—

	<i>Persons present.</i>	<i>Votes.</i>
For the motion,	27	55
Against it	45	282
		<hr/>
Majority against,		227

The fact here apparent, that while each Sabbatarian had on an average only two votes, each of the other persons present had six, exhibits the unfair means employed by "God's people" to overwhelm the *bona fide* shareholders. Yet they were defeated by a majority of nearly two to one of persons present. The reception they met with at the half-yearly meeting in March 1853, will appear from Note H.

be questioned that those who think it right (in other words, according to the will of God) that railway trains should carry passengers on Sundays, cannot by any chance be "God-fearing" men ;*

* From the following letters of Dr Arnold, it will be seen that *he* was none of the "God-fearing" race. Writing from Rugby, February 19, 1840, he says :—"It is with the most sincere regret that I feel myself unable to give an unqualified support to the resolution which you propose to bring forward at the next general meeting of the proprietors of the North Midland Railway Company. Of course, if I held the Jewish law of the Sabbath to be binding upon us, the question would not be one of degree, but I should wish to stop all travelling on Sundays as in itself unlawful. But holding that the Christian Lord's Day is a very different thing from the Sabbath, and to be observed in a different manner, the question of Sunday travelling is, in my mind, quite one of degree ; and whilst I entirely think that the trains which travel on that day should be very much fewer on every account, yet I could not consent to suspend all travelling on a great line of communication for twenty-four hours, especially as the creation of railways necessarily puts an end to other conveyances in the same direction ; and if the trains do not travel, a poor man, who could not post, might find it impossible to get on at all. But I would cheerfully support you in voting that only a single train each way should travel on the Sunday, which would surely enable the clerks, porters, &c., at every station, to have the greatest part of every Sunday at their own disposal. Nay, I would gladly subscribe individually to a fund for obtaining additional help on the Sunday, so that the work might fall still lighter on each individual employed."—*Life of Arnold*, 5th ed., vol. ii., p. 207.

Again, on the 22d of the same month, after stating the facts and inferences quoted *ante*, p. 281, he proceeds :—"It is on these grounds that I should prefer greatly diminishing public travelling on the Sunday to stopping it altogether ; as this seems to me to correspond better with the Christian observance of the Lord's Day, which, while most properly making rest from ordinary occupation the general rule, yet does not regard it as a thing of absolute necessity, but to be waived on weighty grounds. And surely many very weighty reasons for occasionally moving from place to place on a Sunday are occurring constantly. But if the only alternative be between stopping the trains on our railway altogether, or having them go frequently, as on other days, I cannot hesitate for an instant which side to take, and I will send you my proxy without a moment's hesitation."—(P. 209.)

Once more, on April 1, 1840, he writes :—"I agree with you that it is not necessary with respect to the practical point to discuss the authority of the command to keep the Sunday. In fact, believing it to be an ordinance of the Church at any rate, I hold its practical obligation just as much as if I considered it to be derivable from the Fourth Commandment ; but the main question is, whether that rest, on which the commandment lays such exclusive stress, is really the essence of the Christian Sunday. That it should be a day of greater leisure than other days, and of the suspension, so far as may be, of the common business of life, I quite allow ; but then I believe that I should have much greater indulgence for recreation on a Sunday than you might have ; and if the railway enables the people in the great towns to get out into the country on the Sunday, I SHOULD THINK IT A VERY GREAT GOOD. I confess that I would rather have one train going on a Sunday than none at all ; and I cannot conceive that this would seriously interfere with any of the company's servants ; it would not be as much work as all domestic servants have every Sunday in almost every house in the country. At the same time, I should be most anxious to mark the day decidedly from other days, and I think that one train up and down would abundantly answer all good purposes, and that more would be objectionable. I was much obliged to you for sending me an account of the discussion on the subject, and if it comes on again, I should really wish to express my opinion, if I could, by voting against having more than one train. I am really sorry that I cannot go along with you more completely. At any rate, I cannot but rejoice in the correspondence with you to which this question has given occasion. Differences

nor is it less certain that, when success attends the endeavours of any party who have reached so delightful a state of satisfaction with their own holiness as to take the exclusive titles of "God's people" and "the true Israel," the special assistance of the Almighty has been vouchsafed to them on the occasion. "Never in any human event," says the London Lord's Day Society, "can the hand of God be more remarkably traced than in the arrested profanation of the Sabbath by travelling on this particular railway. Most assuredly it may be said here, that not by might nor by wisdom has this been accomplished. It is evidently and manifestly the hand of the Lord. . . . It has pleased God to make it very manifest that it was His own work, to vindicate the honour of His own name, and to put a *distinguishing mark* of His favour on the supporters of his own cause."* In short, the victory was so inexplicable upon natural principles, that only a miracle could account for it; if ever there was a *dignus vindice nodus*, here beyond all question was one! Now, surely, it is high time that this indecent practice in which modern Pharisees of all denominations indulge so pompously, with no better warrant than their own self-conceit, of representing the Almighty as taking a part in every little fray which they regard as the battle of the Lord because it is their own, should be more *openly*, if not more *generally*, treated with the ridicule it deserves. Granting, as I do most willingly, that it was "*not by might nor by wisdom*" that the victory in question was gained, I desire to know by what means it became "evident and manifest" to the victors that this, more than any other advantage ever gained in the world by any one party over another, was brought about "by the hand of the Lord." Those who say that it *was* so accomplished, must (if they are sincere) believe that they *know* the fact asserted; and if they know it, they must know *how their knowledge of it was gained*. To convince the world that the hand of the Almighty works wonders on their behalf, they must shew that they have some infallible means of distinguishing when and why the Divine agency is specially employed. By what signs can we ascertain that the Deity has, by crowning any given enterprise with success, "put a distinguishing mark of His favour" on the prevailing party? How, of two contending "causes," shall it be decided *which* is "His own"? How does it appear that "the inscrutable providence of God," which, at the general election in 1837, for ever excluded Sir Andrew Agnew from Parliament, was not an event in which could be "remarkably traced" the hand of God, interfering to arrest the profanation of His name by its employment on the parliamentary stage in support of error, by Judaising Christians who were "turning again to the weak

of opinion give me but little concern; but it is a real pleasure to be brought into communication with any man who is in earnest, and who really looks to God's will as his standard of right and wrong, and judges of actions according to their greater or less conformity."—(Pp. 209, 210.)

All this is excellent, with one little exception: In wishing that only a single train each way should travel on the Sunday, Dr Arnold seems to have forgotten that although one would be sufficient to enable the people in great towns to get into the country, another would in most cases be necessary to bring them back after a long enough visit had been paid.

* Quarterly Publication of the Society, quoted by Dr M'Crie, p. 388.

and beggarly elements, whereunto they desire again to be in bondage.”* Suppose that I, who believe as firmly that Sir Andrew was the advocate of an unchristian system of Sabbatarian theology, as *he* believed that he was the champion of “God’s own cause,” were to assert that the untoward event from which Dr M’Crie escapes by pronouncing it “inscrutable,” was very manifestly the work of the Deity himself, “to vindicate the honour of His own name, and to put a distinguishing mark of his *displeasure* on the supporters of a cause which was *none of His*,”—and that, consistently with this view, I should describe his victory in the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company as a deplorable occurrence permitted “in the inscrutable providence of God,”—would not the Sabbatarians accuse me of folly and arrogance? Unquestionably they would; and great reason would they have for doing so. Have I less reason for bringing such an accusation against *them*? Their persuasion that the “cause” of which *they* are the champions is “God’s own,” while that for which *I* contend is the devil’s, is no better a foundation to argue upon against me, than my persuasion of the lawfulness of Sunday trains is, to argue upon against them. If the bare belief of a party of combatants that the Lord is on their side, were demonstrative that the fact is so, how could the conclusion be avoided that the Lord is at one and the same moment on the side of parties opposed to each other? Must we not “*try* them which say they are apostles,”†—since, in the jangling crowd of those who by word or behaviour lay claim to the office, an enormous majority must of necessity be men that “are not” what their heated fancy paints them?‡

* Gal. iv. 9.

† Rev. ii. 2.

‡ “Upon great experience,” says Baxter, “I must tell you, that of the zealous contenders in the world, that cry up ‘The cause of God, and Truth,’ there is not one of very many, that understandeth what he talks of; but some of them cry up the cause of God, when it is a brat of a proud and ignorant brain, and such as a judicious person would be ashamed of. And some of them are rashly zealous, before they have parts or time to come to any judicious trial. And some of them are misguided by some person or party, that captivateth their minds. And some of them are hurried away by passion and discontent. And many of the ambitious and worldly are blinded by their carnal interests. And many of them in mere pride, think highly of an opinion in which they are somewhat singular, and which they can, with some glorying, call their own, as either invented by them, or that in which they think they know more than ordinary men do. And abundance, after long experience, confess that to have been their own erroneous cause, which they before entitled the cause of God. Now when this is the case, and one cryeth, ‘Here is Christ,’ and another, ‘There is Christ;’ one saith, ‘This is the cause of God,’ and another saith, ‘That is it;’ no man that hath any care of his conscience, or of the honour of God and his profession, will leap before he looketh where he shall alight, or run after every one that will whistle him with the name or pretence of truth or a good cause.”—(*Works*, vol. ii. p. 131).

“Nothing,” says Selden, “is text but what is spoken of in the Bible, and meant there for person and place; the rest is application, which a discreet man may do well; but ’tis his Scripture, not the Holy Ghost’s.”—(*Table Talk*, art. PREACHING.) Again:—“You say there must be no human invention in the church, nothing but the pure word. *Answer*: If I give any exposition but what is expressed in the text, that is my invention; if you give another exposition, that is your invention: and both are human. For example, suppose the word *egg* were in the text, I say, ’tis meant an hen-egg, you say a goose-egg:

Small "desecrations" as well as great attracted the vigilance of Sir Andrew; and from a successful crusade against the sale of milk and fruit in the Queen's Park at Edinburgh on Sundays, to children in need of such refreshments,* he passed to another, having for its more majestic purpose the suppressing of Sunday labour in all the post-offices throughout Great Britain and Ireland. Here, although, as usual, he greatly overshot the mark of common sense and practicability, some good was doubtless effected by him in hastening the introduction of improved arrangements in the management of this department of the public service. I agree with him thus far, that every person laboriously employed in serving the nation during six days of the week, ought if possible to be allowed relaxation on the seventh; and that, as often as may be, this seventh day should be the Sunday. If additional officers are needed on this account, the nation surely will not grudge an expense which not only is demanded by humanity, but would yield a valuable return in the shape of increased efficiency of performance of the duties. In rural offices, where one or two short attendances on Sunday are enough, no such relay of officials would be necessary. To this extent it is fit that the Sunday-working of the Post-Office should be improved. But in demanding that the transmission of intelligence

neither of these are exprest, therefore they are human inventions; and I am sure the newer the invention the worse; old inventions are best."—(*Ib.*, art. HUMAN INVENTION.)

Bishop Newton, in his Dissertation on the Abuse of Names and Words, exclaims:—"How hath almost every little sect of Christians appropriated to itself the denomination of 'The Church of Christ,' and a part only, and the most corrupt part of it, claimed the title of the whole, and been proudly styled 'the Catholic Church'? How have the names of 'heretic' and 'schismatic' been bandied to and fro among Christians of different communities and persuasions, and some of the very best men, lovers of truth and servants of the God of truth, been so stigmatized by some of the very worst, pretended champions for religion, but really an offence and scandal to it!"—(*Works*, 4to ed., vol. ii. p. 511.)

"Zeal," says Dr Chalmers, "is a good thing, but only when expended on a good and adequate subject. It is not to be told what mischief has been done by needless controversies—both within the Church, among Christians themselves; and without, in restraining the operation of the good leaven which might otherwise have leavened all the families of the earth."—(*Lectures on the Romans*, Lect. 97, vol. iv. p. 365.)

The same sentiment is versified by the author of *Hudibras*, in "Miscellaneous Thoughts," published among his *Genuine Remains*, p. 231:—

"Who doth not know with what fierce rage
Opinions, true or false, engage?
And, 'cause they govern all mankind,
Like the blind's leading of the blind,
All claim an equal interest,
And free dominion o'er the rest:
And as one shield that fell from heaven
Was counterfeited by eleven,
The better to secure the fate
And lasting empire of a state,
The false are num'rous, and the true,
That only have the right, but few.
Hence fools, that understand 'em least,
Are still the fiercest in contest."

See Mr Martineau's *Rationale of Religious Enquiry*, 3d ed., p. 58.

* *Memoirs*, p. 350.

through this great country should be wholly arrested every seventh day, the Sabbatarians forget that as the Government has assumed the monopoly of carrying letters, it is bound either to renounce that monopoly, or to do the work as completely as, but for the monopoly, it would be done by private carriers. Now it is certain that the desire for the transmission and delivery of letters on Sunday is so extensively felt, that private carriers *would* be employed to supply the public demand; and it is equally certain that in the eyes of our leading statesmen (who, besides being as good judges as Sir Andrew was, have much better means of knowing the pertinent facts of the case), an entire cessation of post-office labour on Sunday is inexpedient and impracticable. We may therefore be sure that in the event of the monopoly being given up, the Sunday work of private letter-carriers would be no farther prohibited by law than it would be restrained by public opinion. By both it would be permitted to the extent generally thought expedient by the leaders of public opinion, and no farther; and whenever its amount seemed to the Sabbatarians excessive, their right and duty would be to preach and publish against it, and in this way give such an improved tone to public opinion that all needful reforms would soon be brought about. For no active party of reasonable agitators, whose case is a *good* one, ever fail to effect their purpose in the end.

In 1847 Sir Andrew had the satisfaction of witnessing the formation, in Edinburgh, of that famous "Sabbath Alliance" to some of whose unchristian doctrines the attention of the reader has before been called,* and whose proceedings we shall have occasion to advert to hereafter.† This Judaizing body addressed itself to the work which the Evangelical Alliance, having a much wider circle of members, was precluded from engaging in, by the want of the requisite unanimity about the foundation of the Sabbath. In a recently published "Report on the Desecration of the Lord's Day in Great Britain, by the Rev. John Jordan, Vicar of Enstone, Oxon," we read as follows:—"In order to understand rightly the position which the Evangelical Alliance occupies in regard to the Sabbath question, and more especially to *Sabbath desecration*, which is the proper subject of the Report I am charged to make to this Conference, it will be necessary to revert to the peculiar circumstances that occasioned a matter of such vast importance to religion to be placed in the station that has been allotted to it in our constitution. When the fundamentals of the Alliance were under discussion at the first Conference on Christian union, at Liverpool, it was found that there was *such variety of opinion respecting the scriptural ground and authority on which the Sabbath was to be based*, that it was deemed prudent and forbearing not to introduce it amongst the various topics that form the doctrinal statement of our common faith, but to give it place, instead, amongst the sundry objects for common action, with respect to which we could safely combine, without attempting to decide the precise terms upon which united operation should be carried on. When the Alliance itself was formed by the Conference assembled in London in 1846, although the original doctrinal basis was enlarged, these objects, amongst which

* *Ante*, pp. 170, 196.

† See Note Q.

Sabbath desecration was one, were still left in the same position, and were regarded as matters on which there might be combined action amongst us. Subsequently, when the British Organisation was formed, and when that division of labour took place which appropriated these several objects to different portions of the Organisation, that of Sabbath desecration was committed to the North-Western Division, who thereupon undertook to deal with it. It happened, however, that amongst the members of the committee of that division, to whose special care it was intrusted, *there were such different views on the theoretical, not the practical, part of the subject*, that they effected comparatively little; or rather, with justice it must be said, that what was done was almost entirely due to the energy and zeal of one member of the committee, Dr Crichton of Liverpool, who collected, at some cost to himself, various statistics relating to that town, and evidencing a fearful amount of Sabbath desecration by the running of omnibuses, by steam and canal boats, by railways, by the sale of intoxicating liquors, and even by the continuance of ordinary weekly traffic, on the day of rest. While, however, the matter thus comparatively hung in suspense in the North-Western Division, it was taken up again and again at our annual Conferences, and highly encouraging resolutions were passed, shewing that the Alliance, as a body, was fully alive to its responsibility on this important point. Thus, in the Conference at Edinburgh, in 1847, it was resolved—‘That the Report of the North-Western Committee on the Lord’s Day be referred back to that committee, to prosecute the investigations suggested in the Report. That this Conference cannot thus remit the subject to that committee without expressing, with one heart and voice, their strong sense of the duty devolving upon all Christian people to set their faces against the desecration of the Lord’s Day; believing, as they all do, that the observance of that day is of Divine institution, and of permanent obligation.’ Again, at the intermediate Conference held in London, in the month of October 1848, it was resolved—‘That this Conference, on consideration of the vast and growing amount of Lord’s Day desecration in this country, and the great evil entailed on the country thereby, feel it a solemn and binding duty to lift up their voice against this crying sin.’ Thus, however defective the Alliance may seem to have been in active measures in this matter, it has borne a faithful testimony in its Conferences, both in defence of the divinely appointed Sabbatic institution, and against those unhappy causes of its desecration, which, so fatally for the ruin of souls, abound amongst us.”*

* The Religious Condition of Christendom, exhibited in a series of Papers, prepared at the instance of the British Organisation of the Evangelical Alliance, and read at its Fifth Annual Conference, held in London, August 20 to September 3, 1851. Published by the authority of the Council. London, 1852. Pp. 124-5.

In this volume there are also papers “On the Observance of the Sabbath in France, and especially at Paris, by the Rev. J. H. Grandpierre, D.D., Pastor of the Reformed Church, Paris” (p. 302); and “On the State of the Sabbath Question in Germany, by the Rev. Theodore Plitt, of Bonn” (p. 466). Dr Grandpierre states, that in Paris “almost all the artisans work on Sunday and rest on Monday; thus proving that they need a day of rest in seven, and that in this the law of God perfectly understood the requirements of human nature; but at the same time they rebel against this same law, in refusing to rest on

In the course of his Report, Mr Jordan glances back to the days of James I. and Charles I., who, says he, “by royal proclamation, set the day that God has commanded, in commemoration of the work of creation, and of the day of the resurrection, and to glorify his thrice-holy name.”—(P. 304.) Perhaps, however, they have merely failed to discover that the law of God commands them to rest on Sunday rather than on Monday for this three-fold purpose. At all events, their knowledge of Scripture need not be very profound to make them aware that *Saturday* and not *Sunday* is there said to have been appointed to be kept holy “in commemoration of the work of the creation,” or at least in commemoration of the Creator’s rest therefrom.

It is farther mentioned, that in the southern departments of France, where the silk-worm is cultivated, the persons who pick the mulberry leaves which serve them for food, those who feed them, and those who watch as to the maintenance of a proper temperature, are occupied without intermission day and night; they neither can nor may leave the place where the silk-worms form their cocoons. At this period, which is at the beginning of summer, the churches are deserted, or nearly so.—(P. 307.) Dr Grandpierre laments this in a manner which indicates that he thinks a remedy possible; but unless the people abandon their trade, and leave to other Sabbath-breakers the office of supplying the world with silk, it is difficult to see how the cure is to be effected. He deplores with greater reason the similar influence of the harvest and vintage seasons in emptying the churches.

Turning to our own country and America, the same Reporter says—“It is not the law of the State which has created, or which maintains, in England and the United States, the religious habits which reign there, and which we see especially manifest themselves in the scrupulous observance and sanctification of the Sabbath-day. These habits were both created and propagated there under the influence of the pure Gospel.”—(P. 309.) Should the present volume have the honour to be perused by Dr Grandpierre, he will learn from it that we are not so universally scrupulous in observing and sanctifying the Sabbath as he seems to believe, and that our habits of its observance were created not by “the pure Gospel,” but by what many take to be the Gospel adulterated with Judaism—while “the law of the State,” for nearly three centuries (especially in Scotland, where it was so vigorously aided by the kirk-sessions), has been not a little concerned in the production and preservation of the habits referred to. Without the Sabbath-laws and the ecclesiastical backing which they received, it is highly improbable that the Roman Catholic and Episcopalian districts of Scotland would have adopted the Puritanical Sabbath; and even in the parts lying south of the Forth and Clyde, it is likely that Sunday recreations would have permanently kept their ground.

From the Report on Germany it appears that the state of matters in the Grand Duchy of Hesse is no better than it was twenty-five years ago, to which time the account formerly quoted applies. (See p. 121.) “Mournful news have I,” says Mr Plitt, “to report respecting the Grand Duchy of Hesse. That Sabbath observance was in a very low state in that country, and also that the Ecclesiastical Board did not very much to promote it, we see by a rescript of the Consistory of the year 1843, in which we read,—‘As often as the weather, or other circumstances, makes it necessary to continue agricultural labour on Sundays, after the morning service the burgomaster of the village may give permission for it.’ But even in the Grand Duchy of Hesse a voice was heard advocating Sabbath observance. The deputy Ploch moved, in the Second Chamber, ‘That all public dancing parties, and all worldly amusements in public places, should be forbidden by law during the Sunday.’ In the session of the 24th March, the Committee reported respecting this motion, that it should be rejected. The report of the Committee is, indeed, an interesting one. It proves from Plato, ‘that the gayest [happiest] men are also the best;’ and from the great philosopher Kant, ‘that social amusements dispose men more and more to virtue. The aim which some persons wished to attain by Sabbath celebration must be attained by societies for promoting civilisation and knowledge amongst the people; by singing societies, and societies for gymnastic exercises.’

forth in the 'Book of Sports,' *commanded their subjects to profane the Lord's Day*" (p. 129.) Mr Jordan, it is plain, knows as little of the facts as the other Sabbatarians do.

Sir Andrew Agnew died rather suddenly on the 12th of April 1849, having to the last continued to exert himself zealously for what he regarded as the cause of God. Dr Candlish, in a sermon preached after the funeral, spoke hopefully of "the reward of glory hereafter to be bestowed on him by the Lord of the Sabbath," and described "the tenacity with which he refused ever to relax his hold of the banner given him to unfurl—a firmness unmarred by any vehemence of passion, or surly obstinacy of dogged selfishness or pride. Never man of milder temper, more amiable manners, less irritating to enemies, more generously kind to friends, more uniformly courteous to all. None ever saw him ruffled, impatient, angry, resentful: yet none ever saw him yield; for he knew his own mind, *or rather the mind of his God*; and like a rock he stood amid whatever storms raged around him, as calm and cool, yet as unmoved!"* Apart from the opinion which Dr Candlish expresses in the clause distinguished by italics, and which the departed himself so firmly held, this delineation of his character appears to be an accurate likeness. Of his inflexible perseverance another of his Sabbatarian coadjutors writes in language equally strong:—"Again and again have I seen him, when we were all flagging, come forward to re-assure us. When others seemed tired of the subject, he was, as it were, beginning it anew."† The same gentleman observes that "he never made any enemies, and yet there were few men who had more; but they were the enemies of his Master, and hated him for His sake." These numerous enemies existed, I take it, only in the imagination of Mr Balfour; and what he so confidently adds about the source of their hatred is gratuitous assumption and ridiculous cant. As Dr Candlish, apparently, was unable to conceive that Sir Andrew's Sabbatarian notions could be different from "knowledge of the mind of God;" so, in Mr Balfour's judgment, such as rejected those notions or withstood the measures which Sir Andrew based upon them, could be actuated only by enmity to a

The discussion on the report was a very long one. . . . At last, the motion in favour of the Sabbath was rejected, by forty-two votes against two. In the same way, a motion of Sartorius was rejected—"That a stricter law upon Sabbath celebration be passed; that the theatres be shut on Sunday; and that public dancing parties, at least, be restricted." The ministers declared themselves against the motion. The First Chamber of Deputies only resolved, "That public dancing parties and music be closed on Saturday at midnight, and begin on Sunday only after the service."—(Pp. 473-4.) After what has been said *ante*, pp. 72, 275-6, it hardly needs be added, that I concur with the Committee, and with Plato and Kant, in thinking that, *cæteris paribus*, the happiest men are the best, and that hence, social amusements, if rational and moral in themselves, do really dispose men more and more to virtue. It does not appear that attendance at church is regarded by the Committee as incompatible with the other means of improvement which they recommend. Had they expressed any hostility to public worship, I should have been apt to conjecture that the sermons preached in the churches were, in their opinion, calculated to mislead and deteriorate, rather than inform and improve, the minds of the people.

* Memoirs of Sir A. Agnew, p. 415.

† Letter of Mr James Balfour jun., in Memoirs, p. 405. See also p. 382, note.

servant of that transcendent Being, whom we may still, in the figurative language of the Hebrew bard, represent as “sitting in heaven and laughing at the people who imagine a vain thing.”

While I write, Sabbatarianism is struggling to exclude the public from the Crystal Palace at Sydenham on the Lord’s Day. On this occasion, however, the intelligent working men of London have organised themselves into a compact and orderly phalanx, to prevent their “friends” from interfering with what is so highly valued as a means of refreshment; and have displayed in their proceedings a degree of unanimity and determination, which would have astounded the worthy Sabbatarian Baronet had his days been prolonged till now. At the second of two large, genuine, and enthusiastic meetings of their delegates and others, held in February 1853, the following petition to Parliament was cordially adopted:—

“The humble Petition of the united Working Classes of the metropolis and its vicinity, in public meeting assembled, sheweth,

“That a meeting of your petitioners and others took place at St Martin’s Hall, on Wednesday the 2d day of February 1853, when the following declaration was adopted, with only seven dissentients out of an assembly of two thousand persons:—

“1. That the working men, in this movement, wish it to be understood that they are in no way desirous of questioning the authority of the decrees upon which the institution of the Sabbath in this country is founded, but merely assert for themselves the right to interpret those decrees as their consciences dictate.

“2. That the mode of observing the Sunday among the early Christians proves incontestibly that the present Sabbath is a social institution.

“3. That the Sabbath, whether viewed as a divine or a social institution, is designed especially for the benefit of the labourer.

“4. That while the working classes are desirous of obtaining such a relaxation of the present rigorous mode of observing the Sabbath as will bring it back to its true uses—the recreating and refreshing of the labourer, they are likewise especially anxious to guard the day of rest against any other encroachment than that which is absolutely necessary; and, at the same time, to procure for their fellow-workmen, who may be engaged in ministering to their necessities on the Sunday, some other day of rest in the week, so that the boon of the Sabbath may be equally extended to all.

“5. That the working-classes desire no infringement of the day of rest but such as is absolutely required for their physical and intellectual necessities.

“6. That physical recreation is as necessary to the working man as food and drink on the Sabbath.

“7. That refined and intellectual enjoyment, as well as the means of obtaining information, are even more necessary to the working man than physical recreation on the Sabbath; and that if these necessities be denied him on the present day of rest, then two Sabbaths must be appointed in the week, one to be observed as a day of mere repose, and the other as a day for the recreation of his mental and bodily energies.’

“That an adjourned meeting took place on Wednesday, the 9th of February 1852, at Drury Lane Theatre, when the following resolution was adopted :

“That this meeting, recognising the fact that Sunday is the only day on which it is possible for the working man to obtain that recreation which is necessary for health and to improve his mind, earnestly hope that the legislature will sanction the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sundays, and thus enable the working-classes to obtain on that day a higher, purer, and more intelligent and moral amusement than is now available to them.’

“Your petitioners, for the above-embodied reasons, earnestly hope that the legislature will allow the Crystal Palace to be opened on Sundays, believing that that step would lead to the social and moral elevation of those who now spend their day in a more objectionable manner ; that it would cultivate their minds and improve their habits, and help to render them better citizens of the state, and members of society.

“And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.”

The tone and reasoning of this document are unexceptionable ; and from the judicious manner in which the proceedings of both meetings appear to have been in the main conducted, and the impregnable strength of the positions assumed, there is every reason to expect that the movement will be successful.

At the first meeting (which was held in St Martin’s Hall), delegates representing 92,500 working men were assembled ; while the second (in Drury Lane Theatre) was still more numerously attended. Of the former, even our old Sabbatarian acquaintance the *Record* acknowledges that it “was ‘a fact’ not to be slighted. The Hall, which holds 1200, was quite crowded, and nearly unanimous. That this should be the case, after all the preparations made, was not surprising ; but the numbers, the zeal, and the confidence of those so assembled, should warn us of a serious conflict approaching. We cannot, however, help thinking, that more may grow out of this proceeding than the agitators themselves are yet prepared for. Meanwhile, let all parties assure themselves that a real contest is at hand.” It is highly probable that “more *will* grow out of this proceeding” than the Sabbatarians expect or desire ; but not more, we may reasonably hope, than “the agitators themselves are prepared for.” If the *Record* intends to suggest that the agitation may ultimately lead to the abolition of the Sabbath, I say that such an idea is but the fancy of one who is ignorant of the broad basis on which the institution rests, and who finds it difficult to conceive that the working men of Great Britain have a share of that wisdom which the Sabbatarians so constantly assume to be their own rich inheritance.

NOTE G, Page 6.

Clerical Dogmatism, and Lay Servility.

As, according to the plan of that complicated social system in which we all perform our parts, it is indispensable that authority should be exercised by some over others—as by rulers over subjects, parents over children, wise men over the weak and ignorant, masters over servants, teachers over pupils, and officers over bodies of men associated for military, naval, civil, or ecclesiastical purposes; so Nature—who keeps in motion the great machine of human life, by endowing us with every impulse and affection that is needful to secure the preservation and perpetuation of the species, and to render existence on the whole a scene of enjoyment to individuals—has implanted in us, on the one hand, a disposition *to exercise authority* over inferiors, and, on the other, a disposition *to respect, obey, and be led* by those whom we look up to as superiors in wisdom, knowledge, or that civil authority which, in all ages, has itself been an object of general respect.*

This observation has reference to mankind as a whole. Among the *individuals* composing our race, however, the natural dispositions and talents are widely and endlessly diverse, in absolute and in relative strength—so that in some men the love of power, for example, is out of all due proportion to their other mental qualities; while in others, it is the submissive tendency that overabounds; and in a third class, again, *each* of those opposite qualities is present in such ample measure, that while, on the one hand, their possessor likes well to exercise authority when he may or ought, and is equally disposed to withstand usurpers of it over himself,—on the other hand he pays willing respect and obedience to all who have a title to them, and is prompt in lending his aid in support of lawful authority against those who set it at defiance. In this last case a disposition to respect the rights of others is supposed: were it absent, the love of power might degenerate into tyranny, while the most abject servility to superiors might likewise be displayed.†

When men have too low an opinion of themselves, and too little taste for ruling others over whom they ought to exercise authority, they find the duty so troublesome that it is likely to be but ill performed. Such men should sedulously cultivate self-esteem as a virtue.

* “Although,” says Hooker, “there be according to the opinion of some very great and judicious men, a kind of natural right in the noble, wise, and virtuous to govern them which are of servile disposition (Arist. *Polit.*, lib. iii., iv.); nevertheless, for manifestation of this their right, and men’s more peaceable contentment on both sides, the assent of them who are to be governed seemeth necessary.”—(*Eccles. Polity*, B. I., § 10.)

† Lord Kames, after illustrating the observation that “all histories are full of the cruelty and desolation occasioned by differences in religious tenets,” says:—“I am utterly at a loss to reconcile the foregoing facts otherwise than by holding man to be a compound of principles and passions, some social, some dissocial. Opposite principles or passions cannot, at the same instant, be exerted upon the same object; but they may be exerted at the same instant upon different objects, and at different times upon the same object.”—(*Sketches of the History of Man*, B. ii., Sk. 1.)

“Self-knowledge and self-respect,” says Bishop Newton, “may teach us not only charity to others, but also to set a just value upon ourselves. For as Cicero well observes, the precept of knowing ourselves was not given merely to humble human arrogance, but also that we might know our own perfections. This may oftentimes prove a most excellent guard and preservative of virtue; may hinder us from wasting our time, misspending our money, or doing any thing mean or unworthy of our character and station: enable us to know our good qualities as well as our bad ones, and to cultivate the former as well as correct the latter; instruct us to keep up the respect that is due to ourselves, and upon all occasions to exert a proper courage and resolution, becoming good men and good Christians. What other way can we be assured, whether we deserve the censures of our enemies, or the praises of our friends, and that the former do not abuse and slander, or that the latter do not flatter and betray us? What other way can a man establish the empire and command of the mind, and insure himself one and the same to-day as yesterday, and to-morrow as to-day? A man’s mind is his heaven or his hell; and who would not regulate that upon which his happiness or his misery principally depends?”*

When any disposition is of prime necessity to the welfare of man, Nature, we see, bestows it upon the race so largely, that, unless well governed by reason and conscience, it readily runs to excess, and so leads in numberless instances to folly or vice.† Under due regulation, the desire of power is of such utility in the world, that, as Dr Thomas Brown observes, “it would be truly unfortunate for mankind if

* Works, vol. iii., p. 488; Dissertation on Knowing Ourselves. See also a paper by Dr Johnson in the *Adventurer* (No. 81); and Dr Thomas Brown’s Lectures on Moral Philosophy, Lect. lxii.

† “It should be endeavoured,” says John Howe, “that the passions, which are not to be rooted up (because they are of Nature’s planting), be yet so discreetly checked and depressed, that they grow not to that enormous tallness as to overtop a man’s intellectual power, and cast a dark shadow over his soul.”—(Quoted by Mr Henry Rogers in his *Life of Howe*, p. 485; London, 1836.) The motto of Mr Rogers’s volume is the saying of Robert Hall—“As a minister, I have derived more benefit from the works of Howe, than from those of all other divines put together.”—Bishop Newton also, in his *Dissertation on Anger*, after remarking of the passions in general that they are necessary to incite men to action, adds—“And if we were to examine each passion in particular, we should find them not only very innocent in themselves, but very useful and necessary to the various ends and purposes of life. Love and hatred, desire and aversion, hope and fear, joy and sorrow, if placed upon proper objects, and exercised upon proper occasions, if conducted by righteous means and directed to righteous ends, are all of the greatest use and advantage; and it is only the abuse of them that renders them pernicious and sinful.”—(Works, vol. iii., p. 492.) Pope in his *Essay on Man*, Ep. ii., has finely illustrated the same fact. Here are a few of his couplets:—

“Two principles in human nature reign;
Self-love to urge, and reason to restrain;
Nor this a good, nor that a bad we call—
Each works its end, to move or govern all:
And to their proper operation still
Ascribe all good, to their improper, ill. . . .
The same ambition can destroy or save,
And makes a patriot, as it makes a knave.”

all should relinquish it.”* It is the main source of that noble spirit of independence which Bruce, and Luther, and Washington displayed, and which is a distinguishing feature in the character of the Anglo-Saxon race. When in excess, however, it is accompanied by a proud arrogant disposition (both being phases of one sentiment, self-esteem—modified in the former case by accessory qualities); and it is a trite observation that the weaker and more empty the understanding of the self-idolater, the less prone is he to suspect himself of undue assumption in his conduct to others.†

People fond of authority and influence, especially if desirous also of fame or applause, naturally seek positions in which their wishes may be gratified; and among the high places most obvious to the view of

* Lectures on Moral Philosophy, Lect. lxxi. The same remark (he adds) “is not less applicable to mere glory than to power.”—See the whole of this Lecture, and the three next preceding it.

† See the extracts from Sydney Smith and Abraham Tucker, *ante*, pp. 50, 51; Taylor’s *Liberty of Prophesying*, sect. xi.; Sir William Temple’s *Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands*, ch. v., in his *Works*, ed. 1814, vol. i., p. 153; Dr. Thomas Brown’s *Lectures on Moral Philosophy*, Lect. lxii.; and Bailey’s *Pursuit of Truth*, 2d ed., pp. 75, 150.

“The sluggard,” says Solomon, “is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason.”—(*Prov.* xxvi. 16.)

Hobbes, in his *Treatise of Human Nature*, ch. xiii., § 4, observes:—“The fault of breeding controversy lieth altogether in the *Dogmatics*, that is to say, those that are imperfectly learned, and with passion press to have their Opinions pass everywhere for Truth, without any evident demonstration either from experience, or from places of Scripture of uncontroverted interpretation.”

“The experience of the world,” says Tillotson, “hath sufficiently taught us, that usually those who speak modestly of things, are furnished with the best arguments for their assertions; and that those who have made the strongest pretences to infallibility in any thing have the weakest reasons for what they have said: of which this account may be given, that good reasons and arguments are requisite to beget in a man a rational assurance; but a strong conceit is sufficient to beget in men an opinion of infallibility.”—(*Sermon 222*; in Tillotson’s *Works*, vol. ix., p. 242; ed. 1759.)

Lord Jeffrey, in a letter published in the *Memoirs of Sir James Mackintosh*, makes some fine remarks on the freedom of that profound and extensively-informed thinker from the vice of dogmatism. See vol. ii., p. 493, 2d ed.

“Nature,” says Rochefoucault, “who so wisely has fitted the organs of our body to make us happy, seems likewise to have bestowed pride on us, on purpose, as it were, to save us the pain of knowing our own imperfections.”—(*Maxim 312*.)

Pope, also, writes thus, in his *Essay on Criticism*, Part II., v. 201–210:—

“Of all the causes which conspire to blind
 Man’s erring judgment, and misguide the mind,
 What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
 Is pride, the never-failing vice of fools.
 Whatever nature has in worth denied,
 She gives in large recruits of needful pride!
 For as in bodies, thus in souls, we find
 What wants in blood and spirit, swelled with wind:
 Pride, where wit fails, steps in to our defence,
 And fills up all the mighty void of sense.”

As it is with individuals, so with communities: “the most ignorant nations,” says Goldsmith, “have always been found to think most highly of themselves” (*Citizen of the World*, Letter 115); of which remark, in relation to savage tribes, I have collected some illustrations in the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. viii., pp. 305–308. See also Sumner’s *Records of the Creation*, 2d ed., vol. ii., p. 377.

Scottish aspirants of great or small ability, is the station of a clergyman, administering instruction and reproof from the pulpit, playing a highly influential part in society, and seldom encountering that wholesome opposition which among men of other professions tends to keep luxuriant growths of self-complacency in check.

If, along with the love of influence and reputation (which in the abstract are respectable objects of pursuit, though but of secondary dignity), the aspirant has a competent store of knowledge and good sense, and a devout, upright, and kindly disposition, he is capable of filling the clerical station with infinite credit to himself, and advantage to the community in which he labours. But since the being treated as an *oracle* is apt to impair the humility of even the good and wise, the clergy, and all others who habitually exercise power and receive much deference, ought continually to take heed lest the due dignity of their station degenerate into dogmatism.

In all ages, a more than ordinary share of arrogance and ambition has been ascribed to the priesthood. In the Church of Rome above all, the overweening pretensions of the clergy afford a constant theme of declamation and argument to Protestants*—who, however, while beholding very clearly the mote that is in their Popish brother's eye, are little accustomed to consider the beam that is in their own. For, as we have already had many occasions to remark, there is no essential difference between a claim of infallibility *honestly expressed in words*, and a *tacit assumption* of infallibility by our conduct towards those who, in differing from us, commit precisely the offence, and no more, which *we* commit in differing from *them*. That we may *really* be the Protestants we call ourselves, it is not enough to abuse the Pope and assert against *him* the right of private judgment in religious matters; we must acknowledge, and, what is far more difficult, must *respect, in all others* (whether Jews,†

* See *ante*, p. 107.

† “The account of the Jews who have been plundered, sent naked into banishment, starved, tortured, left to perish in prisons, hanged and burnt by Christians, would fill many volumes. But now they enjoy better times; they escape persecution even in some Popish countries, and those of them who dwell in Protestant nations have been well used, and no where more kindly than here. . . . If we had a circumstantial and an impartial account of all the insurrections and rebellions of the Jews, and of the causes which produced them, we should perhaps find this people to have been often provoked and exasperated by ill-usage, and therefore rather less turbulent and seditious than they have been commonly represented. We should not forget that it is oppression which, usually speaking, begets rebellion; oppression, which, as the wise man observes, ‘will make a wise man mad.’”—(*Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. Hist.*; in his *Works*, vol. ii., p. 341.)

Osorius, a Portuguese historian whose work was published in 1572, speaks of King Emmanuel's cruel persecution of the Jews in terms which would do honour to any age or country. “This,” says he, “was authorised neither by law nor by religion. Can men be compelled to believe what they reject with abhorrence? Do you take upon you to restrain the liberty of the will, or to fetter the understanding? Such an attempt must be unsuccessful; and is not acceptable to Christ, who expects from man devotion of the heart, and not that formal worship which is the offspring of pains and penalties. He wishes them to study his religion, and accept it from conviction, not from terror; for who does not see that forced belief is mere hypocrisy?”—(*Encyc. Brit.*, vol. xvi., p. 655; art. OSORIUS.)

Dissenters,* Roman Catholics,† Deists,‡ or even Atheists,§) the right which in our own case we hold so precious—nor should any man designate his opinions “God’s truth,” except to himself and to those

* It was an advice of Paley to his pupils at Cambridge, that when ordained as clergymen, they should, in their conduct towards dissenters, “above all things abstain from ridicule or reflections upon their persons and teachers; from reproaching them with the conduct of their ancestors or predecessors of the same sect; from idle reports of their absurdities or immoralities; from groundless suspicions of their insincerity; and particularly from charging them with opinions which they disown, or consequences they do not deduce.”—(*Meadley’s Memoirs of Paley*, 2d ed., p. 317.) This eminent divine “was in a great measure free from those virulent antipathies, political and religious, which divided so large a portion of the community during the reign of George III. His ideas were never biassed by the creed of a party, nor were they the narrow dogmas of a sect, but the rational conclusions of a liberal inquirer, who ‘without partialities and passions, was accustomed to weigh all things, and accordingly to give his sentence.’”—(*ib.*, p. 261.) Such was also Bishop Law.—(*ib.*, p. 364.)

Even at the same period, Dr Parr found it necessary to publish an elaborate defence of himself for keeping company with dissenters! See his *Works*, vol. iii., p. 274.

In Dr Channing’s *Works*, p. 1056 of the Belfast edition, there are some excellent remarks, entitled, “The System of Exclusion and Denunciation in Religion considered.” I recommend a perusal of them.

† See the admirable passages quoted from Bishop Watson and Dr Chalmers, *ante*, pp. 28, 178; Dr Campbell’s Address to the People of Scotland upon the Alarms that have been raised in regard to Popery, 1779; and the Rev. Sydney Smith’s *Works*, *passim*. Burke, in his Letter to a Peer of Ireland on the Penal Laws against the Irish Catholics, says:—“From what I have observed, it is pride, arrogance, and a spirit of domination, and not a bigoted spirit of religion, that has caused and kept up those oppressive statutes. . . . It is injustice, and not a mistaken conscience, that has been the principle of persecution, at least as far as it has fallen under my observation.”—(*Works*, vol. vi., p. 291; ed. 1823. See also pp. 299, 372 of the same volume.)

‡ See *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xxx., p. 221. For illustrations of the fact that controversy with Deists need not banish good manners, see Dr Campbell’s letter to David Hume in Burton’s *Life of Hume*, vol. ii., p. 119; and Bishop Watson’s correspondence with Gibbon, Letters Nos. lxxv. and cvii. in *Gibbon’s Memoirs*, printed also in Watson’s *Anecdotes of his own Life*, vol. i., pp. 100, 107.

§ “An Atheist is not to be tabooed. He is not to be thrust out of the pale of humanity. Our puritan forefathers would have branded and imprisoned him; we would reason and plead with him. To us he is, and to them he ought to have been, a man and a brother. If he really believes there is no God (*prove it he cannot*), the ‘portentous heroism’ of such a creed awakes within us thrilling emotions of wonder and surprise. And if with this no-belief he connects a life irreproachable and unselfish, if with this no-belief he associates high patriotic yearnings and generous political sentiments, and if with this no-belief never a word of scorn or cankering hate for those who are entrapped by ‘superstition’ escapes his lips, then we dare not despise, much less loathe, such a man: we can give him the right hand of true friendship, and not fearing that he will make us worse, we will try to make him better. By all means let the Atheist have free speech, let him address the public ear by the press and by the platform with most unchartered liberty; we would no more denounce him than we would attempt to silence him. He has as much right to speak *his* conviction as we ours. And not only so, it is his duty to do this. Suppression of thought leads to suppression of truth. Concealment of conviction becomes an extinguisher of truth.”—(*The Nonconformist*, Dec. 1852.) See *ante*, pp. 200, 250.

Dr Jebb, of Cambridge, says:—“Intolerants, and persons who maintain eternal punishment and atonement, are *more* unfit for society than Atheists. This is the judgment of some.”—(*The Works of John Jebb*, M.D., F.R.S., vol. ii., p. 145; London, 1787.) Bishop Hoadly, also, in his excellent *Discourses concern-*

who voluntarily submit their weaker understandings to his. The self-styled "ambassador of God" must not take it upon him to proclaim dogmatically what is the true religion, what form of worship is most agreeable to the Almighty, what heresies and "heaven-daring profanities" will draw down heavy judgments upon the nation, or what particular form of faith must be taught in churches and schools, at the expense alike of those who receive it as "God's truth," and those who reject it as "hellish lies." On the contrary, to be a Protestant, he must on all such occasions reduce to practice the simple rule which is at the very root of Protestantism, of *doing as he would be done to* in matters of faith and worship. By applying this plain test to his conduct, every professing Protestant may ascertain in a moment whether he really is the man he takes himself to be.* That the Protestant churches, as well as individuals, have, from the days of Luther downwards, generally contented themselves with merely *professing* the principles of the Reformation, is a fact not to be denied by any student of ecclesiastical history who makes the Christian maxim the rule of his judgment. The Bible is most liberally proclaimed to be the only rule of faith; and the right and duty of every private Christian to search it, and to believe whatsoever he conceives to be its meaning, is insisted upon to satiety when it is our own liberty that is at stake. Such declarations hold the foremost place in every Protestant Confession: they look beautiful on paper; but when we inquire to what extent they have influenced men's conduct, an astounding picture of inconsistency and injustice is discovered. The truth appears to be, that the authors of these Claims of Right had in their thoughts, and were rearing a bulwark against, the Church of Rome alone, and had not at all in view the *abstract* question of the right of private judgment. They little considered that they were legalising rebellion against *their own* authority as completely as against the Pope's; and when such rebellion occurred (as it did very soon), they were not less indignant against the "heretics" and "schismatics" than if they themselves had ascended the infallible chair.† "With good and religious reason," says Milton, "all Protestant Churches, with one con-

ing the Terms of Acceptance with God, shews how unfavourable to virtue, and therefore detrimental to the public welfare, are the popular notions of the efficacy of death-bed sorrow, &c., which, nevertheless, are allowed to be everywhere preached without control, as Christian doctrines.

* "From pride," says Baxter, "it comes to pass, that men so magnify their own opinions, and are as censorious of any that differ from them in lesser things, as if it were all one to differ from them and from God, and expect that all should be conformed to their judgments, as if they were the rulers of the Church's faith. And while we cry down Papal infallibility, and determination of controversies, we would, too many of us, be Popes ourselves, and have all stand to our determination, as if it were infallible. It is true, we have more modesty than expressly to say so; we pretend that it is only the evidence of truth that appeareth in our reasons that we expect men should yield to, and our zeal is for the truth and not for ourselves: but, as that must needs be taken for truth which is ours, so our reasons must needs be taken for valid: and if they be freely examined, and found to be infirm and fallacious, and so discovered, as we are exceeding backward to see it ourselves, because they are ours, so how angry are we that it should be disclosed to others!"—(*The Reformed Pastor*, chap. iv.; in *Baxter's Works*, vol. xiv., p. 157.) See also vol. xi., p. 499, and vol. xii., p. 508.

† See Note O.

sent, and particularly the Church of England, in her Thirty-nine Articles, article 6th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and elsewhere, maintain these two points as the main principles of true religion: that the rule of true religion is the word of God only; and that their faith ought not to be an implicit faith, that is, to believe, though as the Church believes, against or without express authority of Scripture.* And if all Protestants, as universally as they hold these two principles, so attentively and religiously would observe them, they would avoid and cut off many debates and contentions, schisms and persecutions, which too oft have been among them, and more firmly unite against the common adversary. For hence it directly follows, that no true Protestant can persecute or not tolerate his fellow Protestant,† though dissenting from him in some opinions, but he must flatly deny and renounce these two his own main principles whereon true religion is founded; while he compels his brother from that which he believes as the manifest word of God,‡ to an implicit faith (which he himself condemns), to the endangering of his brother's soul, whether by rash belief or outward conformity: for 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'§

Although the rational members of the Church of England claim for her, under the twentieth Article, no greater "authority in matters of faith" than that which any association of pious and learned men may reasonably expect from the ignorant,|| the despotic conduct of the Sovereigns and Prelates for a century after the Reformation shews that *they* understood by "authority" something very different from this: and down to the present day the High Church party have con-

* As to the Church of *Scotland*, see *ante*, p. 138.

† Or authoritatively pronounce him to be in error.

‡ Or treats him unjustly, unkindly, or disrespectfully, on account of it.

§ Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, &c.; in Milton's Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 510. He writes to the same effect in his Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes, *ib.*, vol. ii., p. 523.—See *ante*, pp. 33, 42, 46, 49, 53, 108, 113–116, 118, 135, 149, 150–4, 243, 244, 254, 256, 257, 266, 297, 308–318; Dr Owen's Works, Russell's ed., vol. xv., pp. 69, *et seq.*, 223; Shaftesbury's Characteristics, vol. iii., p. 236; ed. 1757; Cook's Historical View of Christianity, vol. ii., p. 235; The Quarterly Review, vol. lxxvi., pp. 185, 186, 203; Dr M'Crie's Miscellaneous Writings, p. 471 *et seq.*; Sedgwick's Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge, 5th ed., p. cclxxx.; and the works referred to *ante*, pp. 34, 107, 109, in the notes.

|| Burnet on the XXXIX. Articles, Art. XX.; Secker's Works, Sermons 42, 53, and 101; Whately, as quoted *ante*, p. 109; Sedgwick's Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge, 5th ed., p. cclxxvi.; and Lewis's Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, ch. iv.—With respect to the authority of the Church of *Scotland*, it may be mentioned that Professor William Dunlop of Edinburgh, in his very able Preface to an edition of the Westminster Confession, &c., published in 1719 (where he gives "a full and particular account of all the ends and uses of Creeds and Confessions of Faith, and a defence of their justice, reasonableness, and necessity as a public standard of orthodoxy,"—in which, however, he is but partially successful), disclaims in the clearest terms the notion "that human composesures, properly speaking, are a standard of orthodoxy, and a *test* by which an erroneous proposition may be certainly distinguished from a sound one: nor can a disputer," says he, "appeal to its decision as a sufficient argument for the truth of his principle; since it is possible that truth may be on the other side, and falsehood may get into the public chairs, and the established creeds of a fallible church."—(P. 60.) "Whether we or our adversaries have judged rightest, must depend upon the Holy Scriptures, to the determination whereof we with confidence and submis-

stantly made demands which nothing short of infallibility can warrant. The satires of Hoadly and Hare against this pseudo-protestant party have already been mentioned;* and in these days, when Tractarianism and other forms of clerical assumption are so rife, the wide circulation of such masterpieces in defence of freedom might do good service to the State.†

sion entirely refer our cause: Only, since our Church hath embraced the Westminster Confession as the uncorrupted faith of the Gospel, and that every society must act according to the light of their own consciences, all that hath been said may be immediately applied to the vindication of the authority which that Confession obtains amongst us, as *a public standard of orthodoxy to be subscribed by all our spiritual pastors and rulers*. . . . It should at least have this effect, to make the people *cautious* of receiving an opinion contrary to the public standard of a Church whereof they are members, and which they think in general so agreeable to the Word of God."—(Pp. 60, 129, 133.) This Preface of Dunlop's is little heard of, and very scarce; being, it is understood, rather more liberal than is pleasing to Churchmen, in very plainly admitting that orthodoxy and God's truth may be two different things.

* *Ante*, pp. 53, 257.—In one of his Sermons, Hoadly says:—"The spirit of pride leads men to think that they are always in the right; and that it is more becoming and reasonable that the whole world should conform to their notions and opinions, than that they should descend to the least compliance with the world about them. And so long as this temper flourishes, it is an absurdity to think of peace or union."—(*Sermon on the Fast-day*, 1709, on the text, "Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?" Acts vii. 26.)—"There have been instances," says he in another place, "even in these later knowing ages, of men, who, merely out of an inward pride, or resentment against others, have denied the evidences, even of mathematical knowledge itself; and rejected it, either in whole or in part, because it hath brought some shame upon themselves, and their own understandings. It is really true, and what shews the corruption of human nature, that light shall be darkness; that four shall be more than six; or anything like to these shall be affirmed, nay, and pretended to be proved, by men who have pride, or resentment, or indignation, working within. So that it is not enough to say, that a man is not what we call commonly grossly vicious and immoral, in the way of pleasure or worldly-mindedness, to prove him to be impartial, and free from bias. For pride and revenge are immoralities within, which bend the mind as strongly as any other vices in the world. Personal prejudice will often put a bias upon it, as powerful as debauchery; and pique, and resentment, will hinder eye-sight itself, and turn the plainest evidences into doubts, and often into falsehoods, with the man that is actuated by them."—(*Sermon on the Duty of Impartial Inquiry in Religion*, preached in 1713.)

One of Job's friends puts some questions which may be usefully kept in mind by not a few professing servants of the meek and lowly Jesus:—"Art thou the first man that was born, or wast thou made before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret of God, and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself? What knowest thou that we know not; what understandest thou, which is not in us?"—(*Job* xv. 7-9.)

† Dr John Brown, in a Note upon the question, "In what sense Christian ministers are messengers of God," says:—

"The expression *Messengers of God*, which I have applied in the text to Christian Ministers, is used only figuratively or analogically, and in a secondary and much lower sense than that in which in the New Testament similar appellations are applied to the apostles. It is meant to denote merely that they are men whose office is to declare divine truth—to which office, if they regularly fill it, they have been called by their brethren,—and, in most cases, the call of the brethren has been sanctioned, by solemn commendation of them to the care of the Chief Shepherd, by those already in office.

"Perhaps an apology is necessary, for applying, to any ordinary officer in

A modern follower of Hoadly, speaking of the two "Apostolical Churches," says—"Infallible and impeccable, the Church of Rome is a Tadmor in the wilderness, miraculously erect and beautiful in the midst of an otherwise universal ruin. The Church of England, *liable to err, BUT ALWAYS JUDGING RIGHT, capable of misconduct, BUT NEVER ACTING WRONG*, is a still more stupendous exception to the weakness and depravity which in all other human institutions signalizes our common nature."* But surely most stupendous of all are those Calvinistic "messengers of God," who, after proclaiming the utter blindness, both moral and intellectual, which afflicts them as members of the human race, proceed, oblivious of the fact they have announced, to argue with their neighbours who cannot be more than *equally* blind with themselves, as if in *their own* case the meaning of blindness were an infallible clearness of sight.†

To the clergy individually, honest Baxter, in his treatise called *The*

the Christian Church, an appellation appropriated in the New Testament to inspired teachers. Undoubtedly the rash assumption, that the terms employed in reference to the apostles may, with few exceptions, be, as a matter of course, applied to ordinary ministers, has not only led to much misinterpretation of Scripture, but to tyrannical assumption on one side, and slavish subjection on the other. It has often made ministers think less of the duties than the dignities of their office—more of its honours than its responsibilities;—and it has cherished a superstitious veneration for the *clergy* (by the way, the New Testament clergy *οἱ κληροί* are not the ministers but the people, I Pet. v. 3), which has perpetuated abuses and greatly impeded the progress of truth and godliness."

He quotes a ludicrously extravagant passage from a work entitled "The Divine Institution of the Ministry, and the Absolute Necessity of Christ's Government: a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 21st Sept. 1722, by Joseph Betty, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford." Among other things, Mr Betty says that "the Kirk very rebelliously and impiously rejected Episcopacy;" and with reference to "the Evangelical priesthood" he exclaims, "What amazing dulness, then, is it not to admire! what shocking profaneness not to revere so great an authority!" Those were the days when, as Jortin tells us (*ante*, p. 247), to deny the apostolical succession of the English clergy was to be guilty of atheism. Dr Brown adds:—"Oxford seems much the same kind of place still. It would not be difficult to find passages in the 'Oxford Tracts,' in the course of publication, as extravagant in sentiment if not in expression as the above. Yet these are the persons with whom the Presbyterian upholders of Establishments at all hazards, seem to delight in fraternizing. These form part and parcel of the venerable Hierarchy and Establishment of England. The Covenanters were much more *nearly* right than those who boast of being their descendants, in their *judgments* on these subjects, whatever we may think of some of their *sayings* and *doings*."—(*The Law of Christ respecting Civil Obedience*, by John Brown, D.D., 3d ed., 1839, pp. 225-7.)

At a meeting in Bristol, in December 1850, the Rev. Dr Gilbert Elliot, Dean of Bristol, said—"As a clergyman I speak to you words which perhaps you may think ought not to fall from the lips of one of the clergy; but I tell you, the laity of every denomination, let the clergy of every denomination know that they are not lords over God's heritage. (Tremendous applause, the cheering extending to the platform.) There is a great contest going on in the world—we have not only to contend against Roman Papacy, but we have to contend against Anglo-Papacy—(cheers)—and when I speak of Anglo-Papacy, I mean not the Papacy only within the Establishment, but the Papacy which is trying to establish itself within each denomination."

* Edin. Rev., vol. lxx., p. 191.

† See Dr Johnson's sarcastic remark in the Rambler, quoted *ante*, p. 154.

Reformed Pastor, gives the following amongst other excellent pieces of advice:—"Our work," says he, "must be managed with great humility; we must carry ourselves meekly and condescendingly to all; and so teach others, as to be as ready to learn of any that can teach us, and so both teach and learn at once; not proudly venting our own conceits, and disdaining all that any way contradict them, as if we had attained to the top of knowledge, and we were destined for the chair, and other men to sit at our feet. Pride is a vice that ill be- seems them that must lead men in such an humble way to heaven. And let them take heed, lest when they have brought others thither, the gate should prove too strait for themselves. God that thrust out a proud angel, will not entertain there a proud preacher, while such. Methinks we should remember at least the title of a minister, which though the Popish priests disdain, yet so do not we."*

What happens when pride takes the place of humility, is admirably depicted by the same skilful hand:—

"It is observable how every man slighteth another's reasons, while he would have all to magnify his own. All the arguments that in disputation are used against him, how frivolous and foolish are they! All the books that are written against him, are little better than nonsense, or heresy, or blasphemy: contempt is answer enough to most that is said against them. And yet the men, in other men's eyes, are perhaps wiser and better than themselves. Most men are fools in the judgments of others! Whatever side or party you are of, there are many parties against you, who all pity your ignorance, and judge you silly deceived souls: so that if one man be to be believed of another, and if the most of mankind be not deceived, we are all poor, silly, cheated souls; but if most be deceived, mankind is a very deceivable creature. How know I that I must believe you, when you befool twenty other sects, any more than I should believe those twenty sects, when they as confidently befool you; if no other evidence turn the scales?"† "For my part," he elsewhere says, "when I consider the great measure of pride, self-conceitedness, self-esteem, that is in the greatest part of Christians that ever I was acquainted with (we of the ministry not excepted), I wonder that God doth not afflict us more, and bring us down by foul means, that will not be brought down by fair."‡

Although the most learned man is ignorant of very much more than he knows, yet the clergy, when acting as instructors of those who have still *less* knowledge than they, must of necessity be in some measure dogmatic in their deportment; but even in the pulpit they ought to imitate as much as possible the method of Paul, who "spake as to wise men," and invited his hearers to "judge what he said." When acting merely as citizens upon the general stage of the world, along with men who are not to be gratuitously presumed their inferiors in wisdom and knowledge, they make a ridiculous figure, if, forgetting that they are out of the pulpit, they carry into secular life that air of superiority and infallibility which is so apt to fasten itself upon

* Works, vol. xiv., p. 125. See also pp. 157-161.

† Treatise on Falsely-pretended Knowledge, Part I., ch. 16; in Baxter's Works, vol. xv., p. 132.

‡ *Ib.*, vol. ix., p. 162.

them in their appropriate place. How different is the tone of the Rev. Sharon Turner in the following passage, from that of some of his brethren ! “ I cannot,” says he, “ pretend to do more than to explain to you those inferences and reasonings which have satisfied myself. It is absurd for any human being, uninspired, to domineer over another. I would not attempt to do so. It would be both unjust and foolish. It would fail in its effect, and be contrary to the well-founded claim which every one has to judge for himself, under his own responsibility to the Deity, who rightfully claims our implicit obedience and immediate acquiescence in all that He discloses. But between man and man, no one can with any justice or reason tyrannize or dogmatize over others.”* In the same spirit Bishop Watson addresses the clergy of his diocese in a Charge delivered in 1795 :—“ When we speak concerning the truth of revealed religion, we include not only the certainty of the divine missions of Moses and of Jesus, but the nature of the several doctrines promulgated by them to mankind. Now you may ask me, what these doctrines are ? *I know what they are to me ; but pretending to no degree of infallibility, I think it safer to tell you where they are contained, than what they are.* They are contained in the Bible ; and if, in the reading of that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbour, or from those of the Church, *be persuaded on your part, that infallibility appertains as little to you, as it does to the Church of which you are a member, or to any individual who differs from you.*”†

As pride is the sin which, from their very position, most easily begets the clergy, so is servility to the clergy a vice which the more ignorant of the laity have ever been prone to display. On this subject something has already been said in the previous pages,‡ and a work of Archbishop Whately on its causes was quoted.§ These, he rightly maintains, are identical with the causes of some leading errors of the Romanists ; and in this view Dr Chalmers concurs with him, in the following animated passages of a sermon preached at Glasgow :—

“ May there not,” says he, “ be all the violence of an antipathy within us at Popery, and there be at the same time within us all the faults and all the errors of Popery ? May not the thorn be in our own eye, while the mote in our neighbour’s eye is calling forth all the severity of our indignation ? While we are sitting in the chair of judgment, and dealing forth from the eminence of a superior discernment, our invectives against what we think to be sacrilegious in the creed and practice of others, may it not be possible to detect in ourselves the same perversion of principle, the same idolatrous resistance to truth and righteousness ? and surely, it well becomes us in this case, while we are so ready to precipitate our invectives upon the head of by-standers, to pass a humbling examination upon ourselves, that we may come to a more enlightened estimate of that which is the object of our condemnation ; and that, when we condemn, we may do it with wisdom, and with the meekness of wisdom.

* The Sacred History of the World, vol. i., p. 5 ; London, 1832.

† Watson’s Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i., p. 106.

‡ See pp. 108, 113–117.

§ See p. 108.

“ Let us therefore take a nearer look of Popery, and try to find out how much of Popery there is in the religion of Protestants.

“ But, let it be premised, that many of the disciples of this religion disclaim much of what we impute to them ; that the Popery of a former age may not be a fair specimen of the Popery of the present ; that, in point of fact, many of its professors have evinced all the spirit of devout and enlightened Christians ; that in many districts of Popery, the Bible is in full and active circulation ; and that thus, while the name and externals are retained, and waken up all our traditional repugnance against it, there may be among thousands and tens of thousands of its nominal adherents, all the soul, and substance, and principle, and piety of a reformed faith. When I therefore enumerate the errors of Popery, I do not assert the extent to which they exist. I merely say that such errors are imputed to them ; and instead of launching forth into severities against those who are thus charged, all I propose is, to direct you to the far more profitable and Christian employment of shaming ourselves out of these very errors, that we may know how to judge of others, and that we may do it with the tenderness of charity.

“ First, then, it is said of Papists that they ascribe an infallibility to the Pope, so that if he were to say one thing and the Bible another, his authority would carry it over the authority of God. And think you, my brethren, that there is no such Popery among you ? Is there no taking of your religion upon trust from another, when you should draw it fresh and unsullied from the fountain-head of inspiration ? You all have, or you ought to have, Bibles ; and how often is it repeated there, ‘ Harken diligently unto me ?’ Now, do you obey this requirement, by making the reading of your Bibles a distinct and earnest exercise ? Do you ever dare to bring your favourite minister to the tribunal of the word, or would you tremble at the presumption of such an attempt, so that the hearing of the word carries a greater authority over your mind than the reading of the word ? Now this want of daring, this trembling at the very idea of a dissent from your minister, this indolent acquiescence in his doctrine, is just calling another man master ; it is putting the authority of man over the authority of God ; it is throwing yourself into a prostrate attitude at the footstool of human infallibility ; it is not just kissing the toe of reverence, but it is the profounder degradation of the mind and of all its faculties : and without the name of Popery, —that name which lights up so ready an antipathy in your bosoms, your soul may be infected with the substantial poison, and your conscience be weighed down by the oppressive shackles of Popery. And all this, in the noon-day effulgence of a Protestant country, where the Bible, in your mother tongue, circulates among all your families, —where it may be met with in almost every shelf, and is ever soliciting you to look to the wisdom that is inscribed upon its pages. O ! how tenderly should we deal with the prejudices of a rude and uneducated people, who have no Bibles, and no art of reading among them, to unlock its treasures, when we think that, even in this our land, the voice of human authority carries so mighty an influence along with it, and veneration for the word of God is darkened and polluted by a blind veneration for its interpreters.

“ We tremble to read of the fulminations that have issued in other days from a conclave of cardinals. Have we no conclaves, and no fulminations, and no orders of inquisition, in our own country? Is there no professing brotherhood, or no professing sisterhood, to deal their censorious invectives around them, upon the members of an excommunicated world? There is such a thing as a religious public. There is a ‘little flock,’ on the one hand, and a ‘world lying in wickedness,’ on the other. But have a care ye who think yourselves of the favoured few, how you never transgress the mildness, and charity, and unostentatious virtues of the gospel; lest you hold out a distorted picture of Christianity in your neighbourhood, and impose that as religion on the fancy of the credulous, which stands at as wide a distance from the religion of the New Testament, as do the services of an exploded superstition, or the mummeries of an antiquated ritual.”

“ But, again, it is said, that Papists worship saints, and fall down to graven images. This is very, very bad. ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.’ But let us take ourselves to task upon this charge also. Have we no consecrated names in the annals of reformation,—no worthies who hold too commanding a place in the remembrance and affection of Protestants? Are there no departed theologians, whose works hold too domineering an ascendancy over the faith and practice of Christians? Are there no laborious compilations of other days, which, instead of interpreting the Bible, have given its truths a shape, and a form, and an arrangement, that confer upon them another impression, and impart to them another influence, from the pure and original record? We may not bend the knee in any sensible chamber of imagery, at the remembrance of favourite saints. But do we not bend the understanding before the volumes of favourite authors, and do an homage to those representations of the minds of the men of other days, which should be exclusively given to the representation of the mind of the Spirit, as put down in the book of the Spirit’s revelation? It is right that each of us should give the contribution of his own talents, and his own learning, to this most interesting cause; but let the great drift of our argument be to prop the authority of the Bible, and to turn the eye of earnestness upon its pages; for if any work, instead of exalting the Bible, shall be made, by the misjudging reverence of others, to stand in its place, then we introduce a false worship into the heart of a reformed country, and lay prostrate the conscience of men, under the yoke of a spurious authority.”*

* The Doctrine of Christian Charity applied to the case of Religious Differences: A Sermon preached before the Auxiliary Society, Glasgow, to the Hibernian Society for establishing Schools and circulating the Holy Scriptures in Ireland; in Dr Chalmers’s Sermons on Public Occasions, pp. 100–103, 104, 105.—See extract from his Diary, *ante*, p. 113.

In the sixth Book of *The Task*, Cowper expresses the sense of the concluding paragraph above quoted, in lines as admirable for the vigour and terseness of their diction, as for the truth of the picture they present:—

“ Books are not seldom talismans and spells,
By which the magic art of shrewder wits
Holds an unthinking multitude enthralled,
Some to the fascination of a name
Surrender judgment hood-winked. Some the style

In no city upon earth could these powerful passages have been thundered forth more fitly than in Glasgow. And as the servility which they reprove has unhappily increased instead of diminishing since the sermon was delivered, the insertion of this portion of it here may suggest some useful thoughts to the "little flock" of saints in that devout and very drunken city.

To a like effect Archbishop Secker says:—"We require no implicit submission to what we teach. We warn you against it. So far as our doctrine is discerned by your reason, or felt by your consciences, to be true, or appears to stand on the testimony of God; so far only believe us. 'We speak as to wise men; judge ye what we say' (1 Cor. x. 15). All that we ask is, judge uprightly. . . . *And as for us, whose business is to teach: paying us too much regard, we acknowledge, is a dangerous temptation to us; AND MAY DO, AND HATH DONE, GREAT HARM TO TRUE RELIGION, TO VIRTUE, TO HUMAN SOCIETY.*"*

As far as the unlearned laity are compelled to take their information upon trust from the clergy, the authority of the guides is exceedingly diminished in comparison with that of learned laymen, by the fact that in most churches they are fettered by Articles or Confessions, in accordance with which they must *believe*, under pain of losing their self-respect and peace of mind; and *teach*, under pain of deprivation, starvation, and disgrace.† To expect, as many seem to do, that

Infatuates. and through labyrinths and wilds
Of error leads them, by a tune entranced.
While sloth seduces more, too weak to bear
The insupportable fatigue of thought."

The talismans and spells to which Dr Chalmers more particularly alludes, are doubtless the Confession and Catechism of the Church of Scotland, which enthral the multitude not only in the ways enumerated by Cowper, but through that superstitious fear of free inquiry which has descended to us from Popish times, and that regard to worldly interest which the inconvenient consequences of free inquiry are so apt to alarm. "The effect of established systems in obstructing truth," says Bishop Watson, "is to the last degree deplorable: every one sees it in other churches, but scarcely any one suspects it in his own."—(Pref. to *Coll. of Theol. Tracts*, p. xiv.) And Gilbert Wakefield observes:—"It is a most shocking reflection to every lover of truth and honesty, that a requisition to acknowledge a multitudinous mass of theological and political propositions, denominated *articles of religion*, which many have never read, which they who read cannot understand, and which the imposers of them have never yet been able to expound with an uniformity of interpretation, should be made an indispensable condition to the privilege of preaching the *truths of Christianity*; nay the basis of that preaching, and the criterion of those truths."—(*Memoirs*, vol. ii., p. 22.)

* Sermon 53, on "The Qualities of a pious and devout Hearer of the Word of God:" Works, vol. ii., p. 134; Edin. 1792. See also Sermon 43, on "The Importance of a careful Examination of our Principles of Religion;" and Sermon 101, entitled "The Sacred Scriptures the only Infallible Rule of Faith and Practice." In the beginning of Sermon 44 he says:—"The first duty of reasonable creatures, with respect to religion, is, informing themselves, as fully as their natural abilities, their improvements in knowledge, and their conditions of life permit, concerning its truth, and the doctrines it teaches."

† See Mr Combe's remarks in his Notes on the United States of North America, vol. i., p. 135; also Wakefield's Memoirs, vol. i., pp. 114, 163.

In England, the temptation to time-serving in the Church is much greater than in Scotland, by reason of the existence of clerical ranks, and extreme di-

persons in this position should be impartial interpreters of Scripture, and candid declarers of their convictions, shews a truly juvenile ignorance of human nature, and of the world as it is.* Most pitiable it is to see the shifts to which good men are sometimes put, when a doctrine which they are bound to defend must be supported against all assailants, in spite of Scripture, reason, and undeniable facts in nature.†

Whiston records that he once waited on Bishop Smalridge, and requested him to write a book to recommend to the world a fair and impartial review of Christian antiquity, in order to the correction of such errors and practices as might have crept into the Church since the first settlement of Christianity. "His Lordship's answer," says he, "as near as I can remember the words, and that with great emotion of mind and body, was this: 'Mr Whiston, I dare not examine; I dare not examine. For if we should examine, and find that you are in the right, the Church has then been in an error so many hundred

versity of emoluments. "O what a sad but prevalent topic am I now come to!" exclaims Whiston. "*The expectation of preferment; more preferment! The grand thing commonly aimed at, both by clergy and laity; and generally the utter ruin of virtue and religion among them both! Poison, sweet poison; first poured upon the Church by Constantine the Great, and greedily swallowed both by Papists and Protestants ever since. But blessed be God who hath given me, instead of that sweet poison, Agur's admirable wish: 'Neither poverty nor riches; but hath fed me with food convenient for me.'* Prov. xxx. 8."—(*Memoirs of his own Life*, p. 156.) See Baxter's Works, vol. xiv., p. 198-9.

"What's orthodox and true believing
Against a conscience?—A good living. . . .
What makes all doctrines plain and clear?—
About two hundred pounds a year.
And that which was prov'd true before,
Prove false again?—Two hundred more."

Hudibras, Part III., Canto I., v. 1273, &c.

"One day, I remember," says Gilbert Wakefield, "my rector, Mr Maddock, was expostulating with me on the subject of my dissatisfaction with the constitution and doctrines of our church; of which sentiments I made no secret at any time, when a good end could be accomplished by a declaration of them. After some disputation on both sides, but without the least tendency to warmth and ill-humour in either of us, I finish'd the debate by a plain question, which I heartily wish every member of the *church-establishment* to put to his own conscience; and to answer it deliberately, and solemnly, according to the report of that faithful arbiter, as he expects to render an account of his actions to the GREAT UMPIRE of the universe—"Tell me plainly, Mr Maddock, did you ever read the Scriptures, with the express view of enquiring into the doctrine of a *Trinity*, EARLY IN LIFE, and before your preferment, or your prospects of preferment, might contribute to influence your judgment, and make it *convenient* for you to acquiesce?" 'Why then,' says he, 'if you ask me that, I must honestly own, I NEVER DID.'—It is scarcely needful to add, that he molested me no more on these questions."—(*Wakefield's Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 180.)

* See *ante*, pp. 46, 47, 87, 115, 235, 252, 258; and Godwin's Political Justice, B. vi., ch. ii. "He that has a mind to believe," says Locke, "has half assented already."—(*Conduct of the Understanding*, sect. 33.) "Yet I allow, and am persuaded," says Wakefield, "that many dignified clergymen are perfectly honest and sincere in professing the doctrines of the Church; but it is an insult to the common sense of mankind, in every age, to call them *unprejudiced* and *proper* witnesses. We should recollect the penetrating remark of the Jewish sage—"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked!"—(*Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 286.)

† See *ante*, pp. 56-61, and 72-106.

years !' I asked him, 'How he could say so, and still be a Protestant.' He replied, 'Yes, he could.' This I testify under my hand. WILL. WHISTON.*

"Strong indeed," says Jortin, with reference to Cardinal Fleury, "are the prejudices of education, and the attachment to a church in which we were born and bred, and to the ministry of which we have devoted ourselves; and candid allowances ought ever to be made for them. Else it would seem impossible for a man of letters, a man versed in ecclesiastical history and in the Scriptures, a man of probity and good sense, to admit the Pope's spiritual authority over the Christian world, the infallibility of Popes or Councils, the celebration of the eucharist in one kind, transubstantiation, celibacy imposed upon the monks, the nuns, and the clergy, the worship of images and relics, the usefulness of monasteries, the miracles ascribed to impostors, fanatics, and lunatics, and a multitude of other things so contrary to religion and to common sense."†

The corporate spirit and party ties of the clergy form another reason why their professed opinions cannot be received so confidently as those of independent investigators of religious truth. This point is well illustrated by Archbishop Whately in the following passage:—

"We know how much the judgment of men is likely to be *biased*, and also how much they are tempted to acquiesce in something *against* their judgment, when earnestly pressed by the majority of those who are acting with them,—whom they look up to,—whose approbation encourages them,—and whose censure they cannot but dread.

"Some doctrine, suppose, is promulgated, or measure proposed, or mode of procedure commenced, which some members of a party do not, in their unbiassed judgment, approve. But any one of them is disposed, first to *wish*, then to *hope*, and lastly to *believe*, that those are in the right whom he would be sorry to think wrong. And again, in any case where his judgment may still be unchanged, he may feel that it is but a *small* concession he is called on to make, and that there are *great* benefits to set against it; and that, after all, he is perhaps called on merely to *acquiesce silently* in what he does not quite approve; and he is loth to incur censure as lukewarm in the good cause,—as presumptuous,—as unfriendly towards those who are acting with him. To be a 'breaker up of the Club' (ἐταιρίας διαλυτής) was a reproach, the dread of which, we learn from the great historian of Greece, carried much weight with it in the transactions of the party warfare he is describing. And we may expect the like in all similar cases.

"And when men have once been led to make one concession, they are the more eloth to shrink from a second; and a third costs still less."‡

This picture of things as they are, is painted from life by the masterly hand of one who has seen and watched as much of clerical doings as most men; and who has the courage to delineate the truth, in the face of the odium which a free exposure of clerical weaknesses is sure to bring upon those who make it.

* Whiston's Memoirs of Dr Samuel Clarke, p. 177.

† Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. Hist.; in his Works, vol. iii., p. 296.

‡ Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c.; 2d ed., p. 112.

Nor is this clerical and corporate influence upon individual clergymen the only cause of the impairment of that authority which their professed opinions enjoy among thinking people, in comparison with those of *laymen* of equal talents, acquirements, and integrity. A still more powerful one is the *pressure from without*—the influence of Pharisaical busy-bodies and ignorant fanatics, both male and female, upon the clergy whom they watch and criticise; and whose lives, unless the unfortunate pastors come up to the approved standard of what they ought to believe, inculcate, and do, these godly people are impelled by a sense of “Christian duty” to make miserable by calumny and insult. Sad indeed is the spectacle of a man of sense and learning, compelled to choose between facing such discomforts, and becoming the tool of some “little flock” of conceited enthusiasts in his neighbourhood! Even should there be in the parish but one restless “evangelical” lady, whose rank happens to give her some local influence, and whose pertinacity and self-importance are enlisted in the service of what she undoubtingly calls “religious truth,” such a neighbour may compel the reluctant but helpless clergyman to patronise schemes, and embark in agitations, which in his own private opinion are needless or mischievous. Nor must the rivalry of hostile sects, when any of them is moving heaven and earth to gain popularity and influence, be forgotten. Who, then, shall say how many of the Scottish ministers to whom the Sabbath Alliance sent its appeals, or who were stirred up by the “Organisation Secretary” and his friends in person, were moved to compliance by such influences as these? Who shall pronounce how often the clergy have patronised measures to which they were at least indifferent, simply because they were *expected* to do so by people whom they were loth to offend?*

A writer in the 92d volume of the *Edinburgh Review*, after making

* One of the first proceedings of the Sabbath Alliance “was to disseminate as widely as possible the principles and objects of the Alliance. The constitution and list of the very influential Committee were generally advertised. A circular was also prepared, explaining its views at some length, and *soliciting co-operation*; and this, being made to enclose a copy of the constitution, &c., as well as a stamped envelope, *was addressed to the ministers of every evangelical denomination in Scotland—between two and three thousand in number.*”—(*First Annual Report*, p. 5.)

With respect to the Alliance, and those auxiliary associations which the Organisation Secretary was instrumental in establishing throughout the country, it is confessed in the same Report that after fourteen months’ experience, “the expectations of many of the leading promoters of the Association” had been discovered to be “far too sanguine. It was found, after the lapse of many months, that in a number of places, committees, composed of all parties, formed apparently under the most harmonious and favourable auspices, and unquestionably earnest in their intentions, *had entirely failed to effect their purpose.* In some other cases *there was but a seeming vitality*; for, though the tracts were circulated, *few members were enrolled, and the contributions barely covered the cost price of the tracts, leaving nothing in aid of the general expenditure.* It is proper to state explicitly and at once, that the Alliance experienced these unanticipated obstacles. They are amply sufficient to account for a less favourable balance-sheet than was expected; for it will be seen, by a glance at the list in the Appendix, how many of the more important and early formed auxiliaries found themselves unable to act.”—(P. 6) This bad success is attributed in the Report to “the error of not giving *congregations* a sufficiently independent and individual interest in the Association, leaving them to act upon the district system or

the observations on conventional hypocrisy which were formerly quoted, p. 214, proceeds as follows:—"Then there are the deliberate dis-

not, according to circumstances: for there *are* places where it has been successfully carried out." But is it credible that if a strong sympathy with the Alliance had really prevailed, the various evangelical sects would not have co-operated as heartily as they do in antipapal and antislavery agitations? Again, when Mr Locke, in the spring of 1849, proposed in the House of Commons the enactment of a law to compel Railway Companies to carry passengers on Sundays, the Committee of the Alliance printed two circulars in succession, which they transmitted by post "to every minister in Scotland, urging them to petition" against the measure: which circulars were "strengthened by one to the same effect despatched by the Sabbath Committee of the Free Church to all the ministers of their denomination;" while "the United Presbyterian Church also, through their Committee of Synod on Sabbath Observance, urged all their ministers and people to oppose the 'disgraceful attempt,' as they justly characterised it, 'to legalise Sabbath-profanation,' and advertised a form of petition."—(*Narrative of the Proceedings of the Sabbath Alliance for the Years 1849 and 1850*, p. 5.) Now, although the success of these urgent appeals fell far short of expectation, can it be believed that all or even most of the ministers who responded to them, had the moral courage to refrain from making a show of activity against the alleged profanation, however little they might disapprove of Sunday trains? Every one of them may have been sincerely zealous; I call no man's honesty in question: what I wish to illustrate is merely this—that since many of them *might* entertain a different opinion from that which under this virtual compulsion they professed, we cannot regard clerical advocacy in such circumstances as unequivocal evidence of approval. Recently, the Alliance invited "the ministers of religion of all denominations throughout Scotland to protest against the proposal to open the Crystal Palace on the Lord's Day;" and "*they cannot doubt*," says their Acting Committee in its Report for 1852, "*that every Protestant minister will sign such a protest, which of itself will constitute a noble testimony to the Divine institution of the Sabbath, and convey so STRONG AN EXPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS OPINION that neither Government nor Parliament will be willing to resist it*"!! What was this but to give warning that the Committee would infer from refusal that the refuser was little better than a Papist? Both Government and Parliament, it may be hoped, can estimate so correctly the "strong expressions of religious opinion" thus extorted, as to be little amazed or influenced by them, however numerous or urgent.

Dr Lorimer, in his treatise on the Sabbath, says, that "while Popery revives everywhere, it is to be feared that Evangelical religion in various communions declines. The present struggle is bringing out *that some, of whom better things might have been hoped, are relaxed in their views and feelings regarding the Fourth Commandment*. Whatever may be the cause, whether undue intercourse with Popery and Liberalism, for political ends of later years, or other influences of longer standing, so it is, that *men are hanging back, or proving decidedly hostile to the present stand for the Sabbath*, whose venerable forefathers would have been the first to take the field, and the last to abandon it." He is so charitable as to say that he "does not charge all with being infidel who are seriously erroneous in their creed and practice in regard to the Sabbath. Much allowance must here, as in similar cases, be made for *unfavourable circumstances of education, social position, and want of thorough examination of the subject*. It is well known that many men, otherwise devout, miserably fail in their views of the Sabbath law. To the Lord of the Sabbath, as the Judge of all, must every one stand or fall."—(*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* pp. 52, 71.) Think of a Free Church minister, who is bound hand and foot by the Westminster Confession, and by the tight cords of his social position as one of the oracles of Glasgow, condescendingly making this allowance for the poor unfettered laymen! Above all, think of Dr Lorimer, who could write a book on the Sabbath without seeming to have ever read the 14th chapter of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, talking charitably of the "want of thorough examination of the subject" by those benighted, though "otherwise devout," individuals!

honesties of the learned, imposing upon the people what they do not believe themselves, for the sake of the end it is supposed to answer. Sir Charles Lyell [in his *Second Visit to the United States of North America*, vol. i., p. 222] adduces at length the text of the three heavenly witnesses, which no scholar, since Porson's investigation of it, professes to believe genuine [see *ante*, p. 45], but which is still nevertheless retained in our Bibles, and also in those of the Episcopal church of America, notwithstanding their opportunity of expunging it when the American Episcopalians revised the liturgy and struck out the Athanasian creed. This disingenuous timidity has long been a reflection upon all our religious teachers. It is now becoming extremely dangerous to their influence and authority. There is no meeting an age of inquiry except in the spirit of perfect candour. The question which lies at the root of all dogmatic Christianity, is the authority of the letter of Scripture; yet, strange to say, that question is neither a settled nor an open one even among Protestants. All the clergy of almost all sects are afraid of it; and the students of nature, intent only upon facts that God has revealed to our senses, have to fight their way against the self-same religious prejudice which consigned Galileo to his dungeon. The geologists, following in the track of the astronomers, have made good some very important positions, and number among them many eminent churchmen of unquestioned fidelity to their ordination vows. It is now, therefore, admitted that the text is not conclusive against physical demonstration. Is the text conclusive against moral induction and metaphysical inquiry? Let a layman put that question, and an awful silence is the least forbidding answer he will receive. No minister of a parish, no master of a school, no father of a family in England feels himself free to pursue any train of instruction that seems in conflict with a familiar text or a dogmatic formula, excepting only the subject of the opening verses of Genesis. He is either fearful of the ground himself, or he cannot clear his own path for others without opening a discussion, which is discountenanced on all sides and branded with reproachful names. He, in spite of himself, must take refuge in evasions and reserve, and close a subject of perhaps the liveliest interest to the most reverential minds, lest the works of God should *seem* to be at variance with his word. Here is the dilemma which will be found at the bottom of the education question in England. This is what is consciously or unconsciously meant in many important quarters by the cry against secular instruction. This is why the natural sciences were so long frowned upon in our grammar schools and colleges, and ancient knowledge preferred to modern as a sounder and a holier lore. The theology of the Vatican was at home among the Pagan mythologies, the Aristotelian physics, and the Hebrew cosmogonies; yet stood in awe of 'the Tuscan artist's optic glass;' and the spirit of the ancient Church has ever since been true to that instinct. But Protestantism, we say again, and printing, have admitted the light of nature into the schools; and, in the unlimited ecclesiastical freedom of the United States, religion and education go hand in hand."*

Sir Charles Lyell, in the work referred to, observes that literary and

* Edin. Rev., vol. xcii., pp. 350, 351.

scientific men, whether Protestant or Catholic, European or American, clergy or laity, abstain in general from communicating the results of their scientific or biblical researches to the million, not so much from any apprehension that the essential truths of Christianity would suffer the slightest injury were the new views to be universally known, as from false notions of expediency, and fear of the prejudices of the vulgar. "They dare not speak out, for the same reason that the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of England halted for one hundred and seventy years before they had courage to adopt the reform in the Julian calendar, which Gregory XIII., in accordance with astronomical observations, had effected in 1582. Hogarth, in his picture of the Election Feast, has introduced a banner carried by one of the crowd, on which was inscribed the motto, 'Give us back our eleven days;' for he remembered when the angry mob, irritated by the innovation of the new style, went screaming these words through the streets of London. In like manner, the acknowledged antiquity of Egyptian civilisation, or of the solid framework of the globe, with its monuments of many extinct races of living beings, might, if suddenly disclosed to an ignorant people, raise as angry a demand to give them back their old chronology. Hence arises a habit of concealing from the unlettered public discoveries which might, it is thought, perplex them, and unsettle their old opinions. This method of dealing with the most sacred of subjects may thus be illustrated:—A few tares have grown up among the wheat; you must not pull them up, or you will loosen the soil and expose the roots of the good grain, and then all may wither: moreover, you must go on sowing the seeds of the same tares in the mind of the rising generation, for you cannot open the eyes of the children without undecieving and alarming their parents. Now the perpetuation of error among the many is only one part of the mischief of this want of good faith; for it is also an abandonment by the few of the high ground on which their religion ought to stand, namely, its truth. It accustoms the teacher to regard his religion in its relation to the millions as a mere piece of machinery, like a police, for preserving order, or enabling one class of men to govern another.

"If such a state of things be unsound and unsatisfactory, it is not so much the clergy who are to blame as the laity; for laymen have more freedom of action, and can with less sacrifice of personal interests take the initiative in a reform. The cure of the evil is obvious; it consists in giving such instruction to the people at large as would make concealment impossible. Whatever is known and intelligible to ordinary capacities in science, especially if contrary to the first and natural impressions derivable from the literal meaning, or ordinary acceptation, of the text of Scripture, whether in astronomy, geology, or any other department of knowledge, should be freely communicated to all. Lay teachers, not professionally devoted and pledged to propagate the opinions of particular sects, will do this much more freely than ecclesiastics, and, as a matter of course, in proportion as the standard of public instruction is raised; and no order of men would be such gainers by the measure as the clergy, especially the most able and upright among them. Every normal school, every advance made in the social and intellectual position of the lay teachers, tends to emancipate, not the masses alone, but still more effectually their spirit-

ual guides, and would increase their usefulness in a tenfold degree. That a clergy may be well informed for the age they live in, and may contain among them many learned and good men, while the people remain in darkness, we know from history ; for the spiritual instructors may wish to keep the multitude in ignorance, with a view of maintaining their own power. But no educated people will ever tolerate an idle, illiterate, or stationary priesthood. That this is impossible, the experience of the last quarter of a century in New England has fully proved. In confirmation of this truth, I may appeal to the progress made by the ministers of the Methodist and Baptist churches of late years. Their missionaries found the Congregationalists slumbering in all the security of an old establishment, and soon made numerous converts, besides recruiting their ranks largely from newly arrived emigrants. They were able to send more preachers into the vineyard, because they required at first scarcely any preparation or other qualification than zeal. But no sooner had the children of the first converts been taught in the free schools under an improved system, than the clergy of these very denominations who had for a time gloried in their ignorance, and spoken with contempt of all human knowledge, found it necessary to study for some years in theological seminaries, and attend courses of church history, the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and German languages, the modern writings of German and other biblical scholars, and every branch of divinity. The Baptist college of Newton has greatly distinguished itself among others, and that of the Methodists at Middletown in Connecticut ; while the Independents have their theological college at Andover in Massachusetts, which has acquired much celebrity, and drawn to it pupils from great distances, and of many different denominations.

“ The large collections of books on divinity, which are now seen in the libraries of the New England clergy, were almost unknown a quarter of a century ago.

“ The average pay also of the clergy, in the rural districts of New England, has increased. About the middle of the last century, it was not more than 200 dollars annually, so that they were literally ‘ passing rich with forty pounds a year ;’ whereas now they usually receive 500 at least, and some in the cities 2000 or 3000 dollars. Nor can there be a doubt that, in proportion as the lay teachers are more liberally remunerated, the scale of income required to command the services of men of first-rate talent in the clerical profession must and will be raised. Already there are many indications in Massachusetts that a demand for higher qualifications in men educated for the pulpit is springing up. It is no bad augury to hear a minister exhort his younger brethren at their ordination not to stand in awe of their congregations, but to remember they have before them sinful men who are to be warned, not critics who are to be propitiated. ‘ Formerly,’ said Channing, ‘ Felix trembled before Paul ; it is now the successor of Paul who trembles :’—a saying which, coming as it did from a powerful and successful preacher, implies that the people are awaking, not that they are growing indifferent about religious matters, but that the day of soporific discourses, full of empty declamation or unmeaning common-places, is drawing to a close.”*

* Vol. i., pp. 224-228.

In his second volume, Sir Charles, after relating some geological discoveries made in the valleys of the Alleghanies, and which could nowise be reconciled with the Hebrew cosmogony in the Book of Genesis, adds some observations on a moral phenomenon which was forcibly brought before his mind in the course of the investigation, and may very fitly be noticed here as illustrating at once the subject in hand, and the absence of genuine religious liberty even in the United States. He says:—

“The interest excited by these singular monuments of the olden times, naturally led to animated discussions, both in lecture-rooms and in the columns of the daily journals of Pennsylvania, during which the high antiquity of the earth, and the doctrine of former changes in the species of animals and plants inhabiting this planet before the creation of man, were assumed as established truths. But these views were so new and startling, and so opposed to popular prepossessions, that they drew down much obloquy upon their promulgators, who incurred the censures, not only of the multitude, but also of some of the Roman Catholic and Lutheran clergy. The social persecution was even carried so far as to injure professionally the practice of some medical men, who had given publicity to the obnoxious doctrines. Several of the ministers of the Lutheran Church, who had studied for years in German universities, were too well informed not to believe in the conclusions established by geologists, respecting the immensity of past time and former vicissitudes, both in animal and vegetable life; but although taking a lively interest in discoveries made at their own door, and joining in the investigations, they were compelled by prudence to conceal their opinions from their congregations, or they would have lost all influence over them, and might perhaps have seen their churches deserted. Yet by maintaining silence in deference to the opinions of the more ignorant, they become, in some degree, the instruments of countenancing error; nay, they are rearing up the rising generation to be, in their turn, the persecutors of many of their contemporaries, who may hereafter be far in advance in their scientific knowledge.

“‘To nothing but error,’ says a popular writer of our times, ‘can any truth be dangerous; and I know not,’ he exclaims, ‘where else there is seen so altogether tragical a spectacle, as that religion should be found standing in the highways, to say, ‘Let no man learn the simplest laws of the universe, lest they mislearn the highest. In the name of God the Maker, who said, and hourly yet says, *Let there be light*, we command that you continue in darkness!’—(*Letter on Secular Education*, by T. Carlyle, July, 1848.)

“Goldsmith, in ‘The Vicar of Wakefield,’ makes his traveller say, that after he had walked through Europe, and examined mankind nearly, he found that it is not the forms of government, whether they be monarchies or commonwealths, that determine the amount of liberty enjoyed by individuals, but that ‘riches in general are in every country another name for freedom.’ I agree with Goldsmith that the forms of government are not alone sufficient to secure freedom—they are but means to an end. Here we have in Pennsylvania a free press, a widely-extended suffrage, and the most perfect religious toleration,—nay, more than toleration, all the various sects enjoying political

equality, and, what is more rare, an equality of social rank ; yet all this machinery is not capable, as we have seen, of securing even so much of intellectual freedom as shall enable a student of nature to discuss freely the philosophical questions which the progress of science brings naturally before him. He cannot even announce, with impunity, results which half a century of observation and reasoning has confirmed by evidence little short of mathematical demonstration. But can riches, as Goldsmith suggests, secure intellectual liberty ? No doubt they can protect the few who possess them from pecuniary penalties, when they profess unpopular doctrines.* But to enable a man to think, he must be allowed to communicate freely his thoughts to others. Until they have been brought into the daylight and discussed, they will never be clear even to himself. They must be warmed by the sympathy of kindred minds, and stimulated by the heat of controversy, or they will never be fully developed and made to ripen and fructify.

“ How, then, can we obtain this liberty ? There is only one method ; it is by educating the millions, and by dispelling their ignorance, prejudices, and bigotry.

“ Let Pennsylvania not only establish numerous free schools ; but let her, when she organises a system of government instruction, raise the qualifications, pay, and station in society of the secular teachers, as highly as Massachusetts is now aspiring to do, and the persecution I have complained of will cease at once and for ever.

“ The project of so instructing the millions might well indeed be deemed Utopian, if it were necessary that all should understand the patient and laborious trains of research and reasoning by which we have arrived at grand generalisations in geology and other branches of physical science. But this is not requisite for the desired end. We have simply to communicate the results, and this we are bound to do without waiting till they have been established for half a century. We ought rather carefully to prepare the public mind for new conclusions as soon as they become highly probable, and thus make impossible that collision of opinion, so much to be deprecated, between the multitude and the learned.

“ It is as easy to teach a peasant or a child that the earth moves round the sun, as to inculcate the old exploded dogma that it is the motionless centre of the universe. The child is as willing to believe that our planet is of indefinite antiquity, as that it is only 6000 years old. Tell him that the earth was inhabited by other races of animals and plants before the creation of man, as we now know it to have been, and the idea is not more difficult for him to conceive than the notion which is usually allowed to take root in his mind, that man and the species of animals and plants, now our contemporaries, were the first occupants of this globe. All that we require, when once a good system of primary and normal schools has been organised, is a moderate share of moral courage and love of truth, on the part of the laity and clergy ; and then the academical chair and scientific lecture-

* “ They who have lands, and safe bank-stock,
With faith so founded on a rock,
May give a rich invention ease,
And construe Scripture how they please.”—*Green*.

room, and every pulpit, and every village school, may be made to speak the same language, in regard to those natural phenomena which are of a kind to strike and interest the popular mind.”*

In Great Britain it is impossible that, as things now stand, the great body of the clergy should welcome a system of education that will confer on the people a love and capability of free inquiry, and enable them to detect the errors of the established theology. To make the clergy cordial promoters of popular enlightenment, their own fetters must be struck off, so that they may no longer be under a professional obligation or temptation to speak otherwise than they think, or to preserve their honesty at the expense of that superiority in knowledge without which the respectful attention of educated hearers is unattainable. So prejudicial and galling is the restraint under which they are at present, that a great relaxation of it cannot be very distant; and most welcome, no doubt, to the best of the clergy, will it be when it comes. As Sir Charles Lyell says, the laity should bestir themselves in aid of their enslaved fellow-citizens, whose hands are so inconveniently tied up from relieving themselves. It is the interest of the entire community that our pulpits should be filled with able, honest, independent, and learned men, and not by preachers so weak, ignorant, or unscrupulous, as to rouse the hostility or disrespect of educated laymen; and if admission to the clerical office shall continue to be possible only through means of a declaration of belief which no man who is at once sincere, intelligent, and well-informed, is able to subscribe and to teach in conformity with, we need no prophet to foretell the consequences which must ensue in an enlightened age. The character of the Scottish clergy, which, as to talent and good sense, is thought by some to have deteriorated visibly in the present generation, will deteriorate still farther in the next; for if good and wise men are scared from the Church by obstacles which are insuperable to *them* (and to *them only*), the proportion of “hirelings,” and weaklings, and fanatics in our pulpits must more and more increase. Surely, when the influence of the clergy for good and for evil is considered, the attention of our statesmen ought to be seriously directed to the means of reforming at least *that* Church which the State supports.

“No particular church,” says Jeremy Taylor, “ought, with rigour, to require subscriptions to Articles which are not evidently true, and necessary to be professed; because in the division of hearts that is in the world, it is certain that some good men may dissent, and then either they shall be afflicted, or be tempted to hypocrisy: of either of which if ecclesiastic laws be guilty, *they are not for edification, they are neither just nor pious, and therefore oblige not.* . . . And at last, in such cases, let the Articles be made with as great latitude of sense as they can; and, so that subscriptions be made to the form of words, let the subscribers understand them in what sense they please, which the truth of God will suffer, and the words can be capable of. This is the last

* Vol ii., pp. 314–318.—See also the Rev. Baden Powell’s *Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth, passim*; Combe’s *Notes on the United States of North America*, vol. i., pp. 135, 193, 261–265, 204–210; ii., 275, 286; iii., 117–120, 124, 254–258, 393–398, 418–431; the same author’s *Moral Philosophy*, Lecture xx.; and Dymond’s *Essays on the Principles of Morality, &c.*, ch. xv., on “The Religious Establishments of England and Ireland.”

remedy, but it is the worst; it hath in it something of craft, but very little of ingenuity; *and if it can serve the ends of peace, or of external charity, or of a fantastic concord,* YET IT CANNOT SERVE THE ENDS OF TRUTH, AND HOLINESS, AND CHRISTIAN SIMPLICITY.* Now, which of these two classes of ends is it of greater importance to promote?

The demoralising tendency of the practice of subscribing Articles which are not believed according to the evident meaning of the words, is thus remarked upon by honest Whiston:—"What will become of all oaths, promises, and securities among men, if the plain, real truth and meaning of words be no longer the measure of what we are to profess, assert, or practise; but every one may, if he do but openly declare it, put his own strained interpretation, as he pleases, upon them? Especially if this be to be allowed in the most sacred matters of all, the signing Articles of Faith, the making solemn Confessions of the same, and the offering up public prayers, praises, and doxologies, in the solemn assemblies of his worship? This, I own, I dare not do, at the peril of my salvation; and if I can no way be permitted to enjoy the benefit of Christ's holy ordinances in public, without what I own would be in myself gross insincerity and prevarication, I shall, I believe, think it my duty to aim to enjoy that benefit some other way, whatever odium or suffering I may bring upon myself thereby."†

One bad effect, in particular, of chaining the clergy by Articles, Confessions, and Creeds, is dwelt upon by Archbishop Whately in several of his works: We cannot believe what they teach, with the same confidence in their sincerity which we should otherwise have. "For," says he, "the argument from authority—the confirmation any one's faith receives from the belief of others—is destroyed, when a *compulsory*" (or *quasi compulsory*) "profession leaves it doubtful in each case whether those others are sincere believers or not. And the prohibition, under secular penalties, of any arguments against a religion, impairs, more or less, in proportion as it is enforced, another and more important branch of evidence, *the defiance of contradiction*; through the medium of which most of the other evidences of Christianity present themselves to the minds of the generality; who could not possibly examine in detail, for themselves, any great part (no one could the whole) of the proofs of each of the historical facts on which our religion rests; but whose confidence rests, and justly rests, on the conviction, that if there were any flaw in the evidence, it would be detected and proclaimed. Force, accordingly, together with fraud, the two great engines for the support of the Papal dominion, have almost annihilated sincere belief in Christianity among the educated classes, throughout a great portion of Europe."‡

In conclusion, I submit to the candid consideration of Evangelical Christians—of those who, if the name they bear is correctly employed,

* Ductor Dubitantium, B. III., Ch. IV., Rule xxiii., § 8, 10.

† Whiston's Memoirs of the Life of Dr Samuel Clarke, p. 52.

‡ Essays on the Errors of Romanism, &c., 4th ed., p. 155. See also Note B. at p. 187 of the same volume; the Archbishop's Charge on the Claims of Truth and Unity, delivered to the Clergy of Dublin, &c., in July 1852, p. 22; and his Introductory Lessons on Christian Evidences, Lesson III.—In his *Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith*, &c., 2d ed., p. 177, he observes:—"To

desire to take their religious opinions from the Gospel alone—the following passages in Baxter's "Right Method for a Settled Peace of Conscience and Spiritual Comfort :"—

"The Lord Jesus in wisdom and tender mercy establisheth a law of grace, and rule of life, pure and perfect, but simple and plain ; laying the condition of man's salvation more in the honesty of the believing heart, than in the strength of wit, and subtlety of a knowing head. He comprised the truths which were of necessity to salvation in a narrow room : so that the Christian faith was a matter of great plainness and simplicity. As long as Christians were such and held to this, the Gospel rode in triumph through the world, and an omnipotency of the Spirit accompanied it, bearing down all before it.

assign to Bodies of fallible men that kind of authority which properly belongs to God and his inspired messengers—*this, while bearing some outward resemblance to humble Christian piety, is, in reality, of the nature of idolatry.*" Again, in *Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion*, 6th ed., p. 221, he makes the true and important remark, that "it is only when our energies are roused, and our faculties exercised, and our attention kept awake, by an ardent pursuit of truth, and anxious watchfulness against error,—when, in short, we feel ourselves to be doing something towards acquiring, or retaining, or improving our knowledge,—*it is then only that that knowledge makes the requisite practical impression on the heart and on the conduct.*"

"While Protestants," says Milton, "to avoid the due labour of understanding their own religion, are content to lodge it in the breast, or rather in the books, of a clergyman, and to take it thence, by scraps and mammocks, as he dispenses it in his Sunday's dole, *they will be always learning and never knowing ; always infants ; always either his vassals, as lay papists are to their priests ; or at odds with him, as reformed principles give them some light to be not wholly conformable.*"—(*On the Likeliest Means to remove Hirelings out of the Church*, in his *Prose Works*, vol. iii., p. 41.)

Chandler says :—" 'Tis my hearty prayer to the Father of lights, and the God of truth, that all human authority in matters of faith may come to a full end ; and that every one who hath reason to direct him, and a soul to save, may be his own judge in every thing that concerns his eternal welfare, without any prevailing regard to the dictates of fallible men, or fear of their peevish impotent censures."—(Chandler's *Dedication to his Sermons preached in Old Jewry*, p. 11.)

Let us next hear the pregnant words of Locke :—"If the religion of any church become therefore true and saving, because the head of that sect, the prelates and priests, and those of that tribe, do all of them, with all their might, extol and praise it—what religion can ever be accounted erroneous, false, and destructive?"—(*Letter concerning Toleration*, p. 47.)

Lastly, I transcribe a passage from Tillotson's 117th Sermon, on "Proving Jesus to be the Messiah," where he is speaking of the rejection of Christ by the high priests, scribes, and Pharisees among the Jews :—"There are very few so honest and sincere, as to be content for truth's sake to part with their reputation and authority, and become less in the esteem of men than they were before. Few are so impartial as to quit those things which they have once laid great weight upon, and kept a great stir about ; because this is to acknowledge that they were in an error, and mistaken in their zeal, which few have the ingenuity to own, though it be never so plain to others ; and therefore it is no wonder that our Saviour's doctrine met with so much resistance, from those who were so much concerned in point of honour and reputation to make head against it. And this account our Saviour himself gives us of their infidelity, John v. 44. 'How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour which cometh of God only?' And chap. xii. 43. 'For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.'"—(*Works*, ed. 1759, vol. vi., p. 12.)

Princes and sceptres stooped ; subtle philosophy was nonplust ; and all useful sciences came down, and acknowledged themselves servants, and took their places, and were well contented to attend the pleasure of Christ. . . .

“ The serpent envying this happiness of the church, hath no way to undo us, but by drawing us from our Christian simplicity. By the occasion of heretics’ quarrel and errors, the serpent steps in, and will needs be a spirit of zeal in the church ; and he will so overdo against heretics, that he persuades them they must enlarge their creed, and add this clause against one, and that against another, and all was but for the perfecting and preserving of the Christian faith. And so he brings it to be a matter of so much wit to be a Christian, (as Erasmus complains,) that ordinary heads were not able to reach it. He had got them with a religious, zealous cruelty to their own and others’ souls, to lay all their salvation, and the peace of the church, upon some unsearchable mysteries about the Trinity, which God either never revealed, or never clearly revealed, or never laid so great a stress upon : yet he persuades them that there was Scripture-proof enough for these ; only the Scripture spoke it but in the premises, or in darker terms, and they must but gather into their creed the consequences, and put it into plainer expressions, which heretics might not so easily corrupt, pervert, or evade. *Was not this reverent zeal ? And was not the devil seemingly now a Christian of the most judicious and forward sort ? . . .*

“ This plot the serpent hath found so successful, that he hath followed it on to this day. He hath made it the great engine to get Rome on his side, and to make them the great dividers of Christ’s church. He made the pope and the council of Trent believe, that when they had owned the ancient creed of the church, they must put in as many and more additional articles of their own, and anathematise all gainsayers ; and these additions must be the peculiar mark of their church as Romish ; and then all that are not of that church, that is, that own not those superadded points, are not of the true church of Christ, if they must be judges. *Yea, among ourselves hath the devil used successfully this plot ! What confession of the purest church hath not some more than is in Scripture ?* The most modest must mend the phrase and speak plainer, and somewhat of their own in it, not excepting our own most reformed confession.

“ Yea, and where modesty restrains men from putting all such inventions and explications in their creed, *the devil persuades men, that they being the judgments of godly, reverend divines (no doubt to be revered, valued, and heard), it is almost as much as if it were in the creed,* and therefore whoever dissenteth must be noted with a black coal, and you must disgrace him, and avoid communion with him as an heretic. Hence lately is your union, communion, and the church’s peace, laid upon certain unsearchable mysteries about predestination, the order and objects of God’s decrees, the manner of the Spirit’s most secret operations on the soul, the nature of the will’s essential liberty, and its power of self-determining ; the Divine concurrence, determination or predestination of man’s, and all other creatures’ actions, &c. ; that he is scarcely to be accounted a fit member for our fraternal communion that differs from us herein. Had it not been for this one plot, the

Christian faith had been kept pure ; religion had been one ; the church had been one ; and the hearts of Christians had been more one than they are. *Had not the devil turned orthodox, he had not made so many true Christians heretics, as Epiphanius and Austin have enrolled in the black list.* Had not the enemy of truth and peace got into the chair, and made so pathetic an oration as to inflame the minds of the lovers of truth to be over-zealous for it, and to do too much, we might have had truth and peace to this day. Yea, still, *if he see any man of experience and moderation stand up to reduce men to the ancient simplicity, he presently seems the most zealous for Christ,* and tells the inexperienced leaders of the flocks, that it is in favour of some heresy that such a man speaks ; he is plotting a carnal syncretism, and attempting the reconcilment of Christ and Belial ; he is tainted with Popery, or Socinianism, or Arminianism, or Calvinism, or whatsoever may make him odious with those he speaks to. O what the devil hath got by over-doing !”*

NOTE H, Page 8.

What are “the Feelings and Opinions of the Scottish People” in regard to Sunday Trains ?

The true reason for abandoning the conveyance of passengers along with the letters, newspapers, &c., which the Sunday trains carry on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway, has before been mentioned (see p. 361) ; but, as we saw, the motive *assigned* by the Board was their wish to conform to “the law and custom of the country,” instead of “arrogating to themselves the right to violate the feelings and opinions of the Scottish people” (p. 362.) The law, custom, feelings, and opinions of the Scottish people on the subject have already, perhaps, been made sufficiently manifest (pp. 353, 362, 389) ; but the proceedings of a meeting of the proprietors of the Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway, held on 10th March 1853, afford so correct and unequivocal an expression of the prevalent “feelings and opinions” of the inhabitants of the East of Scotland, and probably of most other districts of the country, that the insertion of a report of them here will hardly be deemed superfluous.

Shortly before the meeting referred to, the little band of Sabbatarian shareholders of whom Mr Heriot is the head, secretly applied for and obtained proxies from such of their copartners as held their opinions, and, by depositing these with the secretary when it was too late for others to counteract the stratagem, endeavoured to secure a glorious triumph to “the people of God.” Through the vigilance of the editor of the *Scotsman*, however, an alarm was sounded in time to summon the shareholders at large to their posts. “That this is an attempt,” he observed, “by what is, in the worst possible sense, a *stolen* march, to place a small and indeed alien and fictitious minority of the Company above a large and proved majority, is beyond denial. Not only have the shareholders personally decided in favour of two

* Baxter’s Works, vol. ix., pp. 192–196.

trains at every meeting, *but, on the occasion when proxies were placed in the hands of the whole proprietors, in order that the real mind of the company might be ascertained, the votes stood—For trains, 268 persons; 16,037 shares; 1389 votes: Against trains, 90 persons; 2457 shares; 227 votes.* A miserable minority, very few of whom acquired their shares for any other purpose than giving annoyance on this question, now seek to set aside this and all the subsequent corroborative decisions, by stealing in every vote they can muster when it is impracticable for the great body of the proprietors to give any vote at all. A more arrogant, and unfair, and insulting attempt was never made in a public company.”

The following report of the proceedings of the meeting is extracted from the same ably conducted paper, of 12th March:—

“The transpiring of the fact that the party opposed to the running of a morning and evening Sunday train had unexpectedly lodged *proxies* at a period too late to allow of any being lodged on the other side, had evidently created considerable excitement among the shareholders resident in or near Edinburgh; and, when the question came on, the room was very much crowded.

“Mr F. L. M. Heriot had given notice of the following motion:— ‘That the officials of the company should not be worked on the Sabbath-day, but shall be permitted to have that day as a day of rest.’ He now said that, instead of that motion, he would beg to move— ‘That the present system of running railway trains on the Sabbath being wrong in principle and injurious in its effects, besides involving an unnecessary labour on the servants of the company—that on and after 1st April, the running of ordinary passenger-trains on the Sabbath be discontinued.’ (Loud cries of ‘That’s a new motion.’)

“The Chairman said that to him it seemed not competent for Mr Heriot to fall from the motion of which he had given notice, and to make another.

“Mr Heriot then moved the motion in the form of which notice had been given.

“Mr Brown of Ashley said he begged to call the attention of the meeting to the fact that it was beyond their power to entertain any such motion.

“Mr J. R. Stodart, W.S., rising to order, would like first to know if the motion was seconded.

“After some hesitation, Mr Paterson of Castle-Huntly seconded the motion.

“Mr Brown of Ashley then proceeded to contend that the motion was incompetent under the acts constituting the company, which bound them to make a certain number of passages across the ferry each Sunday. The motion, which directed that no work should be done by any servant of the company, was therefore clearly *ultra vires*—they might pass it, but they could not act on it. He moved that it be not entertained. (Cheers.)

“Colonel Graham of Mossknowe seconded the amendment, but would have preferred a direct negative. The more he saw, the more strongly he felt, both on the general question, and on the mode in which certain parties had handled it in that company. (Applause.) He thought the melancholy statistics of drunkenness furnished from

Edinburgh and Glasgow—(loud cries of ‘Hear, hear!’)—were enough to warn them of the evil they would still further inflict on the working classes by shutting them out from all opportunity of going forth to the country and partaking of its enjoyments. (Applause.) Edinburgh was bad enough already, and worse than London—would they make it as bad as Glasgow? (Cheers, and laughter.) Then were they never to have done with the question in that company? They had decided it somewhere about twenty times, and he thought that the gentlemen moving in the matter might take that as their answer. (Cheers.)

“The Rev. Peter Chalmers, Dunfermline, said that, in his opinion, both the original and the amended motion were quite competent. (A laugh.) One reason adduced for running trains had been, that the means of transit formerly in use on Sunday had been removed from the road. Now, he had collected means to prove—(here the reverend gentleman pulled some documents from his pocket, amid a suppressed groan from the meeting)—that at all the chief stations—at Burntisland, at Kirkcaldy, even at Markinch—persons having occasion to travel on Sundays could procure gigs and horses. (Laughter, and cries of ‘Sabbath desecration!’ amid which the reverend gentleman sat down.)

“Professor Dick said he would like to know the reverend gentleman’s authority for working horses on Sunday, when he was so horrified at the idea of running an engine. (Cheers.) The whole conduct of these people was absurd and hypocritical, and he would cry fie upon them. (Laughter, and applause.)

“Mr Hugh Bruce, advocate, was of opinion that, according to common sense, it was not competent to put a motion that it was beyond the powers of the company to carry into effect.

“Mr Balfour, jun., W.S., brought forward Mr Heriot’s amended motion as an ‘amendment.’

“Mr Brown contended that the amendment was a substantive motion.

“Mr Scot Skirving would like to know if there could be an amendment when there was no motion?

“Mr Hugh Bruce was clearly of opinion that the only motion of which notice had been given being one which they could not entertain, it was not competent to proceed, under the name of an amendment, with another motion of which no notice had been given.

“Mr Eagle Henderson would like in a single sentence to state his experience as to the general question of Sunday trains—an experience acquired during an early, long, and extensive connection with the management of Scotch railways. When they put Sunday trains on the Edinburgh and Glasgow line, they were at once made use of by a certain proportion of the population; and it was found that the numbers did not increase—that is, there were a certain number of people who required these trains, but the custom of Sunday travelling did not spread. (Applause.) The same had been his experience on the North British line—the trains were steadily used to a moderate extent, and by most respectable classes of people—(cheers)—but there was no spreading among the population of unnecessary Sunday travelling. He was strongly of opinion that the Scottish public required

a certain amount of the means of transit on Sundays, that they did not abuse it, that they were entitled to have it, and that they would have it. (Loud cheers.)

“The Chairman said that he did not hold it competent to put Mr Heriot’s amended motion as an amendment when the only motion of which notice had been given had been found incompetent. (Loud applause.)

“A shareholder, apparently a country clergyman, commenced a series of observations, but was interrupted by cries that there was no motion before the meeting.

“Mr J. R. Stodart moved that the thanks of the meeting be given to the chairman for his conduct in the chair. (Loud cheers.)

“Dean of Guild Blackadder, who had remained near the door till this time, here advanced into the room, exclaiming, amidst laughter and uproar, that he wished things to be done in an orderly way. He thought Mr Heriot’s motion quite competent.

“Mr Tullis—It just comes to this—that the motion declares that none of the officials of the company shall do any work—now, could they make the passages across the ferry without employing some of their officials?

“A shareholder seconded the vote of thanks to the chairman, which was carried by acclamation, and the meeting dispersed.”

It is undeniable that the newspaper press of Scotland (the best criterion of public opinion), is, with the exception of a very few journals which are either the organs of ecclesiastical parties, or noted for their blind adherence to antiquated laws and institutions, have either advocated Sunday trains to the extent indicated by Mr Eagle Henderson in his speech, or shewn, by their silence “for fear of the Jews,” that they are not hostile. It is well known, moreover, that in 1842, when the question was greatly agitated, every Town-Council of importance with one exception, and in particular the whole of those connected with the district through which the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway runs (namely Edinburgh, Leith, Glasgow, Falkirk, and Linlithgow), after a public discussion, passed strong resolutions, representing to the Proprietors the right which the public have to a reasonable amount of accommodation, and remonstrating against the idea of closing what is virtually the public highway, for a whole day in the week. Another unequivocal piece of evidence of the state of public opinion, at least in Edinburgh, is afforded by the fact, that in the autumn of 1851, when an ubiquitous and pertinacious Sabbatarian speaker at Scottish railway meetings (who, however, is an able man of business, and had done good service to the public in other capacities), was a candidate for a seat at the Town-Council board, his Committee found the opposition so strong on account of his hostility to Sunday trains, that they thought it necessary to issue a circular assuring the electors that the promotion of his favourite measures was no part of his design. The announcement was in the following terms: “The Committee have been informed that Mr Blackadder’s opponents have endeavoured to create an impression that he was anxious to obtain a seat in the Town-Council for the purpose of agitating and urging the views he entertains, and has frequently expressed elsewhere, on the subject of Sabbath-observance. The Committee beg to assure

the Ward that it is with no such object that Mr Blackadder has been proposed, or has consented to stand.”* After a hard struggle, in which he was vigorously supported by a political party which lay under an obligation to him and his fellow-churchmen, he succeeded in gaining his election by a majority of only 239 votes to 234, and went into the Council, pledged to abstain from there troubling the public with the Sabbath question. From these and other symptoms of public opinion—against which the famous Sabbatarian “memorials” are but as dust in the balance, and some of which have been recorded by the Sabbath Alliance itself, whose *empty exchequer* is the most significant fact of all—it may be confidently inferred that the feeling which prevailed at the meeting above mentioned, is that of a vast majority of those inhabitants of Scotland whose opinions are usually thought worthy of being listened to with respect, upon matters where education, independence, good sense, and knowledge of mankind are indispensable to give weight to men’s professions and advocacy. Surely these indications, and the facts adduced in Notes F. and G., may satisfy the Directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company that by adding a few passenger-carriages to the trains which ply on Sundays, they would incur no risk of being “accused of attempting to tyrannize over that public whose customs and feelings they are desirous to respect.” On the contrary, they will escape the reproach under which they lie at present, of tyrannically and unfairly withholding from the public what is due to them, and truckling to a party which has always been, and now is more than ever, regarded by the bulk of the community as far less remarkable for wisdom than for good intentions.

NOTE I., page 9.

The Grounds of Legislation for Sunday Trains.

On 12th February 1849, Mr Joseph Locke, M.P., put the question in the House of Commons to Mr Labouchere, then President of the Board of Trade, whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce any measure providing for the limited use of railways on Sundays in Scotland. The reply was, that they had no present intention of proposing to compel railway companies to carry passengers on Sundays. “At the same time,” added Mr Labouchere, “I desire not to preclude myself from bringing forward such a measure, if I shall see cause to do so, on a future occasion. The railway commissioners have expressed their opinion on the subject by refusing to sanction bye-laws passed by several companies which shut up their railways on Sundays; and I cannot too strongly state my own individual opinion, that it is perfectly possible to have railways open on Sundays, in such a manner, and under such limitations, as shall avoid the unnecessary desecration of the day, and be entirely compatible at once with the convenience of the public, and the proper observance of the Sunday. I hope, therefore, that those railway companies in Scotland, which have taken another view of the subject, will be induced to allow,

* *Scotsman*, 20th Oct. 1851, p. 4.

under proper limitations and restrictions, the running of trains on Sunday; but I am reluctant, on a point involving conscientious and religious scruples, except in case of extreme necessity, to propose any compulsory measure on the subject."

On 3d April Mr Loeke moved for leave to introduce a bill to secure to the public, on Sundays, a limited and reasonable use of the railways which conveyed passengers on the other days of the week. He remarked, that the petitions which had been presented and the agitation which had taken place on this subject were quite beside the object of his simple bill, which had been very much misconceived in Scotland. Its object merely was to secure that the railways should carry passengers in those trains which were used for the conveyance of the mails and post letter-bags on the Sundays. There was nothing in it inimical to a proper feeling of respect for the Sabbath as a day of rest, or which was inconsistent with Christian principles. (Hear, hear.) He hoped, therefore, that the House would allow the bill to be introduced and printed, that its merits, whatever they were, might be made known to the public during the recess.

In the course of the debate which followed, Mr Labouchere again expressed his opinion that the running of Sunday trains is consistent with the due observance of the day, but added that he still doubted the expediency or propriety of sanctioning a compulsory measure in opposition to the opinion which he knew was entertained by large classes of the community of Scotland. "He was inclined to think that they would be more likely to accomplish the object of seeing passengers conveyed, as now in England, on Sundays, under such restrictions and regulations as would preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath, which was so honourable a characteristic of Scotland, by leaving the matter to the discretion and good sense of the railway companies of Scotland generally, than by attempting to force a measure upon an unwilling people."

Mr S. Wortley said he intended to vote against the bill, which would interfere both with private property and with the rights of conscience.

Sir George Grey protested against this observation of the honourable and learned gentleman, lest it might be supposed that that House had abdicated any of its undoubted authority to control railway companies, upon the regulations of which the convenience of the public so much depended. It was not a question now as to the running of trains on Sunday in Scotland. All the companies in Scotland were compellable to run the mail trains on Sunday; but, undoubtedly, there was a strong feeling among the Scottish people against the carriage of passengers, and he was not prepared to legislate against that feeling.

Mr E. Ellice objected to the coercive character of the bill. He thought that if the matter was left to the companies, such arrangements would be made as would obviate all cause of complaint. The company on whose line a noble lady had been prevented from travelling, had since rescinded their regulation.

Mr Aglionby supported the bill. It was said to be an interference with private property and the rights of conscience. But railways had

been formed by a most glaring infringement of private property ; and the interference with the rights of conscience was on the part of the railway proprietors, and those Scotchmen who refused to allow Sunday trains.

Sir F. Buxton objected to the bill on the ground that it was an interference with the sincere and conscientious religious feeling of a considerable portion of the Scotch people.

Mr H. Drummond said that as one carriage was at present allowed to travel on Sundays for the conveyance of the mails, it seemed as if the point of conscience with Scotchmen lay between one carriage and two. (Laughter.)

Leave was given, by a majority of 58 to 20, to bring in the bill.

On Mr Wortley's plea of interference with the rights of conscience, the editor of the *Scotsman* justly remarked in his paper of 7th April, that in all that the legislature *actually requires* of railway companies, and in all that Mr Locke's bill proposed to require of them, "it leaves every *individual* in the nation to his own free-will ; it only says that all who *choose* to become railway proprietors shall exercise their powers as such under the conditions with which the Legislature created and delegated these powers. It does not say to individuals, ' You, Andrew Agnew, or you, James Blackadder, shall carry mail-bags, or shall carry men on Sundays ;' but it says to companies, ' We have created you—we have given you the custody of the highway, under limits and on conditions actual and reserved—and, among other things, we command you to carry the mails on Sunday, as was done on the highway which we have enabled you to supersede ;' and it plainly *can*, and, as we think, *ought* to add, ' and we command you to carry passengers along with the mail bags, as was also done on the former species of highway, which, through the powers we have given you, you have driven out of use.' Persons who conscientiously object to perform such conditions need not place themselves under them. The Legislature compels railway companies to do certain things, but it does not compel any individual to become a member of railway companies.

"It will be next maintained, however, that to compel railway companies to do things to which a number of persons conscientiously object, is an interference with the rights of conscience, inasmuch as it prevents such persons becoming railway proprietors. For reasons we shall mention presently, conscience cannot rationally be said to be concerned in the matter at all ; but, supposing it were, Mr Wortley knows very well that legislation would be impotent and a farce were it to do only what nobody conscientiously objected to. The point to be considered is, whether any given proposal is for the general and public benefit, and if so, it is adopted, although particular classes or persons object. Why, Mr Wortley is one of those who even think it for the general benefit that persons should be forced to contribute to the spread and maintenance of religious doctrines which they disown and oppose ; and he leaves them no choice in the matter—to escape the burden a man must fly the country. And yet Mr Wortley, who sees no hardship to conscience in this, exclaims that it would be an intolerable 'interference with conscience' to prevent persons who have voluntarily in-

vested themselves with certain powers which they were quite at liberty to leave alone, using these powers to shut the highway against the public!

“This reply, however, is applicable only to those who hold similiar opinions to Mr Wortley’s as to the support of religion—viz., that men of all other religions are bound to pay for the maintenance of *his*; but we are quite willing to deal with the question on grounds comprehending Voluntaries also. What is it that members of railway companies are asked to do? Nobody dreams of compelling or even asking any Agnewite to travel on a railway on a Sunday (they prefer careering through the streets in cabs and carriages), or of preventing them using every possible *persuasion* against others so offending, or even driving the offenders out of their own congregations. All that is asked is, that they shall not *forcibly prevent* others from such a limited and reasonable use of the highway as suits their necessities and agrees with their conscience. Now, there has not been a more pernicious bit of nonsense generated of late years than that which afflicts some unthinking Voluntaries, to the effect that the rights of conscience are so illimitable, that a man whose conscience so induces him should be freely allowed to coerce or violate the conscience of his neighbour. We combated this pestiferous idea strenuously when certain landowners ‘conscientiously’ refused to grant sites for Free churches; and all that was said in favour of the Free-Church claims in that case is applicable with tenfold force, with much more besides, *against* what we may fairly call the Free-Church claims in the case of railways. The persecuted then are the persecutors now. We should like to see an attempt to shew that, while the compelling of landlords to sell their private property for the purposes of a sect they conscientiously abhorred, is a protection of conscience, the compelling of railway proprietors to give reasonable and limited accommodation to the public on the highway of which they are custodiers, is a violation of conscience. It may be asked in addition, why we never hear anything about conscience in the parallel cases of ferry trustees, who are bound to run a certain number of boats every Sunday, and of road trustees, who are not only bound to keep open the gates on Sundays at all hours of the day or night, but are actually compelled to grant exemptions to Sunday horses and carriages not applicable to ordinary days.

“But can Mr Wortley, or any other man of common sense, that knows the circumstances, believe that anything that it would not be ridiculous to call conscience, is really involved in this bill? The men who have knowingly, voluntarily, and ‘conscientiously’ come under an obligation to carry mail-bags, cannot very decently complain that they are made to carry men and women at the same time. Mr Henry Drummond, well known as a man of active and zealous piety, very properly sneered at such consciences—‘the point of conscience with Scotchmen,’ said he, ‘lies between one carriage and two.’ Is that a conscience worthy of respect, or even belief, which runs with a train carrying bags of invoices and of wicked newspapers, and leaves behind (as we have a recent and high instance) daughters imploring to be allowed to reach their parents’ death-beds? When persons systematically drive with their man-servants and their cattle through the streets every Sabbath-day, for mere purposes of luxury and display,

and forbid a locomotive to run for the necessities of the public, is all that proof that they have a tender conscience, or only that the human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked?

“The substance of the remarks of Mr Labouchere and Sir George Grey was, that they think the railway companies who do not run trains act very foolishly and unjustly, but that they are very reluctant at present to force a compulsory measure on ‘an unwilling people.’ If by this phrase, Mr Labouchere means that any but a very small minority of the Scotch people are opposed to a limited and reasonable use of railways on Sundays, he has been grossly and dishonestly misled.

* We could scarcely ask a better proof of this than the list of petitions against the measure which we print elsewhere. With the exception of a very few Dissenting congregations, the petitioners are just the sort of people who have opposed everything which the public voice of Scotland has carried, or helped to carry, during the last thirty years. When Scotland speaks, it is not through kirk-sessions and deacons’ courts. Does Mr Labouchere know, that when the Edinburgh and Glasgow line was shut three years ago, out of which all this wretched hubbub has arisen, every Town-Council along the line, or within many miles of it, strenuously objected and protested? And does he know that that line was shut only by a fraudulent intrigue, after it had been open six years, and nobody saying a word against it? And does he know that at the meetings of all the other companies where the question has been mooted, the running of trains has been carried by overwhelming majorities of the *Scotch* shareholders?

“And here comes what is really the most intolerable portion of the Agnewite manœuvres. If the question had been left even to the Scotch shareholders in railway companies, their decision might have been submitted to, because they might be held as forming a representation of the public; and, at all events, as their decision would have been for opening, the question need never have gone farther. But the matter is *not* left to the *bona fide* shareholders, but is constantly in danger of being taken out of their hands by persons who purchase solely for this purpose, and subdivide their shares so as to obtain the greatest number of votes. We have before printed ‘private and confidential’ circulars, revealing the mode in which this system is carried on, and we have open proof both of its existence and extent in speeches in the Free Assembly announcing that ‘whole Presbyteries have become shareholders solely with a view to stopping the trains.’ Now, is it to be tolerated that the control of the highways of the country is thus to be within the reach of any clique of persons who may band themselves together for the purpose of forcing on the public certain theological observances which they do not even obey in their own proper persons? Is the highway to be open this month and shut the next—the line of communication to be broken off at this point and continued at a point twenty miles further on—according to the caprice of any set of men who choose to combine and misuse the powers the law at present gives? These powers are powers delegated by the legislature, and we are entitled to look to the legislature for protection against their abuse.”

On 23d April, Mr Locke moved the second reading of his bill,

and supported it by an able speech in which he exposed the inconsistency of the Sabbatarians, who extensively employed their own carriages and public cabs on Sundays without necessity; and shewed that nearly as many persons were employed in connexion with the mail-trains on Sundays as would be needed were passengers also conveyed.

Mr Hume gave the motion his hearty support, and denied most emphatically that railway establishments are, as had been asserted, private property, and ought to be allowed to be shut or opened just as the directors pleased. Parliament, by its enactments, had taken away the means that formerly existed for communication between different parts of the country; and what were the ordinary words always used in the preambles and applications for railway bills? Here was a specimen:—"Whereas additional means of communication with Edinburgh, Glasgow, and adjacent parts have become necessary, and therefore it is prayed that the House do grant powers and facilities" for that purpose. No one would have sanctioned these bills and their preambles if it had been thought that, instead of "providing additional facilities" for the public, what really was sought was the power of taking away all facilities of public communication at the arbitrary decree of any body of directors.

The Lord Advocate (Rutherford) said that while he did not think the railway proprietors in Scotland had always exercised the soundest judgment in regard to this question, he did not conceive that the grievance had risen to such a point as would justify the House in interfering in a matter of such great delicacy, not merely because it would lead to a very indefinite kind of interference, but especially because it would trench upon feelings of a deep and serious character, with which Parliament, if aware of their extent, would not lightly interfere.

The bill was thrown out by the small majority of 131 to 122. Mr Labouchere voted against it, on the ground (which was that of nearly all the other members who did so) that the admitted evil had not yet reached such a magnitude as to make it worth while to resort to a legislative remedy offensive to the feelings of "a large body of the Scottish people." "Now, in the first place"—to quote the *Scotsman* once more—"this is but a poor plea for the denial of justice, even if the statement of the real feelings of a large body of persons being involved were correct. The same plea, if worth anything, should have prevented Mr Labouchere and others emancipating the Catholics, or passing the Educational Minutes of Council, and should prevent them seeking to emancipate the Jews—for all those measures, and many such others, more deeply offend the religious feelings of larger bodies of the people than the compelling of public companies to carry men and women along with the mail-bags. In the second place, the statement as to any large body of the Scotch people feeling 'outraged' by such a bill as Mr Locke's, is nothing but a great mistake. Mr Labouchere seems to admit himself a little impressed by the number of adverse petitions with an aggregate of 30,000 signatures (including 10,000 from Edinburgh, gained by an importunate canvass from door to door, without distinction of age or sex). But Mr Labou-

there must know that a little organisation and labour will get up as great a demonstration as this on any side of any question. Through the instrumentality of associations, a number of petitions more imposing in every respect than those of the Scotch Alliers are presented every year on a variety of subjects, such as the abolition of capital punishments, war, and the malt-tax—to all which Mr Labouchere pays no attention whatever. Or, to take a more strictly parallel case, the Irish established clergy, acting through the same species of machinery as the Scotch Alliers, send up every now and then hundreds upon hundreds of petitions against the Irish system of national education, while nobody ever thinks of petitioning on the other side; and yet neither Mr Labouchere nor any one else ever proposes to abandon the Irish educational system as ‘offensive to the religious feelings of a large body of the people,’ and, in fact, the value of such petitions is so well understood that they or their subject is scarcely ever heard of within the walls of Parliament. The cut-and-dry petitions got up by the Scotch Alliers are just of the same quality and value; while, unlike the Irish case, they are counteracted by real and legitimate expressions of opinion on the other side. Before the introduction of Mr Locke’s bill this opinion had been expressed through the *bona fide* Scotch railway proprietors, through the Town-Councils, and through the press—to say nothing of such indirect proofs to the same effect as the admitted bankruptcy of the ‘Sabbath Alliance’ in cash and character. Since then, although the fallacy about ‘compulsion’ might have been expected to frighten off some of the weaker brethren, as in the case of the Sites’ Bill, the very reverse has been the case. All our contemporaries of the press have remained unshaken, unseduced, unterrified—two or three that were neutral have within the last month declared on the right side; and at this moment, beyond the half-dozen papers the special organs and utensils of Free Church ecclesiastics, and our two Conservative prints in Edinburgh (of whom the less said the better), the Alliers have, so far as we can find, only one supporter in the newspaper press of Scotland, that one happening to be a very by-word of stolidity and inefficiency among the country papers. Of the Town-Councils, we need say nothing after the firm tone taken by the Councils of the towns principally concerned. The members of these bodies are surely better representatives of the Scotch public than deacons’ courts, or the other bodies to whom Mr Labouchere is so deferential; being in fact more directly elected by, and more fully and frequently responsible to, the public than any other body of men, by no means excepting members of Parliament.”

As the expedient of leaving the matter to “the discretion and good sense” of the directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company has utterly failed, and as the quality of the agitators and petitioners against the Sunday trains is now better understood in Parliament than before, it is probable that the bill, if again introduced, would pass into a law. I agree with those who dislike such legislation in general; but as the directors continue obstinate, to them and their abettors be ascribed whatever incidental evils may be occasioned by the enactment. Those evils, however, if any, are not likely to be very serious.

If my position be well-founded, that the Edinburgh and Glasgow

Railway Company *engaged* to give the public the means of travelling on Sundays, the following remark of Selden is precisely applicable to them :—“Pretending religion and the law of God is to set all things loose :—when a man has no mind to do something he ought to do by his contract with man, then he gets a text, and interprets it as he pleases, and so thinks to get loose.”* What would this shrewd and witty jurist have said of men voluntarily bringing themselves under the obligation of a contract, *for the very purpose* of being in a position where they would be forced by their “consciences” to break it, and also to compel others, in spite of *their* consciences, to do the same?

NOTE J, page 9.

Proposed Standing Committee for the License of Sunday Travellers.

It was publicly proposed some years ago by a Sabbatarian speaker, that, to provide for cases of necessary or charitable travelling on Sundays, there should be established a standing Committee of saints for Scotland, before whom should be laid the facts of each case as it occurred, and who should have the power of deciding whether a railway train should be permitted to run for the accommodation of the applicant!

Burns, whose independent spirit could not imagine a sadder spectacle on earth than that of a man going about *begging for work*, would have found a still more melancholy object of contemplation had he conceived the case of a free British subject laying an humble petition before a Committee of saints, for leave to visit a dying wife or sister on a Sunday.

Had this uncompromising foe of sanctimonious pride been still amongst us, with what hearty glee would he have discharged his shafts of ridicule at the Puritans of the present time!

NOTE K, page 10.

The Causes and Cure of Drunkenness.

“Intemperance in the use of spirituous liquors,” says George Combe, in the *Phrenological Journal*, “is one of the vices that degrade and render miserable a large portion of the operative classes in Britain: The object is to provide a remedy for the evil; and the first step towards this end is to discover its cause. The causes of intemperance, then, may be one or other of the following:

“1. An innate love of intoxicating liquor, in the form of a strong craving appetite.

“It is well known that particular individuals are infected with this craving, apparently as a positive disease. We have known well-educated females, in the middle and higher ranks, the victims of it, whom no principles of religion, morality, or shame, could restrain from

* Selden’s Table Talk, art. RELIGION.—See *ante*, Note B.

the immoderate use of ardent spirits. It is certain that, among men, there are numerous and unhappy examples of a similar disposition. It is also a matter of common remark, that occasionally, in the same family, some individuals are the victims of this vice, while others are entirely free from it, although all have been trained from infancy in the same manner.

“ According to Phrenology, this passion for intoxicating beverage may arise from the inordinate development of a particular portion of the brain, inherited from birth, and occasioned by the excessive activity of the corresponding organ in the parents of the individual.

“ If this be a fact, it is certainly an important and fundamental one; because, if the tendency be innate and strong, and arise from the state of the organism, all remedies which are likely to be effectual, must act upon the source of the evil. No sensible person would expect to remove a troublesome noise from the ears of another, caused by over-excitement of the auditory apparatus, by merely reading lectures to the patient against the folly and evil consequences of hearing imaginary sounds. Yet, where the tendency to drunkenness takes its rise from a particular state of the organism, moral and religious admonitions, unaccompanied by physical applications, bear very much the same relation to its cause, as a discourse does to over-excitement of the ear. According to phrenological principles, the drunkard, from this cause, is a patient, who requires physical as well as moral treatment. He must, by all means, be restrained from using intoxicating liquors, and subjected to a long course of physical training, to change the habits of his body, before any success in his reformation can be expected; and it is not to be confidently relied on, even when all these measures have been applied. Repentance, promises of amendment, and other merely mental impressions, have as little abiding influence on such men, as the waves raised by the wind have on the surface of a lake; they may be strong while they last, but their endurance is brief, and their effects truly transitory.

“ If this principle be founded in nature, we consider it of paramount importance to be known as a law instituted by the Creator, that men may be aware not only of the treatment which their vices demand from their guardians, but of the influence on their offspring of their own irregular habits.

“ 2. A second cause of intemperance may be extreme deficiency of food, either in quantity or quality, accompanied by hard labour. The effect of bodily labour, carried beyond the physical strength of the individual, is to exhaust the nervous system of its energy and vivacity. When toil ceases, there is a painful feeling of want and depression, attended with a craving for stimulus, which is nearly intolerable. Looking to the cause of the evil for our direction in applying a remedy to it, we would prescribe wholesome food in sufficient quantity, cleanliness, fresh air, and labour proportioned to the strength. The application of these sanative means, however, requires time, money, and a condition of mind in which the whole conduct is subjected to moral restraint. The individuals subject to this form of temptation, however, are in general sunk deep in helpless poverty, and, at the end of each day's labour, are scarcely able to provide means for purchasing the plainest food, in the most moderate quantity. Beset by the feeling

of depression, and that heart-gnawing craving for stimulus and reaction which we have described, they fly, as if impelled by an irresistible infatuation, to the gin-shop, and enjoy a moment's felicity, which we verily believe to be to them inexpressibly delicious, although most transitory, and soon to be followed by suffering still more severe than that which it for the moment relieves. If this be a correct description of the cause of intemperance in a large proportion of the operative classes, it points out the means necessary to be adopted for its removal. The physical condition of the sufferers must be improved as the first step; and one means of doing so would be to teach them the real cause of the passion which impels them to drink, and to aid them in overcoming it. They should be assisted and encouraged to obtain more nutritive and abundant food, and to cleanse their persons, apparel, and habitations; and some grateful mental stimulus should be administered at the hours when the periodical indulgence is generally resorted to. While the physical causes are left untouched, sermons, and essays, and lectures against intemperance, will produce only a temporary and limited effect. They will operate only on those individuals whose moral and intellectual powers yet retain so much strength as to be capable of maintaining an ardent struggle against the craving impulses of their physical nature; a portion small in number in such circumstances of destitution.

“3. A third cause of intemperance may be a flow of exuberant spirits, arising from strong health and worldly prosperity, in persons of little education, knowledge, and mental cultivation. Our intemperate ancestors, of the higher and middle classes, were men of this description. They felt within themselves a great capacity of enjoyment; but, having few ideas, and no intellectual pursuits, they were grievously at a loss to discover in what direction they could obtain substantial pleasure. The bottle presented itself to their imaginations as the readiest and most obvious fountain of joy. They drank deep, and expanded their souls in rude and boisterous merriment. We recollect of striking examples of this species of intemperance being exhibited by the farmers of the fertile districts of Scotland, about the years 1800-1-2-3, and upwards. They had entered life expecting to maintain a hard struggle with fortune, and to obtain only daily bread in an humble way, without the least prospect of becoming rich. By the progress of the war, and the restriction of cash payments by the Bank of England, prices of agricultural produce rose to an unprecedented height, and wealth poured into their coffers in copious streams, absolutely without an effort. There is no rivalry in trade among farmers, for the prices of their commodities are affected by causes so extensive, that individuals appear to have no influence over them. They are, therefore, either all in prosperity, or all in adversity, at the same time, and cordially sympathize with each other in every turn of fortune's wheel. At the time above mentioned, the whole tenantry of large tracts of country, whose minds were so moderately cultivated, that they only knew how to read, and scarcely to write, found themselves becoming gentlemen all at once; and they gave indulgence to their mirth in frequent and long-protracted festivities. We knew of a ‘house-heating’ among them which was supported for two nights and a day, the guests eating, drinking, and sleeping by turns, the

shutters being closed, the candles burning, and the feast going forward all the time without intermission. Drunkenness in these classes has almost entirely ceased; and why? Because the men have become more intelligent, and the women more refined, in consequence of a far higher education, procured by the very wealth which at first, when ill applied, deteriorated their habits.

“Looking to this class of causes of intemperance, therefore, we would recommend for its removal the institution of seminaries for instructing in useful and entertaining knowledge every class of the community.

“We have entered into these details to shew, that, though intemperance is a single vice, it may have a variety of causes; and that measures calculated to remove it ought to bear distinct reference to each of its causes, and differ according as the cause differs; and also that it is indispensable to keep in view the influence of the organism on the mind, as otherwise many of our efforts will prove abortive.

“It appears to us, that an excellent foundation for improving the moral and physical condition of the people, would be laid by instructing them in the constitution of their own minds and bodies, and shewing them how the organs and faculties which they possess are all capable of becoming fountains of enjoyment if rightly employed, and of intense misery if abused. If the Creator has bestowed a rational nature on man, He must have intended him to improve his condition by studies such as these; and we shall never cease to appeal to the conscience and understanding of the teachers of mankind, until they shall condescend to do justice at once to the Author of the universe and to their fellow men, by giving due attention to the order of creation. If any of them shall read these pages, we ask him how he can answer to his own mind for neglecting truths at once so obvious and so practically useful.”*

Since these observations were published (about twenty years ago), the current of public opinion has been running more and more in the channels there indicated.

Writers on insanity now universally recognise the morbid craving for intoxicating liquor as a form of madness, to which the name of *dipsomania* has been given; and the establishment of proper asylums for the reception and treatment of this class of patients has been proposed. Whether any such has yet been actually set on foot I am not aware; but the system could hardly work well unless a law were enacted, empowering the seclusion of dipsomaniacs by relations or dependents whom they were dragging to ruin with themselves.

With respect to the *second* cause, some cheering progress has been made towards improvement, but much still remains to be done. By the abolition of the Corn-laws, and the adoption of the free-trade policy, the labouring classes of Great Britain have been enabled to obtain more abundant and more nutritious food than formerly; improved dwelling-houses, and the use of public baths and wash-houses, have enabled many, as they will yet enable more, to preserve their health, strength, and cheerfulness, by breathing fresh air and keeping themselves clean and comfortable; while, if the amount of labour undergone is still so excessive as too frequently to produce that feeling of

* Phrenological Journal, vol. viii., pp. 606-609.

exhaustion and mental depression which tempts the weary wretch to fly for relief to the bottle, still it is likely that the disposition to shorten the hours of labour will spread and increase, and that moreover there will by-and-by be placed within reach of the workman when his daily task is finished, a sufficiency of those means of bodily and mental refreshment which leave no sting behind, and of which he will be more and more able and ready to avail himself, the better he shall be trained and educated in his childhood.

The knowledge of human nature is not yet so generally taught as it might very usefully be to the young. In only a few schools is instruction given concerning the structure and functions of the human body, its influence on the mental powers, and how both mind and body are affected, and our happiness increased or diminished, by air, light, cleanliness, different kinds of food, and habits of life. A branch of education so exceedingly important as this, is however rapidly coming into vogue,* and will soon take as high a place in our schemes of education as already it has done in Massachusetts.†

The comparative sobriety of the Parisians‡ arises, no doubt, from a variety of causes. In the first place, the French belong chiefly to the Celtic race, which by nature is less disposed to indulge in the pleasures of eating and drinking than the Teutonic race. Secondly, it may be that the French operatives do not in general work so long or so hard as ours, and thus have less need of, as they have less desire for, the exhilaration which spirituous liquors are the ready means of producing. Thirdly, the climate being warmer and more constant than ours, they probably work in better-ventilated workshops, and more frequently in the open air, than our artisans do; thus keeping their blood in a better state for carrying on the functions of the body, and for sustaining cheerfulness by a more healthy stimulus to the brain

* See *ante*, pp. 73, 272-275.

† The General Laws relating to Public Instruction, passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1850, contain a chapter (229), entitled "An Act requiring Physiology and Hygiene to be taught in the public schools." It is as follows:—

"SECT. 1. Physiology and Hygiene shall hereafter be taught in all the Public Schools of this Commonwealth, in all cases in which the School Committee shall deem it expedient.

"SECT. 2. All School Teachers shall hereafter be examined in their knowledge of the Elementary Principles of Physiology and Hygiene, and their ability to give instructions in the same.

"SECT. 3. This Act shall take effect on and after the first day of October One thousand eight hundred and fifty-one. (*April 24, 1850.*)"

A Declaration of the great importance of a knowledge of Physiology and Hygiene to all classes of the community, and a strong recommendation that these should be taught in common schools as an elementary branch of education, has been subscribed and published by fifty or sixty physicians and surgeons (including the most eminent) in London; and they add their testimony that the efficacy of their prescriptions and professional efforts for the welfare of their patients is greatly impeded by the general deficiency of such knowledge.

‡ See *ante*, p. 215.—I say "the comparative sobriety;" for even in Paris there is a good deal of drunkenness among the working-classes, as may be seen from a work entitled, "Des Classes Dangereuses de la Population dans les Grandes Villes, et des Moyens de les rendre meilleures. Par H. A. Fréquier, Chef de Bureau à la Préfecture de la Seine (Bruxelles, 1840)," p. 429 *et seq.* The remedies suggested by this writer appear to me to be superficial and impracticable.

than ill-oxygenated blood can supply. The climate, moreover, being less irritating to the nervous system than ours, the Frenchman is less subject to those uneasy feelings which depend on meteorological causes, and which tempt to indulgence in stimulants for relief. Fourthly, the French are naturally a more lively, cheerful, and talkative people than we, and hence more capable of enjoying each other's company without the aid of stimulants.

We learn from science the important fact, that the heat of the body results from chemical action, which demands a larger and larger supply of calorific material, the greater the abstraction of heat in consequence of cold weather or inadequate clothing and housing.* And as we instinctively crave a supply of those kinds of aliment which the body is in need of,† it happens that when too little heat-sustaining material is consumed in the form of solid food, the desire for alcoholic liquors (which contain it in abundance) is apt to become ungovernable. To this cause is attributed the passion of the North American Indians for spirits; the animal food on which they chiefly live containing too little fat (a substance rich in carbon and hydrogen) to supply the needs of the system. A French writer on the effects of a vegetable diet, remarks that “the inhabitants of warm countries are generally sober—as the Hindoos, Chinese, New Hollanders, Arabs, Spaniards, &c.; whilst others in opposite circumstances have a craving for highly animalized food and for spirituous liquors: such are the English, the Germans, the Russians (especially in Lapland), the Samoyedes, and the people of Kamtschatka.”‡ Accordingly Dr Carpenter, in his prize-essay “On the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors, in Health and Disease,” distinguishes as a class of cases in which “the use of a small amount of alcoholic liquors seems beneficial, or at any rate justifiable,” that in which “there is a deficiency of the proper sustenance, so that the alcohol supplies the means of maintaining the animal heat, for which the animal tissues would otherwise be attacked.”—(Sect. 182.)§ Dr Combe observes—“Continued and severe exertion, whether of body or of mind, often exhausts the system so much as to render the temporary use of wine, and even of spirits, not only harmless, but positively beneficial; but in these cases they should be considered as medicines, and care should be taken not to carry the stimulus too far. That, in

* See Dr Combe's *Physiology applied to Health and Education*, art. HEAT in the Index; also his treatise on *Digestion and Diet*, chap. x.

† *Phrenological Journal*, vol. x., p. 261.

‡ *De l'Influence Comparative du Régime Végétal et du Régime Animal sur le Physique et le Moral de l'Homme*, par Emile Marchand, M.D., p. 87. Paris, 1849.

§ In what has been said, the reader will see a reason why we are inclined to eat more in cold weather than in hot. During some diseases, also, a craving for those particular kinds of food which will be most beneficial to the system is remarkably experienced. Thus a feverish patient loathes animal food, which would be highly prejudicial to him; and the sufferer from scurvy longs for those acid vegetables which are the most effectual means of cure. So also, physicians are in the habit of taking the patient's wishes as in some degree a safe criterion whether wine ought to be administered. In the lower animals the instinctive power of selecting proper food and medicine attains a far higher degree of perfection than in man, whom Nature, after endowing him with *reason*, has left to discover by means of it many of the paths to happiness.

some circumstances, stimulus is really required, is shown by the ease with which the system bears its effects. I have known a delicate lady, during recovery from fever, take to the extent of a bottle of Madeira in twenty-four hours, without producing the least undue excitement of either the mind or the pulse, but rather the contrary—it soothed the mind and reduced the pulse; and this I take to be in all circumstances the true test of the propriety of using wine or spirits.*

It is mentioned by Dr Collins in his Sketch of the Life of the late Dr Joseph Clarke of Dublin, that in his early years the Doctor was a tall slightly-made man, and, from taking too little nourishment, under the mistaken idea that abstinence was good for him, hardly equal to the fatigue of his profession. “On one occasion of debility, he sent for Dr Harvey (a well-known physician in Dublin), to advise what he should do; and after detailing to him his inability for so much work, &c., &c., Dr Harvey asked him abruptly ‘What do you eat for dinner? and what do you take after it?’ ‘Indeed,’ replied the Doctor (whose appetite was but indifferent), ‘I sometimes take a little mutton-broth, with a little boiled mutton, and at other times chicken. I take very little wine, or occasionally a little drop of spirit in water.’ Dr Harvey replied, ‘Phew—nonsense, man; take your roast mutton and roast beef, with a pint of good port wine daily, and you will be as stout a man as any in the kingdom.’ ‘I took his advice,’ said the Doctor; ‘I speedily improved, and enjoyed excellent health afterwards.’”—(Pp. 80, 81.) This case seems favourable to the opinion of those who advocate the moderate use of exhilarating drinks as a means designed by Providence, and accordingly employed in all ages by mankind, for promoting cheerfulness and good fellowship, and increasing the strength of mind and body. This invigorating effect they seem to produce not merely by their own nutritive and stimulant qualities, but also, in some circumstances, by adding to the power of the digestive and assimilative organs to convert the solid food into blood.†

Lastly, the means of recreation are far more accessible to the French than to us, whose need is so much greater; and until we supply this want like rational beings, drunkenness, I fear, will continue to prevail, even although every public-house in the kingdom be closed.‡

* On Digestion and Diet, 9th ed., p. 175.

† See the very instructive case of the prisoners at Nîmes, *ib.*, p. 164.

‡ With respect to the importance of recreation and intellectual culture as preventives of vicious indulgence, see Dr Channing’s Address on Temperance, in his Works, p. 370 *et seq.* (Belfast ed.); Mr Frederic Hill’s treatise on Crime, its Amount, Causes, and Remedies, Chap. IV.; Dr Combe on Physiology applied to Health, &c., pp. 261-2, 287, and on Digestion and Diet, p. 176; Sir John Herschel’s Address to the Subscribers to the Windsor and Eton Library; Mr J. M. Capes’ preface to his work entitled “A Sunday in London;” Mr Helps’ Companions of my Solitude, pp. 27, 220; Mr Marjoribanks’ “Mistaken Views regarding the Observance of the Sabbath;” the New Monthly Magazine, vol. xxxviii., p. 210; and Note L in the present volume.

Mental anxiety being a copious source of intemperance, gloomy views of the character of God and the destiny of man (*ante*, pp. 71, 230-238), have a direct and powerful tendency to foster this destructive vice, and even to excite *insanity* in persons of a feeble and impressible nervous system. I am told that the num-

Sublatâ causâ, tollitur effectus; this is the principle which must guide us, if our efforts for sobriety are to succeed. As long as a craving for

ber of patients sent to the Lunatic Asylum of a great puritanical city in the west of Scotland has been found to be usually greater immediately after the services attending the celebration of the Lord's Supper than at other times; and it appears from a paper on the Statistics of Mental Diseases in Denmark, by Dr J. R. Hübertz of Copenhagen, lately read to the Statistical Society of London, that in Denmark "insanity is far more prevalent among Calvinists, in proportion to their number, than any other persuasion."—(*Proceedings of the Statistical Society*, Feb. 21, 1853, in the *Athenæum*.) Dr Combe, in his work on Mental Derangement, after relating several cases of religious insanity, proceeds to say—"Much alarm has unnecessarily been expressed by seriously disposed persons at the assertion that madness can ever be caused by indulgence of devotional or religious feelings, to whatever excess these may be carried; and no little obloquy has been thrown upon those observers whose experience has compelled them to state the fact. Even in France, where religion is certainly not cultivated with extreme ardour, public opinion on this subject was so strong some years ago, that Pinel, then the head physician of the largest Asylum in Europe, and the best acquainted with the facts and history of insanity, was so much afraid to brave its censures, that while, on the one hand, he expressed his conviction that 'nothing is more common in hospitals than cases of madness produced by too exalted devotion, by scruples carried to a destructive excess, or by religious terrors;' he yet, on the other hand, felt constrained by public opinion to 'suppress his daily notes, containing a mass of details of this kind' which had come under his observation, and to take his examples 'elsewhere than in his own country,' or, in other words, from the works of English authors! Surely religion rests on too firm a foundation to require such a sacrifice of truth and candour to supposed expediency and to bigotry. And if, in any circumstances, the exercise of our devotional feelings even *seems* to bring on the loss of reason, it is surely not only allowable, but a *positive duty*, for the professional writer under whose cognisance these things occur, to investigate accurately, and state fearlessly, the conditions under which he has seen them happen, that others may be preserved in time from a similar affliction. . . . If, then, it be TRUE that excessive activity and exclusive indulgence of the devotional feelings may induce cerebral disease and madness, particularly in susceptible subjects,—instead of attempting to conceal the fact from a false fear of bringing religion into danger, we ought by every means to make it generally known, that the evil may be avoided by those who might otherwise inadvertently fall into it. When fairly examined, indeed, the danger is seen to arise solely from an *abuse* of religion, and the best safeguard is found to consist in a right understanding of its principles, and submission to its precepts. For if the best Christian be he who in meekness, humility, and sincerity, places his trust in God, and seeks to fulfil all his commandments; then he who exhausts his soul in devotion and in prayer, and, at the same time, finds no leisure or no inclination for attending to the active duties of his station, and who, so far from arriving at happiness or peace of mind here, becomes every day the further estranged from them, and finds himself at last involved in disease and despair, cannot be held as a follower of Christ, but must rather be regarded as the follower of a phantom assuming the aspect of religion. When insanity, then, attacks the latter, it is obviously not religion that is its cause; it is only the abuse of certain feelings, the regulated activity of which is essential to the right exercise of religion; and against which abuse, a sense of true religion would, in fact, have been the most powerful protection. And the great benefit to be derived from knowing this is, that whenever we shall meet with such a blind or misdirected excess of our best feelings in a constitutionally nervous or hereditarily predisposed subject, instead of encouraging its exuberance, as at present we often do, by yielding it our respect and admiration, and even attempting to imitate its intensity, we shall use every effort to temper the excess, to inculcate sounder views, and to point out the inseparable connexion which the Creator has established, between the true dictates of religion and the practical duties of life which it is part of his purpose in

ardent spirits exists, ardent spirits will be manufactured and consumed. Let us then avail ourselves of all the means which science puts within

sending us here that we should fulfil,—a connexion, it may not be superfluous to add, which it is impossible to pourtray or enforce more strongly than is done in the lives both of the Founder of Christianity and of his disciples. Nowhere is it more clearly shewn that true religion is intended, in this life, to be the guide of conduct, and that it is not sent to supersede the active discharge of our social duties, or to encourage us to pour out our minds in mere emanations of feeling, without, at the same time, giving positive evidence, in the amelioration of our lives, that we have been really benefited by the contemplations in which we have been indulging.

“When, again, the mind is perplexed by conflicting doctrines, the brain frequently becomes disordered, so far as to produce insanity; and this is easily intelligible. The interests of religion exceed all others in weight and magnitude; and it is therefore quite natural that a mind deeply imbued with a sense of their importance, and, at the same time, distracted by opposing tenets, and without a director in whom it can confide, should, in the attempt to reach the truth, and to reconcile all contradictions, become excited to an intense degree, giving rise to a corresponding overaction in its corporeal organ, which shall ultimately precipitate the latter into disease. The merchant or speculator will often pass sleepless nights and restless days, looking forward to impending loss; and we consider it nothing unusual to learn that a man of keen passion has, in such circumstances, become deranged from excess of cerebral excitement. But to any one who duly appreciates religious truth, the merchant's loss or the speculator's disappointment will seem as nothing compared to its value. If, then, the lesser cause may so readily induce cerebral disease, is it not still more likely that the greater and more important may also upset health in a susceptible subject?

“Dr Burrows has some excellent observations on this subject, when advocating the same views. ‘I do not recollect,’ he says, ‘an instance of insanity implying a religious source in any person stedfast to his ancient opinions. Wherever it was suspected to emanate from such a cause, it was clearly to be traced to circumstances which had diverted the lunatic from the authority of primary principles, to the adoption of new tenets, which he had not comprehended, and therefore had misapplied. *The maniacal action appeared always to originate during the conflict in deciding between opposite doctrines, and the exacerbation arrived before conviction was determined.*’ (P. 39.) I concur essentially in these remarks, and think that they deserve much attention; but there is a period of life at which a less degree of doubt than is implied in Dr Burrows' observation frequently gives rise, not indeed to regular mania, or melancholia, but to a state resembling one or other in every respect, except that it is more obviously connected with constitutional disorder, is more tractable, and less liable to recur. I allude chiefly to females, particularly to those of a nervous, delicate temperament, about, and soon after, the age of puberty. I have seen some instances of religious despondency, approaching to despair, in such persons, characterised by great activity of the devotional feelings, and caused, not by doubts of the truth, but by fears for their eternal welfare. At that time of life, reason begins to come more vigorously into play, but the mind is as yet in possession of no fixed principles of judgment or of action; every situation is new, and the strongest feeling is apt to assume a predominance of which reason disapproves, and hence internal dissatisfaction and melancholy; with this disposition, a strong expression accidentally dropped, harsh denunciations expressed with vehemence and warmth, and eloquent appeals to particular feelings, especially if reiterated, will often sink deep into the mind, gain strength by being brooded over in solitude, produce a change of habits and of temper, and at last plunge the patient into melancholy. Cases of this kind are, I believe, more common than is generally supposed, for, as enough of self-control still remains to fit the patient for the ordinary intercourse of society, and the measures resorted to for the amendment of the general health almost always restore the mental vigour, they are comparatively little noticed out of the families in which

our reach, for *diminishing the desire* of an excess of intoxicating liquors. To act otherwise is to put a plaster on the sore, instead of trying to remove the deep-seated causes of which it is a symptom.

NOTE L, page 10.

Recreation a Sabbath-duty.

The necessity of seasons of rest to man has been considered in the previous pages;* and something was said of the refreshing and improving occupations which might at such intervals be usefully engaged in, as restoratives of bodily strength on the one hand, and antidotes to excessive or monotonous intellectual exertion on the other.† At the close of Note E, I ventured to express the opinion, that not merely the refreshment of *repose* (which was the only thing expressly provided to the Jews by the Fourth Commandment), but the additional refreshment which rural excursions, manly exercises, the fine arts, and all other means of innocent *recreation*, ought to be sought upon our weekly day of leisure, by those who during the six preceding days have been “labouring and doing all their work.”

As before observed, the *sole* purpose of the Fourth Commandment was the refreshment of labouring men and animals among the Jews and their proselytes.‡ Cessation from work being in all cases indispensable for the end in view, while the other means of refreshment *could not* be invariable, this cessation alone was prescribed; and the purpose of the institution having been clearly made known by the lawgiver, he left each Israelite to determine for himself how the day might be most suitably employed for the invigoration of the exhausted frame.

Considered etymologically, the word RECREATION includes *rest* within its signification, as well as those *active employments* which reanimate the body or mind. As Fuller observes in speaking of the mind,

they occur.”—(*Observations on Mental Derangement*, by Andrew Combe, M.D., pp. 188-9, 190-4.)

I have the more readily extracted these remarks on a very important subject, closely akin to the one treated of in the text, because Dr Combe's volume from which they are taken has for many years been out of print. See farther, on Religious Insanity, the *Journal of Psychological Medicine*, vol. i., p. 245-6.

Southey, in No. xiii. of *Espriella's Letters*, observes that, without doubt, the May-day sports of the English were once connected with religion; and adds—“It is the peculiar character of the true religion to sanctify what is innocent, and make even merriment meritorious: and it is as peculiarly the character of Calvinism to divest piety of all cheerfulness, and cheerfulness of all piety, as if they could not co-exist; and to introduce a graceless and joyless system of manners suitable to a faith which makes the heresy of Manes appear reasonable. He admitted that the Evil Principle was weaker than the Good one, but in the mythology of *Calvin* there is no good one to be found.” See what the same writer says of the *Book of Sports*, *ante*, p. 321.

“A merry heart,” says Solomon, “doth good like a medicine; but a broken spirit drieth the bones.”—(*Prov.* xvii. 22.)

* See pp. 225-6, 229-242; and the whole of Note E, pp. 267-279.

† *Ibid.*, and pp. 369, 371-2.

‡ *Ante*, pp. 226, 187-8.

“Recreation is a *second creation*, when weariness hath almost annihilated one’s spirits. It is the breathing of the soul, which otherwise would be stifled with continual business.”* “Sleep itself,” he accordingly adds, “is a recreation;” and even to sit or lie down may in strictness be similarly described. But the word is now universally used to signify refreshing *active* employment alone.

Although the stricter Puritans speak of all recreations as “vain and idle,”† this preposterous way of viewing them is by no means universal among those of the Evangelical school. Thus Mr Wilberforce, who was a man of sense, scholarship, and refinement, as well as of piety, says, “There can be no dispute concerning the true end of recreations. *They are intended*” (by the Deity, of course) “to refresh our exhausted bodily or mental powers, and to restore us with renewed vigour to the more serious occupations of life.”‡ They include, it is plain, a great deal more than what are usually understood by “amusements.” Every agreeable and exciting occupation, reasonably indulged in during intervals of toil, is recreation; the aim of which is said by another eminent writer to be, “to divert the mind or body from labours, by attending to something that pleases and gives no trouble.”§ “It is in recreations,” says he, “as in meat and drink,—which are then good, when they are necessary and useful to the purposes of our nature and employment. Sleep is necessary, and so long it is good; but a man must not therefore spend the best of his time in sleep, but that time that is allowed to it, and without which he cannot well do his business. The limits of these things are not so strait as necessity, nor yet so large as humour or desire; but as a man may drink to quench his thirst, and he may yet drink more to refresh his sorrow, and to alleviate his spirits, and to ease his grief, provided that he turn not his liberty into a snare,—so he may in his recreation and his sports.

Cito rumpes arcum, semper si tensum habueris;
At si laxaris, cum voles, erit utilis.
Sic lusus animo debent aliquando dari,
Ad cogitandum melior ut redeat tibi.—*Phœdrus*, liii.

[Soon is th’ elastic vigour spent
Of stoutest bow that’s ne’er unbent;
But, loosen’d oft, its strength remains,
Nor disappoints the archer’s pains.
Ev’n so thy soul, with toil opprest,
At times indulge with playful rest:
So shall a livelier wit be thine,
And cheerfulness thy labour join.]

Within this bound he must keep, that he lose none of his business for his sport;—that he make his other time more useful;—that this be the less principal;—that it be taken as physic, or as wine at most:—and the minutes and little points of this measure are no otherwise to be weighed and considered, but that we take those proportions which

* The Holy State, B. III., ch. xiii.

† See Dr Muir’s speech, quoted *ante*, p. 216.

‡ Practical View of Christianity, ch. vii.

§ Taylor’s Ductor Dubitantium, B. IV., ch. i., § 33.

ourselves think we need to so good purposes, or which we are advised to by a wise guide.”*

“ From due refreshment life, health, reason, joy ;
From wild excess pain, grief, distraction, death ;
Heaven’s justice this proclaims, and that her love.”†

“ If thy life be sedentary,” says Fuller, “ exercise thy body ; ‡ if stirring and active, recreate thy mind. But take heed of cozening thy mind, in setting it to do a double task, under pretence of giving it a play-day, as in the labyrinth of chess, and other tedious and studious games.” Recreations distasteful to some dispositions, he adds, “ relish best to others ;” and “ as soon may the same meat please all palates, as the same sport suit with all dispositions.”

If, however, one set of muscles be almost exclusively employed in a man’s ordinary calling, the exercise of those which are left comparatively idle is a beneficial kind of recreation : thus, walking and leaping are refreshments to the tailor or the shoemaker—as sitting is to the

* Taylor’s *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. iv., ch. i., § 32.

† Young’s *Night Thoughts*, B. viii., v. 666–9.

‡ “ The great men among the ancients,” says Locke, “ understood how to reconcile manual labour with the affairs of state ; and thought it no lessening to their dignity to make the one the recreation to the other.”

In 1829 a “ Manual Labour Academy” was established at Germantown, near Philadelphia, with the excellent object of combining intellectual cultivation with useful bodily labour, so as to secure good health as an indispensable basis for extensive moral and intellectual improvement. An account of it is given in Woodbridge’s *American Annals of Education*, No. I., quoted by Dr Combe in an article on the principles of education, in the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. vii., p. 174. Whether it still exists and flourishes, I do not know ; but its success in 1830 was encouraging. “ The usual branches of study in classical schools,” says a Report quoted in the *Annals*, “ are pursued, with the addition of the study of the Bible. The hours of recreation are not hours of waste, and idleness, and immorality. They are employed in useful bodily labour ; such as will exercise their skill, make them dexterous, establish their health and strength, enable each to defray his own expenses, and fit him for the vicissitudes of life ; particularly so, if they be destined for our new settlements as Christian missionaries. . . . Thus far they have been employed in carpenter work, gardening, farming,” &c. ; and with the best results. From this union of systematic bodily labour for three or four hours every day with the usual academic studies, many comforts have arisen. The pupils not only defray the expenses of their own education, and turn out better fitted for the business of life, but “ their blood flows rich, and warm, and equable ; and the east winds cannot penetrate them. Their thirst demands water, their hunger plain food, their limbs rejoice in muscular efforts, and their minds in truth. Sleep rests them, and their waking eyes behold the light of another cheerful, useful day,” &c. The religious enthusiast and the ardent student regard the time employed in such labour as misspent. But, as is very justly observed in the Report, the great characters of the sacred writings followed useful occupations, and were not like the pale and feeble devotees of the present day. “ The demureness, sickliness, gloom, and eccentricities of modern Christianity did not belong to them. These are the effects of a diseased body on the mind. The schools of the prophets contained men of muscular exertion. We find them felling trees, preparing beams, carrying them to a distance, and erecting their own college edifices. The disciples were occupied, after the resurrection of their Master, in corporal labour. Paul, the pupil of Gamaliel, by birth and education high, is found at Corinth employed at *manual labour*.”

These principles are admirably reduced to practice in the “ Training College” at Chester, described in the *Chester Guide*, p. 38.

ploughman or the dancing-master. And in the case of *mental* labour, those parts of the brain which it leaves unemployed may with advantage be brought into action at leisure hours. The principle of the thing has been very well stated as follows:—"No human faculty, whether mental or physical, can continue in uninterrupted activity, and at the same time continue in health. Monotony of employment is proverbially disagreeable; and it is so, because it calls into activity always the same faculties. When this is the case, the faculties employed, after a certain length of time, become exhausted, and a disinclination for further exertion arises, and gradually increases in strength, until a cessation in the performance of their functions is absolutely imperative. After a period of rest, however, these faculties regain their strength, and are fit for renewed exertion, and their exercise is now accompanied with pleasure. In addition to this, it is to be remarked, that when those powers which are specially required in a man's daily occupation become exhausted from protracted exercise, it is not necessary while they are enjoying their needful repose, that the man himself should be in a state of inactivity: other faculties, which probably have been all but dormant during his days of toil, will now crave gratification, and in affording them the gratification they demand, he will now reap a new and a rich harvest of enjoyment."*

As formerly remarked (pp. 373, 374), whatever it is needful that we should habitually do, Nature prompts us to do, by means of propensities so clamorous for satisfaction, that, although doubtless the government of them demands our constant care, all attempts to *extinguish* them must not only fail, but lead to *more* vicious and disastrous excesses than those which we are endeavouring to repress by denying ourselves reasonable gratification. Well says Horace—

"Naturam expellas furcâ; tamen usque recurret."

"Strive to expel strong Nature, 'tis in vain;
With double force she will return again."†

"To some, perhaps to many," says Dr Channing, "religion and amusement seem mutually hostile, and he who pleads for the one, may fall under suspicion of unfaithfulness to the other. But to fight against our nature, is not to serve the cause of piety or sound morals. God, who gave us our nature, who has constituted body and mind incapable of continued effort, who has implanted a strong desire for recreation after labour, who has made us for smiles much more than for tears, who has made laughter the most contagious of all sounds, whose

* The Dawn, No. viii., edited by Charles Clarke. Glasgow, August 1850. —See the subject amply elucidated in Dr Combe's *Physiology applied to Health and Education*, especially the chapters on the "Nature of the Muscular System," "Rules for Muscular Exercise," "Laws of Mental Exercise," and "Influence of the Nervous System upon the General Health." See also Sweetser's *Mental Hygiene*, Part i., ch. v.; and Field's *Life of Parr*, vol. i., p. 103.

There is an admirable "Essay concerning Recreation," by Locke, in his *Life by Lord King*, vol. ii., p. 165, ed. 1830; and he treats of the recreations of children in his *Thoughts concerning Education*, § 108.

† "The fact is, that there is nothing hopelessly impracticable in the world, unless it be to put an end to something which is based on the interests and happiness of mankind."—(*Speech of Mr Cobden at Manchester*, Dec. 4, 1850.)

Son hallowed a marriage feast by his presence and sympathy, who has sent the child, fresh from his creating hand, to develop its nature by active sports, and who has endowed both young and old with a keen susceptibility of enjoyment from wit and humour,—He, who has thus formed us, cannot have intended us for a dull, monotonous life, and cannot frown on pleasures which solace our fatigue and refresh our spirits for coming toils. It is not only possible to reconcile amusement with duty, but to make it the means of more animated exertions, more faithful attachments, more grateful piety. True religion is at once authoritative and benign. It calls us to suffer, to die, rather than to swerve a hair's breadth from what God enjoins as right and good; but it teaches us that it is right and good, in ordinary circumstances, to unite relaxation with toil, to accept God's gifts with cheerfulness, and to lighten the heart, in the intervals of exertion, by social pleasures. A religion giving dark views of God, and infusing superstitious fear of innocent enjoyment, instead of aiding sober habits, will, by making men abject and sad, impair their moral force, and prepare them for intemperance as a refuge from depression or despair."*

Wollaston says—"The humouring of such appetites as lie not under the interdiction of truth and reason, seems to be the very means by which the Author of Nature intended to sweeten the journey of life: and a man may upon the road as well muffle himself up against sunshine and blue sky, and expose himself bare to rains, and storms, and cold, as debar himself of the innocent delights of his nature for affected melancholy, want, and pain."†

As, then, excitement and enjoyment *will* and *ought to be* obtained, however sternly denied by those who have the power to prohibit or terrify men from the indulgence of their natural desires, it is the dictate of wisdom to endeavour to guide those desires into proper channels, to moderate them when violent, to stimulate them when sluggish, and thus to educe from them as large an amount of good, alloyed with as small a proportion of evil, as is compatible with the existing order of sublunary things.

It is interesting to observe how generally the most *agreeable* kinds of recreation are at the same time the most accessible, and the most improving.‡ A taste for natural history,§ for philosophy,|| litera-

* Address on Temperance, in Channing's Works, p. 374. See Dr Chalmers's Moral Philosophy, p. 297; Addison's essay on Cheerfulness, in the Spectator, No. 387; and Mrs Carter's on Superstition, in the Rambler, No. 44.

† The Religion of Nature Delineated, Sect. ix., p. 317.

‡ See a paper by Bishop Berkeley on Natural and Fantastical Pleasures, in the Guardian, No. 49; and Dr Aikin on Cheap Pleasures, in his Letters to his Son, vol. i., Letter xxvi.

§ "So many advantages with respect to health, tranquillity of mind, useful knowledge, and inexhaustible amusement, are united in the study of nature, that I should not fail most warmly to recommend it to your notice, had you not already acquired a decided taste for its pursuits. Here I can speak from my own experience; for the study of English botany caused several summers to glide away with me in more pure and active delight than almost any other single object ever afforded me. It rendered every ride and walk interesting, and converted the plodding rounds of business into excursions of pleasure. From the impression of these feelings, I have ever regarded as perfectly superfluous the pains taken by some of the friends of natural history, to shew its utility in

ture, ¶ eloquence, ** society and conversation, †† music, ‡‡ or the beauties

reference to the common purposes of life. Many of their observations, indeed, are true, and may serve to gain patrons for the study among those who measure every thing by the standard of economical value; but is it not enough to open a source of copious and cheap amusement, which tends to harmonise the mind, and elevate it to worthy conceptions of nature and its author? If I offer a man happiness at an easy rate, unalloyed by any debasing mixture, can I confer on him a greater blessing? Nothing is more favourable to enjoyment than the combination of bodily exertion and ardour of mind. This the researches of natural history afford in great perfection; and such is the immense variety of its objects, that the labours of the longest life cannot exhaust them.”—(*Aikin, loc. cit.*)

|| “How charming is divine philosophy!
Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,
But musical as is Apollo’s lute,
And a perpetual feast of nectar’d sweets,
Where no crude surfeit reigns.”—*Milton’s Comus*, v. 476–480.
“Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum
Subiecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari!”
Virg. Georg., lib. ii., v. 490–492.

See *ante*, pp. 69–72; Bacon’s treatise Of the Proficiency and Advancement of Learning, B. i., near the end; Brougham’s Discourse on the Objects, Advantages, and Pleasures of Science; Sir J. Herschel’s Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy, § 7, 11, 12; and Dr Chalmers’s Moral Philosophy, p. 291.

“No longer,” says Sir David Brewster, “does the Christian philosopher dread, as he once dreaded, an alliance with knowledge. He now draws his most impenetrable armour from the once unfathomable depths of Time and Space, and he extracts his brightest lance from the bowels of the earth. He has now no enemy but ignorance and vice; no false friend but superstition; no deceitful ally but the priest that ministers at the shrine of mammon, who swears by the gold of the temple, and by the gift upon its altar.”—(*Address to the Members of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution*, Nov. 11, 1851.)

¶ “Of all the amusements,” says Sir John Herschel, “which can possibly be imagined for a hard-working man, after his daily toil, or in its intervals, there is nothing like reading an entertaining book, supposing him to have a taste for it, and supposing him to have the book to read. It calls for no bodily exertion, of which he has had enough, or too much. It relieves his home of its dullness and sameness, which, in nine cases out of ten, is what drives him out to the ale-house, to his own ruin and his family’s. It transports him into a livelier, and gayer, and more diversified and interesting scene, and while he enjoys himself there he may forget the evils of the present moment, fully as much as if he were ever so drunk, with the great advantage of finding himself the next day with his money in his pocket, or at least laid out in real necessities and comforts for himself and his family—and without a headache. Nay, it accompanies him to his next day’s work, and if the book he has been reading be any thing above the very idlest and lightest, gives him something to think of besides the mere mechanical drudgery of his every-day occupation—something he can enjoy while absent, and look forward with pleasure to return to.

“But supposing him to have been fortunate in the choice of his book, and to have alighted upon one really good and of a good class—what a source of domestic enjoyment is laid open! What a bond of family union! He may read it aloud, or make his wife read it, or his eldest boy or girl, or pass it round from hand to hand. All have the benefit of it—all contribute to the gratification of the rest, and a feeling of common interest and pleasure is excited. Nothing unites people like companionship in intellectual enjoyment. It does more; it gives them mutual respect, and to each among them self-respect—that corner-stone of all virtue. It furnishes to each the master-key by which he may avail himself of his privilege as an intellectual being, to

of nature and art, §§ is not only an inexhaustible source of delight to

‘Enter the sacred temple of his breast,
And gaze and wander there a ravished guest;
Wander through all the glories of his mind,
Gaze upon all the treasures he shall find.’

And while thus leading him to look within his own bosom for the ultimate sources of his happiness, warns him at the same time to be cautious lest he defile and desecrate that inward and most glorious of temples.

‘I recollect an anecdote told me by a late highly respected inhabitant of Windsor as a fact which he could personally testify, having occurred in a village where he resided several years, and where he actually was at the time it took place. The blacksmith of the village had got hold of Richardson’s novel of ‘Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded,’ and used to read it aloud in the long summer evenings, seated on his anvil, and never failed to have a large and attentive audience. It is a pretty long-winded book—but their patience was fully a match for the author’s prolixity, and they fairly listened to it all. At length, when the happy turn of fortune arrived, which brings the hero and heroine together, and sets them living long and happily according to the most approved rules—the congregation were so delighted as to raise a great shout, and procuring the church keys, actually set the parish bells ringing. Now let any one say whether it is easy to estimate the amount of good done in this simple case. Not to speak of the number of hours agreeably and innocently spent—not to speak of the good fellowship and harmony promoted—here was a whole rustic population fairly won over to the side of good—charmed—and night after night spell-bound within that magic circle which genius can trace so effectually; and compelled to bow before that image of virtue and purity which (though at a great expense of words) no one knew better how to body forth with a thousand life-like touches than the author of that work.

“If I were to pray for a taste which should stand me in stead under every variety of circumstances, and be a source of happiness and cheerfulness to me through life, and a shield against its ills, however things might go amiss, and the world frown upon me, it would be a taste for reading. I speak of it, of course, only as a worldly advantage, and not in the slightest degree as superseding or derogating from the higher office and surer and stronger panoply of religious principles—but as a taste, an instrument and a mode of pleasurable gratification. Give a man this taste, and the means of gratifying it, and you can hardly fail of making a happy man, unless, indeed, you put into his hands a most perverse selection of books. You place him in contact with the best society in every period of history—with the wisest, the wittiest—with the tenderest, the bravest, and the purest characters that have adorned humanity. You make him a denizen of all nations—a cotemporary of all ages. The world has been created for him. It is hardly possible but the character should take a higher and better tone from the constant habit of associating in thought with a class of thinkers, to say the least of it, above the average of humanity. It is morally impossible but that the manners should take a tinge of good breeding and civilization from having constantly before one’s eyes the way in which the best-bred, and the best-informed men have talked and conducted themselves in their intercourse with each other. There is a gentle, but perfectly irresistible coercion in a habit of reading well directed, over the whole tenor of a man’s character and conduct, which is not the less effectual because it works insensibly, and because it is really the last thing he dreams of. It cannot, in short, be better summed up than in the words of the Latin poet—

‘Emollit mores, nec sinit esse ferus.’

It civilizes the conduct of men—and *suffers* them not to remain barbarous.’—(Address delivered to the Subscribers to the Windsor and Eton Public Library, 29th Jan. 1833; in a volume entitled “The Importance of Literature to Men of Business: a Series of Addresses delivered at various Popular Institutions.” London: 1852. Pp. 39–42.) See also Addresses by Lord Mahon at Manchester and the Duke of Argyle at Glasgow, pp. 209 and 262 of the same volume; and Dr Aikin’s Letter on Cheap Pleasures, above referred to.

its possessor, but tends to elevate him above grovelling pursuits, to

** The delight of mankind in ELOQUENCE is seen in the eagerness with which they flock to those churches where excellent oratory may be heard: and if the speaker be devout, wise, and well-informed, as well as eloquent, the improvement and refreshment which his hearers may receive from him are incalculable.

On the Stage, the effect of eloquence is greatly enhanced by the addition of scenery and action. That the drama might be made the vehicle of much higher instruction than it at present conveys, is an opinion generally held by those who have deeply studied the nature of man. What Luther thought on the subject we have seen already (*ante*, p. 122); and the grave Lord Clarendon expresses himself to a similar effect. "The mind," says he, "hath as great need of recreation and relief as the body hath, the fatigue of the spirits being as grievous as that of the limbs; and the finding wholesome and innocent supplies for both, is a good part of the business of human life; and though there are many excellent exercises which confirm the strength of the body and improve its activity, some of which in a degree recreate the mind too, yet there are very few prepared purely for the mind, and of those none so efficacious, and which administer so much pleasure and content to it, as those representations upon the stage. . . . I must still suppose," he adds, "that all due care will be taken for the castigation of all rank expressions and personal reflections, and then I am not afraid nor ashamed to pronounce, that the theatres are a provision of the most innocent mirth, wit, and instruction, that ever was or can be made for the delight of a nation. . . . All nations we are acquainted with have such natural inclinations to gazing and spectacles, that they crowd to those which are not in themselves very pleasant, as executions, and other ingrateful objects. It is better by much to comply with this natural curiosity, by providing places for them to resort to, and to be pleased in, than by inhibitions and restraints to extinguish that harmless appetite, and divert into pensiveness or murmuring."—(*Miscellaneous Works*, 2d ed., pp. 344, 345.) Addison also observes, that "the stage might be made a perpetual source of the most noble and useful entertainments, were it under proper regulations."—(*Spectator*, No. 93.) Dr John Gregory says to his daughters—"I know no entertainment that gives such pleasure to any person of sentiment or humour, as the theatre. But I am sorry to say, there are few English comedies a lady can see, without a shock to delicacy. . . . Tragedy subjects you to no such distress. Its sorrows will soften and ennoble your hearts."—(*A Father's Legacy to his Daughters*, 1788, pp. 141, 142.) And the philosophical Dr Rush remarks, that "Could the eloquence of the stage be properly directed, it is impossible to conceive the extent of its mechanical effects upon morals. The language and imagery of a Shakspeare upon moral and religious subjects, poured upon the passions and the senses, in all the beauty and variety of dramatic representation! who could resist, or describe their effects?"—(*Medical Inquiries and Observations*, by Benjamin Rush, M.D., Professor of the Institutes of Medicine, &c. in the University of Pennsylvania, vol. ii., p. 34.) To these laymen may be added the pious Bishop Newton, who expresses himself in language equally strong. He says—"The stage under proper regulations might contribute much to the reformation of mankind, and advancement of piety and virtue; and this effect it had in the times of the old Greeks and Romans, plays being then, if I may so speak, their *sermons*, and the best public lectures they had of morality and religion."—(*Works*, vol. iii., p. 577, 4to.) Paley was all his life fond of the theatre. In his youth he lived at Greenwich, and we are told that "the acting of Garrick would at any time make him walk to London without his dinner, in order that he might be there in time. . . . In after life, when he still continued peculiarly fond of even the worst theatrical exhibitions, his first care was to bustle up to what he thought the best place, which was in front of the actors, as near the stage as his situation might allow."—(*Life of Paley*, by his Son; *Works*, vol. i., p. xxxiv., ed. 1838.) "To the many excellent persons," says Henry Mackenzie, "of different ranks and persuasions, who have held, or still hold, dramatic entertainments to be of such baneful effect on the moral and religious principles of a people, I can only reply, that viewing their scruples with that indulgence and respect to which the purity of their intentions, and the respectability of their characters,

warm his piety, enlarge his sympathies, increase his knowledge, in-
 are entitled. I should, were I to allow the justice of their fears, be obliged to
 regret that a department of literary composition, which affords the amplest field
 to the talents of the writer, and the feelings of the reader of poetry, should be
 liable to the imputation of such hurtful consequences; I should remind them
 how much of life is spent, and must be spent, in amusements; and that, to draw
 the young and the gay into innocent fields of amusement, is to gain or to save
 a great deal of their time from hurtful dissipation. But, in truth, the plea on
 behalf of theatrical exhibitions rests on higher and more certain grounds; for
 it is proved by repeated experience, marked in the accurate and impartial re-
 gisters of officers of police, that in several great cities, when, from an accident,
 such exhibitions are suspended, every kind of wickedness and crime, even those
 which trench on the public safety (without taking into account any advantage
 of improvement in manners), has always increased in a very great degree.
 The truth seems to be, as our venerable colleague Dr Adam Ferguson expres-
 ses it, in a letter to me on the subject of Mr Home's dramatic writings, 'that
 theatrical compositions, like every other human production, are, in the abstract,
 not more laudable or censurable than any other species of composition, but are
 either good or bad, moral or immoral, according to the management or the effect
 of the individual tragedy or comedy we are to see represented, or to peruse.'
 —(*Account of the Life and Writings of John Home*, pp. 45–47.)

Boswell, in his *Life of Johnson*, reporting a conversation at the London Pan-
 theon in 1772, says:—"Happening to meet Sir Adam Ferguson, I presented
 him to Dr Johnson. Sir Adam expressed some apprehension that the Pantheon
 would encourage luxury. Sir (said Johnson), I am a great friend to public
 amusements; for they keep people from vice. You now (addressing himself to
 me) would have been with a wench, had you not been here.—O! I forgot you
 were married."

Lastly, here is the very sensible opinion of a writer in the *Quarterly Review*:
 —"Knowing that mankind must and will have places and periods of relaxation,
 it is far more worthy of the real Christian philanthropist to try to keep them
 sound than to get rid of them altogether, especially as it is a fact directly corro-
 borative of this argument, and one which no Utopian theory can overthrow, that
 in those towns where no public amusements have been permitted or provided,
 public morals have been at a lower ebb than in any other."—(Vol. lxxii., p. 49.)

†† "The second fruit of friendship is healthful and sovereign for the under-
 standing, as the first is for the affections; for friendship maketh indeed a fair
 day in the affections from storm and tempests, but it maketh day-light in the
 understanding, out of darkness and confusion of thoughts: neither is this to be
 understood only of faithful counsel, which a man receiveth from his friend;
 but before you come to that, certain it is, that whosoever hath his mind fraught
 with many thoughts, his wits and understanding do clarify and break up, in
 the communicating and discoursing with another; he tosseth his thoughts more
 easily; he marshalleth them more orderly; he seeth how they look when they
 are turned into words; finally, he waxeth wiser than himself; and that more
 by an hour's discourse than by a day's meditation."—(Bacon's *Essay of Friend-
 ship*.) See also a paper by Addison in the *Spectator*, No. 93.

The same delightful essayist, in his account of a Sunday spent at Sir Roger
 de Coverley's country-seat, says—"I am always very well pleased with a
 country Sunday, and think, if keeping holy the seventh day were only a human
 institution, it would be the best method that could have been thought of for the
 polishing and civilising of mankind. It is certain the country people would
 soon degenerate into a kind of savages and barbarians, were there not such fre-
 quent returns of a stated time, in which the whole village meet together with
 their best faces, and their cleanliest habits, to converse with one another upon
 indifferent subjects, hear their duties explained to them, and join together in
 adoration of the Supreme Being. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole
 week, not only as it refreshes in their minds the notions of religion, but as it
 puts both the sexes upon appearing in their most agreeable forms, and exerting
 all such qualities as are apt to give them a figure in the eye of the village. A

vigorate his understanding, improve his health and temper, refine his country fellow distinguishes himself as much in the churchyard, as a citizen does upon the 'Change, the whole parish-politics being generally discussed in that place either after sermon or before the bell rings.—(*Spectator*, No. 112.)

‡‡ MUSIC “delighteth all ages, and beseemeth all states; a thing as seasonable in grief as in joy; as decent being added unto actions of greatest weight and solemnity, as being used when men most sequester themselves from action. . . . We are at the hearing of some more inclined unto sorrow and heaviness, of some more mollified and softened in mind; one kind apter to stay and settle us, another to move and stir our affections: there is that draweth to a marvellous, grave, and sober mediocrity; there is also that carrieth as it were into ecstasies, filling the mind with a heavenly joy, and for the time, in a manner, severing it from the body: so that, although we lay altogether aside the consideration of ditty or matter, the very harmony of sounds being framed in due sort, and carried from the ear to the spiritual faculties of our souls, is, by a native puissance and efficacy, greatly available to bring to a perfect temper whatsoever is there troubled, apt as well to quicken the spirits as to allay that which is too eager, sovereign against melancholy and despair, forcible to draw forth tears of devotion, if the mind be such as can yield them, able both to move and to moderate all affections.”—(Hooker's *Eccles. Polity*, B. v., § 38.) See likewise Aristotle's *Polities*, B. v.; Bishop Atterbury in Chambers's *Hist. of English Literature*, vol. i., p. 661; Kames's *Elements of Criticism*, ch. ii., part i.; Dr John Gregory's *Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man, &c.*, pp. 111–163; and Burney's *History of Music*, vol. i., p. 173 *et seq.*

In January 1850, Dr Cumming, minister of the National Scotch Church, London, delivered an excellent lecture on “Music in its Relation to Religion,” before the Young Men's Christian Association, in Exeter Hall. “Music,” said he, “has a wonderfully soothing influence. . . . Are you, young men, worn out with the toils of the day, and anxious to drown the lingering echoes of the roar of the wheels and machinery of mammon? Learn to sing, or play on the violin, sacred anthems, airs, and tunes. Amusement or relaxation you must have. Try this; it will exert on you all the power and none of the poison of opium. Singing keeps off pulmonary disease. Disease of the lungs often arises from failing fully to inflate them. Now moderate exercise of the voice is just as necessary to the health of the whole chest, as exercise of the whole body to its healthy development. Music has also an inspiring power. If you feel dull, sleepy, and exhausted, a lively tune on the violin will rouse your nerves, and restore them to harmony. Don't have recourse to wine or alcohol; these will aggravate, not cure. Try music; it is essentially tectotal, and yet inspiriting. . . . Beautiful it is that for a two-shilling-and-sixpenny ride on the railway I can feast my sight upon green trees and sweet flowers, and enjoy bright views and beautiful landscapes; and it is no less so that for half-a-crown I can summon five hundred musicians to this platform, and order them to render to my ear what Handel conceived and Mendelssohn composed. . . . Milton says, ‘If wise men are not such, music has a great power and disposition to make them gentle;’ Chrysostom, ‘God has joined music with worship that we might with cheerfulness and readiness of mind express his praise in sacred hymns;’ Bishop Horne, ‘The heart may be weaned from everything base and mean, and elevated to everything excellent and praiseworthy, by sacred music.’ Martin Luther was deeply affected by music. One day two of Luther's friends, on visiting him, found him in deep despondency, and prostrate on the floor. They struck up one of the solemn and beautiful tunes which the Reformer loved. His melancholy fled; he rose and joined his friends, adding, ‘The devil hates good music.’ Some of Luther's tunes are from the old Latin chants, and others were composed by himself. ‘Most of the singing in the Mass,’ he said, ‘is very fine and glorious, breathing nothing but thankfulness and praise, such as *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Alleluia*, *Benedictus*, *Agnus Dei* ;’ and some of it he devoted to pure Protestant ends. Luther was a strenuous advocate for making music a part, a prominent part, in the education of the young; and in 1544, together with George Rhau, he prepared

manners, and, if not immoderately indulged, render him a more efficient hymn-book with music for schools. He was an exquisite performer on the flute; and when a poor student, his beautiful playing secured him many a night's lodging. He says, 'I have always loved music; I would not for any price lose the little musical power. It drives away the spirit of melancholy, as we see in the case of King Saul. By its aid a man forgets his anger, lust, and pride, and expels many temptations and evil thoughts. The devil cannot abide good music—he hates it. Music is a great disciplinarian; she makes people tractable and kindly disposed. Music is a lovely gift of God; it awakens and moves me so, that I preach with pleasure.' No one will assert that Luther was less abundant in labours because so fond of music. . . . I have just seen and tried a selection of music, chiefly old Latin and German, collected and politely sent me by Ernest Bunsen, son of the distinguished Prussian minister, in which are several of Luther's noble, solemn, and plaintive compositions, which are little known in this country. I do so long to see the wretched rants, that are but too popular, banished from our churches and chapels, in order that these grave and noble compositions may occupy their place; and one object of this lecture is, to lead you, if possible, to abjure and eject many of those tunes which have neither merit nor beauty, and popularise those noble compositions, the anthems, chants, and tunes of the ancient masters. . . . I have no sympathy whatever with the ultrapuritanic views of some on this side the Tweed, or the covenanting prejudices of others north of the Tweed in this matter. I do not admire the anile ignorance which hears heresy in the sounds of an organ, or sees a Papist in its patron or player."

There is one opinion, expressed by Dr Cumming, in which I am unable to agree with him: He regards the fact that most of the sounds of nature are "on the minor key—plaintive—sad," as the consequence of a primeval curse, and as "giving proof of the apostle's assertion, 'All creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' . . . Sin," says he, "has thrown creation's choir very much out of tune. We hear but occasional snatches of her grand harmonies, reminding us of the time when all was very good, and predicting the time when all will be so again. The great minstrel is the same, the instrument only is out of tune."—(P. 7.)

This seems to be a very literal way of interpreting the apostle; and surely Dr Cumming here writes as a Calvinistic theologian, and not as the man of taste which the rest of his Lecture indicates him to be. To my mind, so far is it from being true that the sounds of Nature are out of tune, that on the contrary they appear to be designedly adapted to refresh and delight the mind of man by that soothing tone which Dr Cumming distorts into a groan of misery. This is the position of Dr Chalmers, in his *Bridgewater Treatise*, chap. iv. If sin has thrown creation's *choir* out of tune, why has it not thrown creation's *livery* into discord too? Why do writers on natural theology find it possible to corroborate our belief in the benevolence of the Deity, by the fact that the prevailing colour of vegetation is one which delights and refreshes the eye, instead of fatiguing it as bright scarlet would have done? And why are not the harmonious colours and the fragrance of flowers observed to have been marred by sin? Let us hear what Cowper—the melancholy Cowper—says of this alleged discord of nature:—

"Nor rural sights alone, but rural sounds,
Exhilarate the spirit, and restore
The tone of languid Nature. Mighty winds,
That sweep the skirt of some far-spreading wood
Of ancient growth, make music not unlike
The dash of Ocean on his winding shore,
And lull the spirit while they fill the mind;
Unnumber'd branches waving in the blast,
And all their leaves fast flutt'ring, all at once.
Nor less composure waits upon the roar
Of distant floods, or on the softer voice
Of neighb'ring fountain, or of rills that slip
Through the cleft rock, and, chiming as they fall

cient worker in whatever sphere of usefulness it is his function to labour with the hands or brain.

Upon loose pebbles, lose themselves at length
 In matted grass, that with a livelier green
 Betrays the secret of their silent course.
 Nature inanimate employs sweet sounds,
 But animated nature sweeter still,
 To soothe and satisfy the human ear.
 Ten thousand warblers cheer the day, and one
 The live-long night : nor these alone, whose notes
 Nice-finger'd Art must emulate in vain,
 But cawing rooks, and kites that swim sublime
 In still repeated circles, screaming loud,
 The jay, the pie, and ev'n the boding owl,
 That hails the rising moon, have charms for me.
 Sounds inharmonious in themselves and harsh,
 Yet heard in scenes where peace for ever reigns,
 And only there, please highly for their sake."—*The Task*, B. I.

Cowper, we see, preserved a healthy appreciation of nature, in spite of the unhappy theological views which added to the bitterness of his existence. In this respect he does not fall short even of Southey, whose theology was of a much more cheerful kind, and who, in some verses written on a Sunday morning in 1795, thus beautifully expresses his feelings :—

“ Go thou and seek the House of Prayer !
 I to the woodlands wend, and there
 In lovely Nature see the God of Love.
 The swelling organ's peal
 Wakes not my soul to zeal,
 Like the wild music of the wind-swept grove.
 The gorgeous altar and the mystic vest
 Rouse not such ardour in my breast
 As where the noon-tide beam
 Flash'd from the broken stream,
 Quick vibrates on the dazzled sight ;
 Or where the cloud-suspended rain
 Sweeps in shadows o'er the plain :
 Or when reclining on the cliff's huge height
 I mark the billows burst in silver light.

Go thou and seek the House of Prayer !
 I to the woodlands shall repair,
 Feed with all Nature's charms mine eyes,
 And hear all Nature's melodies.
 The primrose bank shall there dispense
 Faint fragrance to the awaken'd sense ;
 The morning beams that life and joy impart,
 Shall with their influence warm my heart,
 And the full tear that down my cheek will steal,
 Shall speak the prayer of praise I feel !

Go thou and seek the House of Prayer !
 I to the woodlands bend my way
 And meet Religion there !
 She needs not haunt the high-arch'd dome to pray
 Where storied windows dim the doubtful day :
 With Liberty she loves to rove
 Wide o'er the heathy hill or cowslip'd dale,

According to the Shorter Catechism of the Church of Scotland,

Or seek the shelter of the embowering grove,
 Or with the streamlet wind along the vale.
 Sweet are these scenes to her ; and when the night
 Pours in the north her silver streams of light,
 She woos Reflection in the silent gloom
 And ponders on the world to come."

Southey's Poems, 1801 ; vol. i., p. 48.

It would be a great mistake to interpret this fine outpouring of sentiment as if it were a Directory of Sabbath-observance, to be followed regularly either by the writer himself or by anybody else. It is merely an expression of the feelings of a young poet on a certain beautiful Sunday morning ; and as to the general question, it indicates only that he saw nothing sinful in an occasional ramble in the country on the Lord's Day, but on the contrary experienced warm religious emotions while thus enjoying the beauties of nature.

§§ See some excellent remarks by Mr Henry Glassford Bell on the pleasures derived from NATURAL SCENERY and WORKS OF ART, in his Address to the Members of the Glasgow Athenæum, Nov. 11, 1851, included in the volume before referred to: also Grahame's Sabbath and Sabbath-Walks.

Beattie makes it our positive duty to enjoy the beauties of nature:—

"O, how canst thou renounce the boundless store
 Of charms, which Nature to her votary yields!
 The warbling woodlaid, the resounding shore,
 The pomp of groves, and garniture of fields;
 All that the genial ray of morning gilds,
 And all that echoes to the song of even,
 All that the mountain's sheltering bosom shields,
 And all the dread magnificence of heaven,
 O how canst thou renounce, and hope to be forgiven!"

The Minstrel, B. i., st. 9.

Listen also to Wordsworth:—

"Nature never did betray
 The heart that loved her; 'tis her privilege,
 Through all the years of this our life, to lead
 From joy to joy: for she can so inform
 The mind that is within us, so impress
 With quietness and beauty, and so feed
 With lofty thoughts, that neither evil tongues,
 Rash judgments, nor the sneers of selfish men,
 Nor greetings where no kindness is, nor all
 The dreary intercourse of daily life,
 Shall e'er prevail against us, or disturb
 Our cheerful faith that all which we behold
 Is full of blessings. Therefore let the moon
 Shine on thee, in thy solitary walk;
 And let the misty mountain winds be free
 To blow against thee: and, in after years,
 When these wild ecstasies shall be matured
 Into a sober pleasure, when thy mind
 Shall be a mansion for all lovely forms,
 Thy memory be as a dwelling-place
 For all sweet sounds and harmonies; oh! then,
 If solitude, or fear, or pain, or grief,
 Should be thy portion, with what healing thoughts
 Of tender joy wilt thou remember me,
 And these my exhortations!"

Lines written near Tintern Abbey.

Bacon, in his *Essay of Gardens*, says:—"God Almighty first planted a gar-

Q. 60, the Fourth Commandment requires every Christian to sanctify the Sabbath “by a holy resting all that day, even from such worldly employments *and recreations* as are lawful on other days, and spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God’s worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy.” But I have studied the Commandment for many years without finding in it a syllable that prohibits recreations; nor have I succeeded better in trying to discover in it an injunction of the public and private exercises of God’s worship, as either the whole *or any part* of the duties of the day: on the contrary, I have been forced to the conclusion, that since the very purpose of the law (as expressed in Exodus xxiii. 12) was the periodical refreshment of the labourer, and since “worldly recreations” are highly conducive to that end, the Fourth Commandment, if it enjoins aught beyond the mere rest which it *specifies*, actually enjoins *by implication* those very recreations which we are told in the name of God that it forbids! That it enjoins also, by implication, more generous *feeding* than on other days, when the labourer cannot so well digest and assimilate his food, and expends more bodily substance than he gains, the Jews themselves, as we shall presently see, have always believed; and there is equal reason to think, that if sufficient *sleep* be unattainable during the active portion of the week, a more than usual amount of it should be taken on the Sabbath. *Bathing*, also, which is a most excellent means of refreshment, may be regarded as another of the duties enjoined by implication in the Fourth Commandment.

“The Jewish lawgiver,” says an able writer, “was not an ascetic; nor was asceticism the character generally of ancient worship. Moses instituted numerous *festivals*, but not a single *fast*. Fasts were all of Rabbinical origin. In common with the eastern nations, the Jews observed a mourning festival at the autumnal equinox, which with them was held on the tenth day of the seventh month. This day was to be a Sabbath on which they were ‘to afflict’ their souls, and offer sacrifices of atonement—the only instance of the word Sabbath being connected with sorrow; and it was to be a *tenth* not a *seventh* day that was to be so observed.

“The most solemn festival of the Jews was that of the Passover, but it was called a feast, not a fast; and as a feast, or social festival, they were taught to observe it. They were told to kill and roast a lamb, the whole of which was to be eaten before the next morning; and they were to eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, not because more unpalatable than other food, but as a memorial of the

den; and, indeed, it is the purest of human pleasures; it is the greatest refreshment to the spirits of man; without which building and palaces are but gross handyworks; and a man shall ever see, that when ages grow to civility and elegance, men come to build stately, sooner than to garden finely; as if gardening were the greater perfection.”

I have repeatedly witnessed with delight the crowds of happy people who enjoy the beauties of Hampton Court gardens and works of art on Sundays. The nation is indebted to Joseph Hume for this means of recreation; and it is much to be desired that Botanic Gardens, Museums, and Galleries of Art, should be generally thrown open on Sunday afternoons for the refreshment and improvement of the people. Arrangements might easily be made for preventing undue confinement of the attendants on this account.

haste of their departure from Egypt. The general character of the Mosaic festivals may be inferred from the frequent mention of the word *rejoicing* in connection with them; and what was understood by 'rejoicing' does not admit of question. It was not confined to psalm-singing. There is nothing equivocal about the following injunctions relating to the feast of weeks, and to the case of those who, on account of distance from the Tabernacle, could not bring with them to the feast contributions in kind, but had to convert them into money. 'And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after; for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth: and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt *rejoice*, thou, and thine household.'*

"The seven days' feast of Tabernacles, the great harvest-home festival of the Jews, during which they dwelt in tents—a feast which is said to have resembled the yet more ancient Bacchanalian festivals, before they became corrupted into drunken orgies—was one of 'rejoicing' in a similar sense. Rejoicing, with the ancient Israelites, was not that 'rejoicing in spirit' to which our evangelical clergy would confine the services of religion; but was connected with solid food or other 'good things.' Wherever the altar might be erected in the promised land, it was not merely for expiatory sacrifices for sin, but—'Thou shalt offer peace-offerings, and shalt *eat* there, and *rejoice* before the Lord thy God.' †

"Many persons will be slow to believe that *holiness* was ever connected with eating and drinking and making merry; but there can be no mistake on the subject. ‡ Nehemiah gives the following precise instructions for the observance of a day of national thanksgiving; one which he required to be kept, in an especial and emphatic sense, 'holy unto the Lord:—'Go your way: eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared: for this day is *holy* unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry, for the joy of the Lord is your strength. . . . And all the people went their way to eat, and to drink, and to send portions, and *to make great mirth*, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them.' §

"That the religious festivals of the Jews were not ascetic, but joyous in a *bona fide* sense, is further demonstrated by the fact that they were occasions for *dancing*. When David brought the ark from the house of Obed-edom, the Gittite, he not only sacrificed 'oxen and fatlings,' but '*danced* before the Lord with all his might.' The ark was brought into the City of David with 'shouting and the sound of the trumpet,' the king himself setting the example of 'leaping and *dancing* before the Lord.' || This was not a new or an exceptional custom, although David's wife, Michal, appears to have been scandalized by seeing her husband so forgetful of his royal dignity as to dance 'uncovered,' girded only with 'a linen ephod;' for we find at an earlier period, that the passage of the Red Sea and overthrow of the Philistines were in like manner celebrated with singing and dancing. 'And Miriam *the prophetess*, the sister of Aaron, took a

* "Deut. xiv. 26."

† "Deut. xxvii. 7."

‡ In Note R., I shall consider the meaning of the phrase "keep holy" in the Fourth Commandment.

§ "Neh. viii. 10, 12."

|| "2 Sam. vi. 16."

timbrel in her hand ; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with *dances*. And Miriam answered them : Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously : the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.*

“Subsequently we read of the people *dancing* round the image of the golden calf, at the sight of which the anger of Moses was kindled, not because of the dancing, but of the idol which led to it ;—of Jephtha’s daughter going out to meet her father ‘with timbrels and with *dances* ;’—and of the women welcoming the return of Saul from the slaughter of the Philistines ‘with singing and *dancing*.’ The Psalmist says—‘Praise the Lord with the sound of the trumpet ; praise him with the psaltery and harp : praise him with the timbrel and *dance*.’†

“Many pious persons consider dancing at any time an irreligious custom, but this is evidently not the doctrine of the Bible. Not only is dancing nowhere condemned in the Scriptures,—while the ‘solemn meetings’ of the Rabbinical ‘New-moons and Sabbaths’ are denounced by Isaiah as an iniquity and an abomination,‡ but dancing is spoken of by Jeremiah as one of the national customs of the Jews to be restored when they return to their own land ; for ‘Then shall the virgin rejoice in the *dance*, both young men and old together ; for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow.’§

“Nothing is said in the Pentateuch of the ‘Sabbath-day’s journey,’ to which allusion is made in the New Testament ; but the Rabbinical tradition was, that a journey on the Sabbath-day was limited to a distance of 2000 cubits (about an English mile) from the walls of a city. It was held to be lawful to walk any number of miles *within* the city ; and modern Jews entertain this opinion. Of the spirit, however, of the original institution in regard to travelling there can be no doubt. The Sabbath was to be a day of rest, not of labour : whether in the city or without the city, whether in journeying or remaining in-doors, nothing was to be undertaken that would fatigue a man or beast, and that could therefore be called ‘work.’

“Putting all these facts together, we may form a very distinct notion of the nature of Sabbath-day observances among the ancient Israelites. The leading object was not religion, in our sense of the term, but relaxation. Religion, however, was no doubt so far connected with it that the people attended on the Sabbath-day, whenever they could conveniently do so, ‘the morning and evening sacrifices.’ The interval between them, we may be morally certain, was devoted, at the pleasure of individuals, to the miscellaneous objects of rational recreation :—visits to friends ; pleasant walks ; social pastime, the song, and the dance.||

“It is a fair presumption that, after a time, the day was devoted

* “Exodus xv. 20.”

† “Psalm cl. 3.”

‡ “Isaiah i. 13.”

§ “Jeremiah xxxi. 13.”

|| “Among us,” says Michaelis, “many people may, from intolerable languor, be tempted to work on Sunday, especially where refinement in doctrine represents amusements and social meetings as profanations of that day. But this could not be the case by the Mosaic regulation, according to which, the Sabbath was at the same time a day on which amusements and feasts were authorised.”—(*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. iv., p. 46.)

by many to other objects than those of either natural recreation or religious worship. Among a rude and unlettered people, without mental resources, it could not have been an easy task to prevent excesses of many kinds on a day of uninterrupted leisure, for

‘The devil finds some mischief still,
For idle hands to do.’

“Abuses of the Sabbath, carried to a great height, would lead to an effort to restrain them, on the part of the better disposed. Vice would be met with indignant rebuke by priests and elders; and in times of public calamity, when God was supposed to be manifesting his wrath against the nation, there would be the natural reaction of the human mind, of passing from one extreme to another; indulgence would give place to penance, and the Sabbath of dissipation would become the Sabbath of superstition.

“The Sabbath of superstition, the Sabbath of idolatry, the Sabbath which substitutes the idols of ceremonial observances for truthfulness of heart, the Sabbath which degrades God to the level of a human monarch—some petty stickler for etiquette; the Sabbath of modern Puritanism; was the Rabbinical Sabbath of the days of Christ and his apostles.”*

* *Sabbaths: An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions, and the Authority for a Sabbatical Observance of the Modern Sunday.* Reprinted from the *Westminster Review* for Oct. 1850. London, 1850. Pp. 30–34.

Dr M'Crie says of the ancient Jews—“So far were they from converting the day thus redeemed from ordinary toil into a season of ascetic gloom, that in point of fact, if we may judge from the practice of their descendants, they devoted it more than any other day to carnal ease and festive indulgence. The Sabbathine rules enjoin the sons of Abraham to prepare for the feast, by laying in a stock of provisions the day before; and the costlier the viands and wine were, the more honour was done to the Sabbath. On that morning, they were allowed to repose in bed longer than usual. On rising, they were to dress themselves in their best attire, and, after finishing the services of the synagogue, to prepare themselves for social pleasure. Forgetting all worldly cares, and avoiding all sadness of countenance, they were literally to “make glad and be merry;” the festal cup was to circulate freely, and the conversation to turn on topics of a light and amusing character. Marriages were frequently celebrated on Sabbath, and the evening was occasionally spent in music and dancing. Such was the ‘Judaical observance of the Sabbath,’ sanctioned by the most solemn rules of the Jewish rabbis, and practised in many places to the present day.”—(*Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, p. 194; where Buxtorf's *Synagoga Judaica*, cap. xv. is referred to.) Dr M'Crie seems to think that these “solemn rules” of the Jewish rabbis are at variance with the law of Moses; but this, it is evident, is not at all the case.

Dean Milman, in his *History of the Jews* (Murray's Family Library), speaking of the period subsequent to the Captivity, says:—“In later times, as well as a day of grateful recollection, the Sabbath became one of public instruction in the principles of the law, and of social equality among all classes. Rich and poor, young and old, master and slave, met before the gate of the city, and indulged in innocent mirth, or in the pleasures of friendly intercourse.—(Vol. i., p. 113.) He elsewhere observes—“It is most likely that from this time (the date of the completion of the canon of the Old Testament) the Jews began to establish synagogues, or places of public worship and instruction, for the use of which copies of the sacred writings were multiplied.—(Vol. ii., p. 25.)

Lightfoot, in his *Exercitations upon St Luke* (ch. xiv., v. 1), says—“The Jews' tables were generally better spread on the Sabbath-day than on any

The learned and philosophical Michaelis, than whom perhaps no man ever understood more thoroughly the *spirit* of the Mosaic Law, expresses himself in the following terms:—"That man," says he, "can have no enjoyment of life, who is obliged to toil perpetually, and in the same irksome uniformity of employment. Yet every man ought to have some enjoyment of life, were it only for a single day of recreation occasionally: wherefore else is he in the world? If he never tastes the pleasures of life, he soon dwindles into wrinkled insignificance. Nor is it merely rest from his daily toil that he ought in justice to enjoy on such occasions; but he should have it in his power to sport away the time in social enjoyment, in feasting, dancing, or whatever else is most agreeable to his taste, if not contrary to good morals. By this variety of pleasure, the mind is roused from its usual dull uniformity, enlivened and restored; the powers of the body are renovated; and it becomes more supple, and fitted for greater ex-

others; and that, as they themselves reckoned, upon the account of religion and piety."—(*Works*, Pitman's ed., vol. xii., p. 142. See also xi., 187.) This famous scholar, who was a member of the Westminster Assembly, opposes strenuously the notion that recreation is lawful on the Sabbath. Here is the way in which he tries to maintain his puritanical position:—"Oh! then I celebrate the Sabbath (saith the Sabbath-breaker); for I do no work, but play and recreate, and drink, and sit still, and do no work at all.' Friend, dost thou think God ever established idleness and folly by a law? that he hallowed the Sabbath-day to be a playing, fooling, sporting day? But, Christian, how readest thou, as a Christian? 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;' not a Sabbath for thy lust and laziness. And 'in it thou shalt do no manner of work' of thine own, but the work of the Lord thy God. And the rest, that he hath commanded, is not for idleness, but for piety towards God; for which end he gave all the laws of the first table,—namely, to leave communion with the world and worldly things that day, and to have it with God; as in Isaiah lviii. 13, 14, 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy will on my holy days, and call the Sabbath a delight.'"—(vii., 380.)

The passage in Isaiah, of which a portion is here quoted, is thought by many besides Lightfoot to mean that the Sabbath should be spent in worship and religious meditation. But nobody who reads it with reference to *the law of Moses*, instead of to modern notions of the Puritans, can interpret it in such a manner. Abstinence from work was all that the Mosaic law required; and by "not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure," on the Sabbath-day, an *Israelite* could understand simply "not indulging thy desire to work on the holy day." The next clause, "nor speaking words" (for "thine own" is avowedly an interpolation by the translators), appears to signify, "nor speaking words of repining;" *i. e.* "without a word of rebellious complaint about the hardship of obedience to my law, in opposition to thine own desire to labour on my holy day." (See Amos, viii. 5.) Supposing, however, the authorised version, "nor speaking thine own words," to be correct—what kind of words must we understand to be signified? Clearly, such as were contrary, not to the Fourth Commandment, which had reference to *deeds* alone, but to the laws which regulated *speech* among the Israelites: each was to be doubly careful on the Sabbath not to utter those impious, spiteful, or lying words which the law prohibited on *every* day, but which were peculiarly unsuitable to a divinely-appointed season of *festive enjoyment*.

Finally, when interpreting the Book of Isaiah, or the similar productions of other Hebrew prophets, let us not forget, that these *are not the statute-law of Israel*, to be literally interpreted as such; but *collections of Oriental poetry*, which we shall greatly misunderstand if we bring to the study of them the dry critical spirit in which the very prosaic Acts of the British Parliament are fitly scanned in this western extremity of Europe.

ertion. In short, the common man throws off the slave, the porter, the hind, the tailor; and the man of learning the dull pedant. *Augetur tum et coitus libido; quod viribus corporisque mentisque progeniei futuræ multum conferre solet.* Physicians, who ought certainly to be consulted on many points of legislative policy, will give the reader more ample satisfaction on this subject; which, indeed, is handled in several medical books, commonly to be met with.—It were cruel to deprive even the slave of a share in such enjoyments, for they are, as it were, a recompense for the hardships of his life; and every man who lives, manifestly has a right to partake in them: and it were no less foolish than cruel; for his health, vivacity, and bodily vigour will suffer in consequence of such privations. It is therefore prudent to allow him seasons of recreation: although selfish and tyrannical masters, who only look to immediate advantages, are, from their ignorance of human nature, and the effects of unceasing labour, sometimes inclined to be of a different opinion.”

Passing from the Jewish to the Christian Sabbath, he proceeds:—“There arises then a moral and political question, ‘Can the day of divine worship be aptly united with the day of rest and enjoyment?’ For my own part, I think it may; provided only, we do not include all manner of vicious excesses under the term enjoyment: and, in fact, the question has been already thus unanimously decided many thousand years ago, by almost all the nations on the face of the earth; however much many gloomy moralists of these later times may have condemned entertainments, dancing, playing, and even afternoon companies and visits, as profanations of Sunday, and zealously, although much too late, endeavoured to prevent them. To set apart two days of every week for holidays, as Mr Von Justi once proposed, would leave too little time for necessary labours, and would, in fact, be reviving, under the sanction of the magistrate, *blue Monday*, or St Crispen’s holiday, the abolition of which gave so much trouble to legislative authority, even to the Diet of Ratisbon itself, which only notices the most flagrant evils. It cannot be here objected that amusements are apt to degenerate into immoral practices, repugnant to the sanctity of the Sabbath—dancing, for instance, into intrigues—else must we also abolish going to church itself, in regard to which, neither sex can pretend to be always actuated by spiritual considerations alone. It were rather to be hoped that amusements would keep within the bounds of morality and virtue by being placed in the train of religion; and it should rather be an object of enquiry, Whether they might not be still more closely connected with religion, and thus many excesses be prevented.

“At any rate, it is contrary to that desire of variety which is implanted in human nature, to appropriate a *whole* day every week to devotion alone.* The application of the mind for so long a time to one object, and an object too which does not affect the senses, *is nothing less than labour of the hardest and most fatiguing kind*; and devotion of

* See the opinions of Horsley, Dr Vicesimus Knox, and Bishop Porteus, *ante*, pp. 120, 121, 336; and as to the practice of the early Protestants in England and Scotland, pp. 295, 298, *et seq.* In the *Rambler*, No. 30, Miss Talbot contrasts the cheerful with the puritanical mode of Sabbath-observance; as does also Mrs Beecher Stowe in her *Four Ways of Spending the Sabbath*.

this nature will generally lose in intensity, tenderness, and unconstrained spontaneous ardour, what it gains in duration. On this account also, therefore, it is expedient to divide the Sabbath between religious duties and lawful enjoyments; because one day will thus serve for what would otherwise require two, and more time for labour thus be gained to the community.”*

Michaelis goes on to shew that the only thing prohibited by the Mosaic precept is *servile work*, or *business*. We find in the Pentateuch no definition of the words so translated: but two examples—the gathering of manna and of sticks†—illustrate to us the meaning of phrases with which the ancient Israelites were too familiar to need an explanation. “Of *mental labour*,” adds Michaelis, “Moses, in his Sabbatical statutes, mentions not a word; nor was it necessary, considering the circumstances and occupations of his people.”‡ As, however, the brain, equally with the bones and muscles, has need of repose and recreation in order to recruit its substance and strength, the law of the Sabbath was plainly quite as applicable to it as to them. *Fighting*, which, in ancient times, as in our own, was regarded as by no means a servile employment, is with good reason held by Michaelis to be beyond the true scope of the Fourth Commandment, although upon this subject some of the later Jews took up a different notion. Had the law been all along interpreted as it was by the defenders of Jerusalem against the Syrians and Romans, assuredly the Gentile neighbours with whom the Israelites were so frequently at war would have taken such advantage of their folly, that many disasters (of which we read nothing in the earlier Jewish history) must have been experienced in consequence of it.§

The Jewish Sabbath, it will be remembered, began at sunset on Friday evening. Hence, the feasts which were eaten upon the holy day could be cooked just before its commencement; and after its close there still remained time enough for preparing the evening meal.|| A modern writer on the Sabbath is so bold as to affirm that it “is awfully violated by VISITING, FEASTING, travelling, worldly amusements,” &c.¶ Now it happens to be recorded that in ancient Jerusalem a leading member of the strictest sect of Jewish professors thought it no sin to make a feast on the Sabbath, and invite Jesus to partake of it; and, moreover, that Jesus without scruple complied with the invitation. We must therefore hold that in the opinion of the writer just quoted, who cannot be supposed to have been ignorant of the 14th chapter of St Luke’s Gospel, our Lord on this occasion sanctioned by his example an “awful violation” of the law of God!*** If this impious idea be rejected, then assuredly, even on the supposition that the Fourth Commandment is of universal and perpetual obligation, we may indulge ourselves without offence in visiting and feasting on

* Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. iii., pp. 152–155.

† Exod. xvi. 22–30; Numb. xv. 32.

‡ Michaelis, p. 163.

§ Op. cit., pp. 170–181.

|| Op. cit., p. 164.

¶ Buck’s Theological Dictionary, edited by Dr Henderson; art. SABBATH.

*** Perhaps, after all, the charitable notion is admissible, that the New Testament was but partially known to the writer; for he seems to be as little acquainted with the 14th chapter of the Romans, and some other passages in the writings of Paul about the observance of days, as with the 14th chapter of Luke.

the Sabbath, provided we so consistently follow the law of Moses as to let the work of cookery be done on the previous day, which must be made to close at sunset: for it is a mistake to suppose (as Dr Lorimer, for instance, does) that the Jews might lawfully cook on the Sabbath, and that therefore we may do so likewise.* If the Fourth Commandment binds us, cooking on the Sabbath, except in specially urgent cases, is altogether indefensible.

When Principal Lee was examined twenty years ago before Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee, he was asked whether the picture of the Covenanters, which Sir Walter Scott has given in *Old Mortality*, was correct; and to this question he replied in the negative. Concerning the Puritanical Sabbath (of which some particulars have been adduced, *ante*, pp. 149, 275, 310, 311), he said "that there never was such gloom attending its observance in Scotland as that celebrated writer alleges. The Sabbath, though observed with the greatest reverence, was a day rather of sober and cheerful piety than of any painful restraint."† *De gustibus non est disputandum*: one man's meat is another man's poison; and what is a most melancholy situation to one, may be as cheerful as possible to another. Yet it does seem incredible that the worthy Principal would find it pleasant to be cooped up every Sunday in a cellar in one of the dark and fetid "closes" of Edinburgh, with no better recreation than a walk twice a day to and from the High Church, and the pleasure of listening to four long and not very cheering sermons. Even he, I suspect, would have thought it allowable to "vage" to the Castle-hill in quest of sunshine, fresh air, a pleasant talk with his friends, and a sight of the Pentland Hills; nor would he have very loudly censured such as contrived to elude the vigilance of the "honest men" posted at the city gates to prevent the people's "forthbreaking." Nay, he might even have thought it venial, in spite of the clerical prohibition, to follow the example of Jesus Christ and the *ancient* Pharisees, in strolling pleasantly among the corn-fields in the neighbourhood. But let the Sabbath of the Covenanters be called dull or cheerful as you please—what state of morals existed in Scotland while it was observed in the manner we have seen? On this point, Dr Lee expresses his belief that "the time of the Covenanters was a period of *great religious light*, and of GREAT STRICTNESS AND PURITY OF MORALS."‡ For this persuasion the

* "So far as I am aware, there is no evidence that the Jews were required, or actually did observe the Sabbath more strictly than is required of all true Christians now. The prophets, in speaking of Sabbath desecration, do not find fault with acts connected with the preparation of food." (They find fault with *working*, and the work of cooking might be meant, as well as any other kind of labour.) "Our Lord, who must have kept the Sabbath in the scriptural sense in which it was binding on every Jew, sanctioned the rubbing of ears of corn for food on the Sabbath," (only as an exceptional case, however, and perhaps to reprove the superstitious strictness which held such trivial acts to be "work,") "and attended entertainments, where there must have been a considerable preparation for the guests."—(*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* p. 64.) Were it not incredible that a Free Church Doctor can be ignorant how the Jews avoided desecration in the cooking of their Sabbath feasts, I should feel it unavoidable to infer such ignorance on the part of Dr Lorimer from these concluding words.

† Report of Committee, p. 272, Q. 4114.

‡ Report, p. 271, Q. 4109.

only ground that appears in his evidence, is a passage from Kirkton's *History of the Church of Scotland*—one which the Sabbatarians are fond of quoting, and which they seem to think conclusive. This famous passage is as follows :—“ At the King's return (in 1660) every parish had a minister, every village had a school, every family almost had a bible, yea, in most of the country, all the children of age could read the scriptures, and were provided of bibles, either by the parents or their ministers. . . . I have lived many years in a parish where I never heard an oath, and you might have rid many miles before you had heard any : also, you could not, for a great part of the country, have lodged in a family where the Lord was not worshipped by reading, singing, and public prayer. Nobody complained more of our church-government than our taverners, whose ordinary lamentation was, their trade was broke, people were become so sober.”*

These sentences, it will perhaps occur to the reader, look very like an old man's eulogy of the good and glorious times when he was young, and his party in the ascendant ; and on this ground he may naturally enough be pronounced a *laudator temporis aeti*, unworthy of implicit credit. But waiving this consideration, let us see what the passage, interpreted without allowance, does really assert. 1. The people, it tells us, generally could read the Bible. (In that age, to possess and read the Bible was thought to be a talisman, bringing the favour of God to its possessor ; and many have this notion still.) 2. In an unnamed parish (probably Merton), † the writer never *heard* an oath, and he presumed that nobody else could hear one within the space of many miles. 3. In a great part of the country, the families in whose houses he lodged, worshipped God on such occasions by reading, singing, and prayer ; and probably did so when he was absent. And, 4. Certain publicans complained that they were ruined by the sobriety of the people. The last item, it will be observed, is the only one relating to *morals* ; and the fact asserted goes no farther than to shew, that if the people got drunk it was not in the houses of the persons (be they few or many, rural or urban) whom Kirkton styles “ our taverners.” Yet, as it seems, upon this slender foundation does Dr Lee ground his belief in great religious light, and great strictness and purity of morals, at the period in question ! If pseudo-Judaical Christianity be “ religious light,” the Covenanters certainly *had* it ; if to know the spirit of the Gospel, and to act in accordance with it, be “ religious light,” assuredly they had it not. As to the great strictness and purity of the morals of the people when under the influence of the sternest Puritanism, I adduce the following testimony.

Among the reasons assigned by the General Assembly in 1642 for a public fast then appointed to be kept, are “ gross ignorance and all sort of wickedness among the greater part ; security, mere formality, and unfruitfulness among the best ; and unthankfulness in all.” ‡ That

* Kirkton, pp. 64, 65 ; quoted Q. 4094. This writer was a Covenanting clergyman, who, after officiating a considerable time at Merton, in Berwickshire, became in 1689 minister of the Tolbooth Church in Edinburgh.

† Dr Lee says he has grounds for believing that Kirkton's description “ is chiefly applicable to the south and west of Scotland, with which the writer was best acquainted.” Merton adjoins the parish of Melrose, of which anon.

‡ Acts of the General Assembly, p. 72.

this description is not itself "mere formality" or puritanical cant, will soon be sufficiently evident.

When Cromwell invaded Scotland, he expected to find the behaviour of "God's people" suitable to the high character they assumed: what he *did* find, is sorrowfully recorded in his letter to the Lord President of the Council of State, dated Edinburgh, 25th September 1650. "I thought," says he, "I should have found in Scotland a conscientious people, and a barren country: about Edinburgh it is as fertile for corn as any part of England; *but the people generally [are so] given to the most impudent lying, and frequent swearing, as is incredible to be believed.*"*

In the *Diary of John Nicoll*, a Writer to the Signet, printed for the Bannatyne Club,† and extending from 1650 to 1667, many plain symptoms of a deep and general corruption of morals are recorded. On 23d January 1650, a man was found guilty of perjury by the Lords of Session, and another was scourged through the town for bigamy.‡ On the 30th of the same month, "four fals witnessis wer broght to the Trone, quhair of twa had thair earis naillit to the Trone, with ane paper upon ather of thair heidis, testifeying thair offencis. Uther twa of thame wer bund to the Trone, with ane paper on ilk-ane of thair heidis, declairand thair faltis."§ A week afterwards, an inhabitant of Leith was punished at the Trone of Edinburgh by having "his tong rin throw with ane het yrne or boitkin," for making up a false title to the property of a deceased person, "to defraud the neerest of kin and ryghteous air."|| On the 17th of the following month it is recorded—"Much falsset and scheiting (falsehood and cheating) at this tyme WES DAYLIE DETECTIT by the Lordis of Session: for the quhilk THAIR WES DAYLIE hanging, skurging, nailing of luggis, and binding of pepill to the Trone, and booring of tounges; so that it wis ane fatall yeir for fals notaris and witnessis, AS DAYLIE EXPERIENCE DID WITNES. And as for adulterie, fornicatioun, incest, bigamie, and uther uncleannes and filthynes, IT DID NEVIR ABOUND MOIR NOR AT THIS TYME."¶ So licentious were the citizens, that an ecclesiastical law was enacted "that no woman sould vent or rin wyne or aill in tavernis of Edinburgh, bot allanerlie (only) servandis and boyes."** In May following, a man and a cow were burnt on the Castlehill for an unmentionable crime.†† On 12th June, "William Blair, messer, wes hangit at the mercat croce of Edinburgh for sindrie falsettis committit be him in his calling."‡‡ In September, when Cromwell had invaded Scotland, "sindrie fastis and humiliatiounis wer appoynted throw the kingdome for averting Godis wraith; bot the Lord wes not yit intreated, bot seemed to hyde his face from his pepill, and treulie the Lord haid just caus, for all our fastis wer bot formaliteis, and the Lordis word haid not force, power, nor strength of conversioun and repentance among this pepill, till his wraith and hott displesour wer powred out, turning the wisdome of the wyse into folie, and the strenth of the strong men into waiknes."§§ Among the causes assigned by the Gene-

* Carlyle's Cromwell, vol. ii., p. 72.

† Pp. 1, 2.

** P. 5.

§ P. 2.

†† P. 15.

† Edinburgh, 1836.

|| P. 2.

‡‡ P. 15.

¶ Pp. 3, 4.

§§ P. 34.

ral Assembly for a solemn fast which was kept "throw the hail kirkis of Scotland" in 1653, we find the following item, which shews that matters had not at all mended since 1642:—"The growth of sin of all soirtis, particularlie pride, uncleannes, contempt of ordinances, oppressioun, violence, fraudulent dealing, and that, under the rod, the maist pairt of the pepill growing wors and wors, and revolting moir and moir."* In 1656, the Diarist complains bitterly of the adulteration of wine and ale, the deficient weight of loaves, and false weights and measures, among the tradesmen of Edinburgh; and the injustice of tax-gatherers, who extorted from the poor, and let the rich and powerful escape.† The praises, moreover, which the impartiality of Cromwell's English judges in Edinburgh extorts from the loyalist Nicoll, are in a strain which shews how rare a thing justice had lately been in godly Scotland.‡ Lastly, let it not be forgotten that at no period was the burning of witches more vigorously carried on than during the sway of the Covenanting clergy; and that nothing could be more unfavourable to the prevalence of a Christian spirit than the superstitious dread and hatred with which the victims were regarded, and familiarity with the spectacle of their conflagration. For men are "savaged" by fear,

* P. 107.

† P. 189.

‡ By these judges, "justice wes iuinistrat summarlie to all pairteis compleand, without partialitie or favour: *their cariages and wayis in that behalf condemning ouris heir in Scotland*; as wes alledgit be many, quho, haiffing actiounes and complayntes gevin in befoir thame, returned fra thanie with great contentment."—(P. 66.) In 1653, they put a stop to the monstrous practice of *private solicitation* by suitors and their advocates and attorneys.—(P. 116.)

Nicoll records also that on 17th February 1650 an Act of the Commission of the General Assembly, prohibiting promiscuous dancing, was read in all the churches of Edinburgh (p. 3); that previously to the battle of Dunbar the clergy "wer not deficient to encourage the pepill, *promessing, in Godis name, a victorie over these erronyous and blasphemous pairteis in England*, quha, aganes the Covenant and Solempne League, did unjustlie persew this natioun" (p. 19); that Cromwell severely punished his soldiers when they plundered or otherwise harmed the citizens of Edinburgh, as well as for drunkenness and immorality (pp. 33, 62, 66, 69); that the downfall of the monarchy was prognosticated by "sindrie unko apparitiounes," which are specified (pp. 77, 87); that when the "old auncient castell and strenth of Blaknes wes blawn up with a powder trayne" on 3d April 1652, by order of the English Commissioners, "it was reportit that the devill was vesible seen upone the wallis of it at its upblowing" (p. 92); and that in February of the same year, a warlock was at his own request "brint for witchcraft," being desirous "that justice be execute aganes him for saiftie of his saull" (p. 106.) The description of the preaching by Cromwell's officers also deserves to be quoted:—"General Lambert haiffing urgit the toun of Edinburgh's commoun Counsell to appropriat to him the Eist Kirk of Edinburgh, being the speciall Kirk and best in the toun, for his exercise at sermound, the samin wes randerit to him for that use; quhairin thair wes dyveris and sindrie sermoundis preached, alsweill by captanes and lieutenantis and trouperis of his army, as by ordiner pastouris and Englische ministeris; quhilkis captanes, commanderis, and trouperis, quhen they enterit the pulpittes, did not observe our Scottis formes, bot quhen thai ascendit, they enterit the pulpites with thair swordis hung at thair sydes, and sum careying pistollis up with thame; and eftir thair entry, layd asyde within the pulpittes thair swordis till thai endit thair sermoundis. It wes thoct that these men war weill giftit, yit wer not ordourlie callit, according to the discipline observit within this Kingdome of Scotland."—(Pp. 68, 69.)

as well as “by woe;”* and exhibitions of cruelty have a natural tendency to foster cruelty in the beholders.†

At Perth and Aberdeen the state of morals seems to have been little better than at Edinburgh, as the Records of the kirk-sessions shew.‡ Elsewhere, too, the same appears to have been the case. Thus, in the Statistical Account of Melrose by the Rev. George Thomson, minister of that parish, we read as follows in reference to the parochial register of the 17th century:—“The number of persons who appear by the list of penitents to have incurred church censure in that age is incredible,—*far exceeding the average of the present day, when the population is nearly trebled.* How is this to be accounted for and reconciled with the zeal and piety of our forefathers, unless by supposing that the age in general was greatly less enlightened and less moral than the present? IT IS MORE EASY TO FIGHT AND DIE FOR GOD, THAN TO LEAD A WELL-REGULATED LIFE IN OBEDIENCE TO HIS LAW.”§

Add to this the testimony of Hugh Binning, who in the middle of the same century was minister of Govan, and Professor of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow; and who has left a high reputation for genius, moderation, and eloquence.¶ “What,” says he, “is now the great blot of our visible church? Here it is: *the most part are not God’s children, but called so*; and it is the greater blot that they are called so, and are not.” Again: “*Set aside your public service, and professions, and is there any thing behind in your conversation, but drunkenness, lying, swearing, contention, envy, deceit, wrath, covetousness, and such like?*”¶¶ Mr Orme adds: “If Principal Baillie’s words have any meaning, *not more than one in ‘forty of the members of his church gave good evidence of grace and regeneration.’*”** These testimonies shew that

* See the description of a pestilence in Thomson’s *Summer*, v. 1081; and the account by Thucydides of the great plague at Athens, quoted in Archbishop Whately’s *Charge on the Right Use of National Afflictions*, p. 8. Of the inhumanising effects of fear, I have treated in the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. ix., p. 415. As to the burning of witches in Scotland, see Law’s *Memorials*, *passim*; and Sir Walter Scott’s *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*. Pitcairn’s *Criminal Trials* exhibit many cases down to 1624.

† The present Dr M’Crie, in his *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, 3d ed., p. 374, tries to lessen the authority of Nicoll by saying that “little weight can be attached to the *opinions* of this writer, who betrays great weakness of mind.” Without thinking it necessary to inquire whether the weakness of his mind exceeded that of some of the clergy of his day who are still held in great reverence by certain religious people in Scotland, I should be glad to know what relation the soundness or unsoundness of his *opinions* has to the accuracy of his narrative of events which took place before his eyes. Boswell “betrays great weakness of mind” in his *Life of Dr Johnson*; but shall we therefore renounce the belief that a more faithful chronicler has never existed?

It appears from Law’s *Memorials*, p. 43, that in the year 1671 vice continued to abound in Scotland.

‡ Spottiswoode *Miscellany*, vol. i., p. 230 *et seq.*; and *Selections from the Records of the Kirk-Session of Aberdeen*, printed for the Spalding Club.

§ *New Statistical Account of Scotland*, vol. iii., p. 55.

¶ See Chambers’s *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, vol. i., p. 208. “He was one of the first in Scotland,” says Mr Chambers, “to reform philosophy from the barbarous jargon of the Schools.”

¶¶ Binning’s *Works*, pp. 518, 546; quoted in Orme’s *Life of Owen*, pp. 98, 99, ed. 1823.

** “Baillie’s *Letters*, vol. ii., p. 85.”

there may be much professed zeal for the Lord of Hosts—*much clamorous contention about Confessions of Faith, Forms of Church Government,* and extirpation of heretics, AND A DEPLORABLE DEGREE OF IGNORANCE, DEPRAVITY, AND IRRELIGION.*”†

The late Dr M'Crie, in his review of Mr Orme's book, says, “We cannot overtake an examination of the unfavourable picture which he has drawn of the state of religion in Scotland about the year 1650.” The quotations from Binning and Baillie he characterises as “akin to the attempts of Popish writers to prove the *Reformation a Deformation*, by culling quotations from the sermons of such Protestant preachers as inveighed most freely against prevailing vices.”‡ But as the “vices” of the Covenanters must have “prevailed” before they were preached against, and as the question between Dr M'Crie and Mr Orme relates to their prevalence, it is difficult to see the drift of the remark just quoted. The Doctor's son with more reason observes, that “it is not by looking into the records of church-courts, which indeed almost supplied the place of courts of police, nor into the ‘Acknowledgments of Sins,’ published about that period, that we can form a *proper estimate* of the moral state of the country.”§ Thus far I agree with him, if by “a proper estimate” he means an estimate of the amount of immorality, *in comparison with* that existing at other times. But we part company when he proceeds to say that “such documents *only* serve to shew that, in these days, the discipline of the Church was administered with a fidelity which is now too little known, though not a whit less needed, and that our fathers were affected by the existence of public evils, which are no longer so candidly acknowledged, only because they are not laid so deeply to heart.” They shew more than this—they shew that at a period asserted by Principal Lee to have been one of great religious light, and of great strictness and purity of morals, there was in fact such a prevalence of immorality among the people, that, even had there been no other evidence than these records, his description must have been pronounced untrue. Would Dr M'Crie *primus* have failed to “overtake” a refutation of Mr Orme's representation had he known that its refutation was possible? On the contrary, there was no work to which he would more eagerly have addressed himself. And if a demonstration of the falsity of the picture was impossible to *him*, who was so familiar with the covenanting times, is it likely to be possible to any one else?

Did the case which I am advocating need any farther proof, it would find ample corroboration in three enactments which tell a plain tale in the Statute Book of Scotland. The first, dated 7th August 1645, is directed against “swearing, drinking, and mocking of piety.” It recites, that although by the solemn National Covenant sworn and subscribed by people of all ranks within the kingdom, and ratified in Parliament in 1641, the whole lieges had bound themselves before God with a solemn oath so to behave themselves in their lives and conversations as beseemeth Christians who have renewed their covenant with God,—and had faithfully promised to endeavour to keep themselves within the bounds of Christian liberty, and be good examples

* Sabbath-observance might have been added here.

† Orme, p. 99.

‡ Miscellaneous Writings, p. 513.

§ Sketches of Scottish Church History, p. 377.

to others of all godliness, sobriety, and righteousness,—yet this part of the solemn oath had been neglected, “*and the open abundance of all vices, dishonourable to God and reproachful to the said National Covenant, hath without doubt occasioned the heavy judgments which the Lord in his great wrath hath poured out upon the land.*”* Another statute, passed on 13th February 1649, recites that notwithstanding the foregoing “*laudable and pious Act,*” the vices for which it provided punishment “*do still continue and increase in the land, unto the great dishonour of God, and scandal of the Gospel;*” and therefore renews it, and extends its operation to “*scolders, filthy speakers, and makers and singers of bawdy songs.*”† And from a third act, “*Against Fornication,*” passed on 1st of the same month, we receive the superfluous information that “*the foresaid sin doth exceedingly abound.*”‡

Dr Owen excellently observes, that in judging of the soundness of any principles, doctrines, or practices, “*their tendency to the promotion or hindrance of piety, godliness, and universal holy obedience unto God, is to be inquired into. This,*” says he, “*is the end of all religious worship, and of all the institutions thereof. And a due observation of the regular tendency of things unto this end, will give a great discovery of their nature and acceptance with God. Let things be urged under never so specious pretences, if they be found by experience not to promote Gospel holiness in the hearts and lives of men, they discover themselves not to be of God.*” Much more when principles, and practices conformable unto them, shall be evidenced to obstruct and hinder it, to introduce profaneness, and countenance licentiousness of life, to prejudice the due reverence of God and his worship, do they manifest themselves to be of the tares sown by the evil one.”§ Tried by this admirable test (which, indeed, is no other than the scriptural one, that “*the tree is known by its fruit*”), the Sabbath-observance of the Puritans must, I think, receive condemnation; even though, without “*countenancing*” licentiousness, it merely promotes incidentally, by its austerities, the vices which it endeavours to suppress. Dr Owen, it is true, applies the principle as one available against “*the opinion which denies all institution unto a day of holy rest under the New Testament;*” but his notion that the principle really *is* adverse to the opinion, rests upon the groundless assumption that unless a weekly Sabbath, and the public worship of God thereon, be instituted in *the New Testament*, there is no foundation for them at all. This very test, however, which he applies to corroborate his doctrine of a Gospel Sabbath, acquires all its significance from the fact, that in spite of the sad perversion which the Christian Sabbath has sustained—in spite of the barbarous puritanical practice of stripping religious worship of those external attractions which experience proves to have a beneficial tendency—in spite of the monstrous impiety of depicting the Divine Being, not as that loving and bountiful Father whom Jesus held up to the affectionate reverence of confiding children, but as an irritable despot, greedy of adulation, jealous lest due honour should be withheld from him,

* Thomson’s Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. vi., p. 195.

† *Ib.*, p. 368.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 360.

§ Preliminary Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Exerc. xxxv., sect. 8, paragraph 6, p. 609.

ever ready to visit offenders with his fearful "judgments,"—pleased with his creatures when they crouchingly abstain from the enjoyments of which he himself has made them capable, and the means of obtaining which he has so profusely spread before them,—dooming a vast majority of them to an eternity of unspeakable torments,—and whom we ought to regard (as indeed, if the picture be a true one, we *must* regard) with feelings akin to those of a condemned criminal towards his executioner—the test, I say, derives its whole significance from the fact, that in spite of all this, the *evident utility* of religious holidays, and of the public worship for which they give opportunity, proves both to be in accordance with the will of God, who, if he desires the happiness of his creatures, must desire the doing of whatsoever is conducive to that end. Had a weekly Sabbath been instituted in the New Testament, the Christian might have contemplated with interest the correspondence between the law of nature and the law of Christ in this particular; but as all practices which the law of nature prescribes are not specially prescribed also in the New Testament, the good effects by which the law of Sabbath-observance is made known to be divine, are no argument in proof of "the institution of a day of holy rest under the New Testament," however useful they might have been in *confirming* a gospel institution of this sort if any such had been recorded.

"It is an easy thing," says the enlightened Catholic Professor of Theology at Freiburg, "to associate one's self with a religious society; while it is confessedly so severe a task to strive with all the soul for the Christian virtues, that but few undertake the work. Only let them forego this undertaking, and people will readily perform any other conceivable outward exercise, no matter how severe, especially if you persuade them that they will thereby obtain something over and above, which will apply to the discharge of their burdensome account with the law of God. Hence it is apparent why those priests, who prescribe external acts of penance to the faithful, may always depend upon their satisfaction, and an increase of popularity. But the Church can never approve, nor allow, this mere romance of *special devotions, acts of piety*, and the like, to take the place of the homely duties of Christian life. It is sometimes urged, that these accessories of worship, by multiplying the motives of devotion, accomplish their purpose; but, to refrain from all other replies, *I will only answer, that the merit of a man seldom bears a direct relation to the multitude of his devotions.* They are too often influenced by a mere mechanism of religion, by a disproportioned religious sensibility, by spiritual pride, by an aversion to practical duty, and such like motives. To estimate the comparative merits of one who accomplishes a great abundance of these pious exercises, and one who goes through but few of them, *there is but one just standard, and that is the fruits of genuine godliness and pureness of living, which they respectively bring forth.* Never will any man venture to decry that standard, or to cheapen its importance with the people. Let those who now-a-days so ardently commend external religion, and so gratify the popular taste, take it seriously to heart, whether they are not propagating among the people a most unfair principle of estimating the characteristics of a truly religious life. We find existing, in the time of Christ, a confusion of all faculties of right judgment, truly as-

tonishing. It was a product of Pharisaism. May the like never be reproduced among ourselves!"*

The violent reaction which in both ends of our island succeeded the sway of the Puritans, shewed how destitute of good influence the austerities which had been thrust upon the nation under the name of religion really were. "Those passions and tastes which, under the rule of the Puritans, had been sternly repressed, and, if gratified at all, had been gratified by stealth, broke forth with ungovernable violence as soon as the check was withdrawn. Men flew to frivolous amusements and to criminal pleasures, with the greediness which long and enforced abstinence naturally produces. Little restraint was imposed by public opinion. For the nation, nauseated by cant, suspicious of all pretensions to sanctity, and still smarting from the recent tyranny of rulers austere in life and powerful in prayer, looked for a time with complacency on the softer and gayer vices." †

In short, every thing tends to confirm the conclusion, expressed by Burke in the sentence formerly quoted, ‡ that "*lawful enjoyment is the surest method to prevent unlawful gratification*;" and to establish the principle to which, because of its exceeding practical importance in relation to human welfare, I have several times adverted before, § that happiness is conducive to virtue, and misery to vice. This law of human nature accords with our notions of the benevolence and wisdom of the Deity; and till due regard be paid to it in our conduct, the evils which spring from its neglect will continue to afflict us, in spite of every quackish remedy that may be applied for their removal. When I first read the assertion of Principal Lee about the uncommonly virtuous condition of Scotland during the gloomy reign of the Covenanters, I was staggered by what, if true, would have been strangely at variance with every other fact of human nature within my knowledge. And, as an impartial search for the *truth* has disclosed to me literally nothing that corroborates Dr Lee's allegation, there was assuredly very sufficient ground for incredulity on the occasion.

I conclude this subject by extracting a beautiful passage—as true as it is beautiful—from a sermon of Jeremy Taylor:—

"A cheerful spirit is the best convoy for religion; and though sadness does in some cases become a Christian, as being an index of a pious mind, of compassion, and a wise, proper resentment of things, yet it serves but one end, being useful in the only instance of repentance; and hath done its greatest works, not when it weeps and sighs, but when it hates and grows careful against sin. But cheerfulness and a festival spirit fill the soul full of harmony; it composes music for churches and hearts; it makes and publishes glorifications of God; it produces thankfulness, and serves the end of charity: and when the oil of gladness runs over, it makes bright and tall emissions of light and holy fires, reaching up to a cloud, and making joy round about: and

* Dr J. B. Von Hirscher on the State of the Church in Germany, translated by the Rev. Arthur C. Coxe, pp. 216-218; Oxford, 1852. The title which Mr Coxe has given his translation is "Sympathies of the Continent, or Proposals for a New Reformation."

† Macaulay's History of England, vol. i., p. 179, 5th edit.

‡ See p. 216.

§ See pp. 72, 73, 239, 275-6, 369-70.

therefore, since it is so innocent, and may be so pious, and full of holy advantage, whatsoever can innocently minister to this holy joy, *does set forward the work of religion and charity*. And, indeed, charity itself, which is the vertical top of all religion, is nothing else but a union of joys, concentrated in the heart, and reflected from all the angels of our life and intercourse. It is a rejoicing in God, a gladness in our neighbour's good, a pleasure in doing good, a rejoicing with him; and without love, we cannot have any joy at all. It is this that makes children to be a pleasure, and friendship to be so noble and divine a thing; and upon this account it is certain, that *all that which can innocently make a man cheerful, does also make him charitable: for grief, and age, and sickness, and weariness, these are peevish and troublesome; BUT MIRTH AND CHEERFULNESS ARE CONTENT, AND CIVIL, AND COMPLIANT, AND COMMUNICATIVE, AND LOVE TO DO GOOD, and swell up to felicity only upon the wings of charity*. Upon this account, here is pleasure enough for a Christian at present; and if a facetious discourse, and an amicable friendly mirth, can refresh the spirit, and take it off from the vile temptation of peevish, despairing, uncomplying melancholy, it must needs be innocent and commendable. And we may as well be refreshed by a clean and a brisk discourse, as by the air of Campanian wines; and our faces and our heads may as well be anointed and look pleasant with wit and friendly intercourse, as with the fat of the balsam-tree; and such a conversation no wise man ever did or ought to reprove."*

* Sermon xxiii., on the Good and Evil Tongue; Works, vol. v., p. 348.—Conversation being the theme of this sermon, the author had no call to speak of the *other* means of refreshment adverted to in the foregoing pages; but his remarks, of course, are applicable to them all. If two or more of them can be combined, so much the greater will the refreshment be—as when to brisk conversation we add brisk walking or driving through a delightful country, or the spectacle of beautiful gardens, fountains, architecture, sculpture, and paintings, such as may be seen at Versailles, Hampton Court, or the Crystal Palace. And it is a great additional excellence of such recreations, that they can ever afterwards be enjoyed as “pleasures of memory,” even in the dulllest situations in which we may be placed. Boswell, at the end of his Tour to the Hebrides, records that Dr Johnson often said to him, that the time he spent in this tour was the pleasantest part of his life, and asked him if he would lose the recollection of it for five hundred pounds? “I answered I would not; and he applauded my setting such a value on an accession of new images to my mind.” All who love travelling, and admire and remember the beauties of nature, will sympathise with Johnson and Boswell in this particular, and value highly the power of at any time entertaining their fancy with the recollection of scenery and adventure.

Let us then rejoice that, by means of steamboats and railways, the pleasures and advantages of travelling are now so easy of attainment. Change of air and scene, even when there is little beauty to delight the eye, is well known to be among the best restoratives of health, strength, and cheerfulness; and in proportion as it is so, it promotes the growth of virtue. Let us not reject the advantages which the progress of science has brought within our reach. Regarding Sunday as a day which should be partly devoted (as the Jewish Sabbath was *wholly* intended to be) to the refreshment of the labourer, I cannot, consistently with the views above expressed, avoid the conclusion that the running of Sunday Trains on railways is according to the will of God—as every thing must be which is a means of moral and intellectual improvement, and of present and future delight. In this view I am happy to have the concurrence of the Rev. John Griffith, Vicar of Aberdare, in South Wales, who, in

NOTE M, page 12.

God's Vengeance against Sabbath-breakers.

For the last two hundred and fifty years, the Sabbatarians have never ceased to charge their opponents with bringing down God's vengeance, not only upon themselves who deserve it so richly, but upon the entire nation, including the saints who ought not to be thus made to eat the fruits of other men's sins. Because it is recorded that during the Hebrew theocracy the Supreme Being used to reward and punish his subjects by supernatural means, it is assumed that *now*, when He is no longer pleased to stand in the relation of an earthly sovereign even to the Israelites, He governs *the whole human race* on the principles of that abrogated scheme. Accidents occurring on "Sabbath-breaking" railways are daily proclaimed to be brought about by the special interference of the offended Deity, who, notwithstanding the justice which is said to be the spring of his action on such occasions, is observed to inflict broken limbs not upon the actual transgressors, but upon persons sinlessly travelling on *other* days than the Sabbath. Nay, so inseparable, it seems, is the connection between Sabbath-observance and all kinds of worldly prosperity, that, according to an eminent doctor of the Free Church, "God blesses nations and pious families, and solitary individuals in families which are not pious, *in proportion as they have sanctified the Sabbath*, neither doing

a letter published in the *Cardiff and Merthyr Guardian* of 27th November 1852, after expressing his hearty approval of the proposed opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoons, as a means of diminishing drunkenness, gambling, and fighting among the lower orders, proceeds in the following terms:—

"It is the same thing with *Sunday Trains*. A great outcry has been raised against them. I say it with every consciousness of the responsibility I incur, as incumbent of one of the largest parishes in Wales, and with abundant opportunity of testing their usefulness—that were it *not* for *Sunday Trains*, we should have *ten times more* Sabbath-breaking in this country than we have now. I can hardly conceive a greater calamity, in a moral point of view, to a parish like mine, with its 16,000 workmen, than if some puritanical panic were to seize the Directors of the Taff Vale and Vale of Neath, so that all the Sunday Trains were to be stopped. There would then be no living on the Sabbath here. It is bad enough already,—Domdaniel itself would be hardly worse then. Let the Sunday Trains run as they do now, *resting during Church service*,—they will effect, as they are constantly effecting, a great *moral change* in the people.

"I have spoken my mind honestly on this subject, because I think it is time the Clergy should speak. I will yield to none in doing all and every thing to 'keep holy the Sabbath-day;' and I am quite sure my parishioners will bear me witness in this. But there is a vast difference between keeping this day holy, and that rigid Sabbatarianism which has well nigh threatened more than once to bring back the vapid emptiness of the days of the Roundheads. The question is not one of desecration of the Sabbath, but the enlightenment, the recreation, the *rest*, and the elevation of the working man. Lord Derby has done a noble act, and I trust he will be supported in it. I fear nothing of 'Continental desecration.' I fear nothing for religion, or the Church. Open people's minds; and let us, the Clergy, pray God to open *ours* as well: and 'the city that is set upon a hill can never be hid.'"

their own works nor thinking their own thoughts on this day of the Lord.”*

Now this is a doctrine calculated to mislead most disastrously young men endeavouring to prosper in the world; for if they piously trust to Sabbath-observance as the means of prosperity, they will assuredly be disappointed, and may even acquire a feeling of disgust at religion, instead of mere disrespect for the guides who have led them blindfold into the ditch. It would be in vain to adduce “infidel” writers like Adam Smith and Benjamin Franklin in opposition to Dr Bruce; but as the unquestionable authority of Solomon is on the side of the philosophers, surely it is fit that *he* be respectfully listened to upon such an occasion as this. Does Solomon, then, teach any thing like the doctrine of Dr Bruce? Does he even mention the Sabbath at all? Let any one peruse the Book of Proverbs and answer these questions. The fact will appear, that while Dr Bruce’s all-sufficient Sabbath-observance is completely ignored by the royal teacher, the praises of industry, wisdom, sobriety, and justice, as the means of prosperity, are continually in his mouth. “That man becometh poor who dealeth with a slack hand; *but the hand of the diligent maketh rich.*”† “Riches and honour *are with Wisdom*; yea durable riches and righteousness:”‡ “length of days is in her right hand, and in her left hand riches and honour; her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.”§ “Blessings are upon the head of the just,” and “*a faithful man shall abound with blessings.*”|| “*He that tilleth his land shall be satisfied with bread*; but he that followeth after vain persons shall have poverty enough.”¶ “The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute.”** “The soul of the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing; but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat.”†† “Seest thou a man *diligent in his business*? he shall stand before kings.”‡‡ But “the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags.”§§—The race, to be sure, is not always “to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill, but time and chance happeneth to them all;”||| but still the experience of all times makes it certain that, accidents apart, it is the diligent, sober, just, and intelligent worker, who attains the enjoyment of wealth, honour, and happiness. If a man be so *over-diligent* in his business, as to labour on the weekly holiday, instead of using it for the refreshment of his body and mind, and the cultivation of those intellectual and moral faculties by which his conduct in business should be directed, he is not the diligent man that Solomon speaks of; he wants “*wisdom*,” and will suffer, not indeed for profaning the Sabbath, but for the folly of over-tasking his strength, of leaving the higher faculties of his mind

* The Duty and Privilege of Keeping the Sabbath, by John Bruce, A.M., p. 23. Edinburgh, 1842.

In what part of Scripture is any one forbidden to “think his own thoughts” on the Sabbath?

† Prov. x. 4.

‡ Ib. viii. 18.

§ Ib. iii. 16, 17.

|| Ib. x. 6; xxviii. 20.

¶ Ib. xii. 11; xxviii. 19.

** Ib. xii. 24.

†† Ib. xiii. 4. See also xix. 15; xx. 4; xxiv. 30-34.

‡‡ Ib. xxii. 29.

§§ Ib. xxiii. 21, and 29-32.

||| Eccl. ix. 11.

unimproved, and of incurring the displeasure of fellow-citizens who would otherwise have promoted his welfare.* The Jews, who disregard *our* Sabbath, and observe one which Christians in general hold to be no Sabbath at all, are observed to be a good deal more prosperous than the penniless Sabbath Alliance. Yet, upon the principle of Dr Bruce, how can this be?

The same writer affirms, that “if Christians had added this day (the Christian Sabbath) of their own authority, calling it a divine institution, without any truth, or any title to do so, then should we have expected, that, just as in the case of Nadab and Abihu, so would the Almighty Lawgiver have punished them with rigour for adding to his institutions, and pretending to have *his* authority for an ordinance of their own.”† Upon this passage, several observations occur:—1. Whereas, in these latter days, the Almighty Lawgiver is not known to punish transgressors miraculously, as in the theocratic times of Nadab and Abihu, but is observed to administer his moral government towards men by annexing to misconduct certain evil consequences which naturally and uniformly flow from it,—such a method of punishing as that of which we read in the case of the sons of Aaron, should *not* have been “expected” by Dr Bruce on the occasion supposed. 2. As far as we know, the *primitive* Christians never called the Lord’s day a divine institution;‡ but, had they done so, they would in effect have spoken the truth, seeing that the festival which they observed was in harmony with God’s natural law, made known by reason and conscience. 3. In devoting a portion of the Lord’s day to the social worship of God and to their own spiritual improvement, they obeyed a natural law of God, and enjoyed the advantages which naturally flow from such obedience. And lastly, when, in modern times, the primitive institution was senselessly changed from a joyful festival to a season of sadness and weary formality, this thrusting upon it of a character asserted to be “divine,” but “without any truth, or any title to do so,” actually *has been*, and *is* very visibly at this day, “punished with rigour” (in a natural way), by the loss of an enormous amount of health, happiness, good temper, intelligence, and sobriety, which would otherwise have existed in Scotland during the last two hundred and fifty years. Such is the *real* manner in which “God’s vengeance against Sabbath-breakers” is exhibited to the human understanding!§

According to another luminary of the Free Church of Scotland,

* See *ante*, p. 349.

† *Loc. cit.*

‡ See *ante*, p. 281.

§ Mr Wilberforce, writing at a time when Puritanism was a much milder thing than in the middle of the seventeenth century, observes most truly, that with many persons, even of the graver and more decent sort, “the Sunday is, to say the best of it, a *heavy* day; and that larger part of it, which is not claimed by the public offices of the church, *dully draws on in comfortless vacuity*, or, without improvement, is trifled away in vain and unprofitable discourse. . . . How little do many seem to enter into the *spirit* of the institution, who are not wholly inattentive to its exterior decorums! How glad are they to qualify the rigour of their religious labours! How hardly do they plead against being compelled to devote the *whole* of the day to religion, claiming to themselves no small merit for giving up to it a part, and purchasing, therefore, as they hope, a right to spend the remainder more agreeably! . . . Even business itself is recreation compared with religion; and from the drudgery of this day of sacred

the grand cause of the ruin of the Stewarts was their publication of the Book of Sports, a document having for its tendency (as we formerly saw, pp. 144, 319) the protection of men's liberty against the tyrannical and lawless encroachments of the Puritans. "Ere long," says Dr Lorimer, "the judgments of Heaven pursued the royal family, which had set themselves, or been set by others, against the Lord of the Sabbath; till, after varied calamities, the very line was driven from the British throne."—(*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* p. 22.) This profound writer sees nothing in the *faithlessness* and *despotism* of the Stewarts that could lead to their downfall: to account for the decapitation of Charles I., and the Revolution of 1688, he is obliged to bring the offended "Lord of the Sabbath" upon the stage!—True, there was bad policy as well as anti-Puritanism (for it would be erroneous to say anti-Judaism) in publishing the Book of Sports, and Charles enforced in an arbitrary and indefensible manner the reading of this document from the pulpits of the Church of England; so that the *natural* consequences of impolicy and of the arbitrary spirit displayed on this and *many other* occasions ensued. But this is nothing to the purpose in a Sabbatarian point of view: had Charles forced the clergy to denounce, in spite of their own convictions, the pious practice of burning old women as witches, he would have excited the hostility and religious horror of the Puritans quite as much as he did by punishing refusal to proclaim that his subjects were at liberty to refresh themselves with lawful sports on Sunday afternoons.

The remarks previously made in these pages,* on the gratuitous assumption of the Sabbatarians that the Deity works miracles for them

rest, they fly for relief to their ordinary occupations."—(*Practical View of Christianity*, ch. iv., sect. 2.)

This is a vivid picture of the condition of men who have been put upon a wrong way of observing the Christian Sabbath. The phenomena, it is true, are usually ascribed to corruption of man's nature, and his consequent aversion to all that is good. But it would be as reasonable to give us husks to eat, and to accuse us of repugnance to all that is good for food when we turned away from them with disgust; for, with naturally-constituted people, it is as truly a departure from nature to spend Sunday in the Puritanical way, as to feed upon things ill adapted to the tastes, necessities, and digestive apparatus of man. And even when food is suitable, "*enough*" of it, we know, "*is as good as a feast.*" See the Quarterly Review, vol. xlv., p. 91.

The following is another picture, shewing the influence of Puritanical Sabbath-observance on the temper of some of its votaries:—

" Yet some a Sabbath galls, o'er-strictly set,
 (As hounds, kept long at walk, in kennel fret),
 And then the silent niece, the meek-eyed wife,
 Shrink from the prelude growl of coming strife,
 As, 'neath the thraldoms of a tedious day,
 Resolves of duty, one by one, give way.
 Even thou, the saccharine of all week-day men—
 Confess, my friend—art somewhat acid then!
 Oft, too, on minds not abstract quite, nor pure,
 Long-stretched devotions that but ill endure,
 Slander, who thrives on leisure unemployed,
 Slander drops in, to fill the uneasy void;
 And duly makes, if not in holiest guise,
 Her Sabbath-day a day of sacrifice!"

Rhymed Plea for Tolerance, p. 114.

* See pp. 362-5.

as he used to do for Moses and Elijah, are quite as applicable here as in the former place : the question recurs—Among all the accidents upon railways, how do you distinguish those which are specially brought about by the hand of “the Lord of the Sabbath,” from such as happen in the regular course of his providence? How can you tell whether a certain railway-carriage is shattered in consequence of some weakness of an axle or a sleeper, or is disabled like the chariots of the Egyptians by “the Lord’s taking off their wheels”?* If such questions be thought profane, let the blame rest upon those who by their profane arrogance compel the putting of them.

The presumption of the fanatics who imagine themselves to be admitted into the secret counsels of the Almighty, is effectively reprobated by Archbishop Whately in his Charge on *The Right Use of National Afflictions*, delivered, in September 1848, to the clergy of the dioceses of Dublin and Kildare. He says:—

“It is true, that according to the extraordinary or miraculous dispensations of the Most High, transgressions *have* been visited with temporal judgments that had no *natural* connection with their offences.

“The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah for their wickedness,—the plagues sent on the Egyptians,—the defeat of the Israelites in war, when they had fallen into idolatry,—and indeed the general course of the divine government of *that peculiar* people,—are among the instances recorded in the Old Testament that are of this description.

“And, under the Gospel dispensation, though this was far from being then the usual course of the divine government, a few instances of the same kind are recorded : such as the sudden death of Ananias and Sapphira, and the blindness inflicted on Elymas the sorcerer.

“But in reference to all such instances of what is called the extraordinary or miraculous interference of Providence for the punishment of sin, it will be easy for you, and also very necessary, to point out to your hearers that the connection between the sin and the punishment, is, in these cases, what never can be *known*, except by express divine *revelation*, and is to be declared only by an inspired servant of the Lord. How do we know that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was a judgment for their wickedness? *Because* we are expressly informed of this in the Holy Scriptures. How do we know that the locusts and the storms which desolated Egypt, and the plague which cut off their first-born, were a consequence of their retaining the Israelites in bondage? or that Korah and his company were swallowed up by the earthquake, as a judgment for having ‘provoked the Lord’? or that the sudden death of Ananias was inflicted on him for having tempted the Holy Spirit? Evidently we know this only because Moses, in the one case, and Peter, in the other, by divine authority, declared the sin, and *foretold* the penalty.

“But shall any one of us—you may observe to your people—shall any one of us, uninspired men, presume to pronounce judgment on those who are cut off by sudden death, or who are visited by such calamities as an earthquake, a famine, or a pestilence? Shall we

* Exod. xiv. 25.

take upon ourselves to declare the counsels of the Most High, when He has *not* revealed them? and, in defiance of our Master's express warning, proclaim that these men *were* sinners above those who have escaped such a fate?

“You should warn your people against listening to those false prophets, who dare to give out ‘Thus saith the Lord, when the Lord hath not spoken.’ Whatever high pretensions they may make, it is not piety, but the most daring *impiety*, thus to mimic the voice of God's inspired messengers, and to come forward, without any divine commission, setting forth their own fancies as revelations from Heaven. It is not wisdom from above, but gross ignorance of *both* the Volumes which the same divine Author has opened for our instruction,—the Volume of *Nature*, and the Volume of *Revelation*,—that leads men thus to confound together the ordinary and the extraordinary dispensations of His Providence. *Some* design, no doubt, the Allwise Governor of the world must have, in all his dispensations, whether of sorrow or of joy. He sends want, and He sends abundance,—He allots affliction, and temporal deliverance and prosperity, not at random, but according to some fitness which He perceives in the respective parties, to be the recipients of these dispensations.

“The hardships undergone by the Apostles, they were exposed to, we may be assured, for some good reason: and so also, health, plenty, and every kind of temporal success, are doubtless bestowed with some wise design, on those who obtain such advantages. But when He has not thought fit to reveal *what* his designs are, it is not for us, short-sighted mortals, to pronounce upon them, and presumptuously to usurp the office of his prophets. ‘Wherefore judge nothing,’ says the Apostle, ‘before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts! and *then* shall every man have his praise of God.’ . . .

“The chief practical effect of these denunciations is, as experience but too plainly shews, to set men upon judging their neighbours instead of themselves. Most of you can bear witness that the generality of those who proclaim that some national sin has called down, or is likely to call down, a national judgment, seldom or never attribute this sin to themselves, but to some party, church, or sect to which they are hostile. Or, if they take any blame to themselves, it is for being too lenient and tolerant towards the faults of their opponents. It is the sin of those who profess, or who encourage, or who tolerate, some false or heretical faith—different from their own,—it is the sin of their rulers in advocating ungodly measures,—it is the sin of this or that party, opposed to their own;—these you will always find represented as the national sins which are calling down the divine vengeance. These persons call loudly for reformation; but it is their neighbours, not themselves, that are to be reformed.

“And this accounts for the ready *reception* that this doctrine often meets with, and the *popularity* enjoyed by its advocates. For the natural man is far more quicksighted to the faults, real or supposed, of others, and especially of those in any way opposed to him, than to his own; and far more ready to blame himself for over-tenderness towards his neighbour than for self-partiality. To examine carefully and candidly one's own heart and life, preparatory to that great and

final examination at the Day of Judgment, is far less agreeable, though a far more profitable task, than to criticise the conduct of our rulers, — of our countrymen,—or of the rest of the world.”*

* Pages 12–15, 17, 18.—Selden in like manner observes :—“ We cannot tell what is a judgment of God; 'tis presumption to take upon us to know. In time of plague we know we want health, and therefore we pray to God to give us health; in time of war we know we want peace, and therefore we pray to God to give us peace. Commonly we say a judgment falls upon a man for something in him we cannot abide. An example we have in King James, concerning the death of Henry IV. of France. One said he was killed for his wenching; another said he was killed for turning his religion. No, says King James (who could not abide fighting), he was killed for permitting duels in his kingdom.”—(*Table Talk*, art. JUDGMENTS.)

Even Baxter seems to have forgotten the lesson from the tower of Siloam (Luke xiii. 4, 5); for he records with surprise that in the Great Fire of London “the houses of the most just and godly men no more escaped than the rest, even where God was daily called upon and worshipped! No, nor the churches, where many holy, excellent men had been famous, fruitful preachers, and where the bodies of thousands of true saints had been buried.”—(*Works*, vol. xi., p. 503.)

With the progress of science came juster views of the method of God's government (see *ante*, p. 69); Newton's *Principia* made havoc of prodigies and witchcraft, and we learn from Pope's *Essay on Man* that in the next generation the laws of nature were as fully recognised among the educated as they are at the present day :—

“ Think we, like some weak prince, th' Eternal Cause
Prone for his fav'rites to reverse his laws?
Shall burning *Ætna*, if a sage requires,
Forget to thunder, and recal her fires?
On air or sea new motions be imprest,
Oh blameless *Bethel*! to relieve thy breast?
When the loose mountain trembles from on high,
Shall gravitation cease, if you go by?”

Essay on Man, Ep. IV.

On the subject of this Note, see, farther, Baxter's *Works*, vol. ix., p. 212; Dr Spencer's *Discourse concerning Prodigies*, 2d ed., p. 348 (London, 1665); Bishop Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*, Part III., sections 19 and 20 (quoted in Chambers's *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, vol. i., p. 448); Cato's *Letters* (by Thomas Gordon), No. 52, Nov. 11, 1721, “Of Divine Judgments—the Wickedness and Absurdity of applying them to Men and Events;” Butler's *Analogy*, part i., ch. ii.; Michaelis's *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. i., p. 196; D'Israeli's *Inquiry into the Character of James I.*, in his *Miscellanies of Literature*, p. 333; Whately's *Essays on the Errors of Romanism*, &c., 4th ed., p. 18, and his *Lessons on Christian Evidences*, Lesson viii., § 3, 4; George Combe's *Constitution of Man*, and *On the Relation between Science and Scripture*; the introduction to Carlyle's *Cromwell*; Samuel Bailey's *Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions*, &c., 2d ed., pp. 197–218, where there is an admirable essay “On Inattention to the Dependence of Causes and Effects in Moral Conduct;” and a pamphlet entitled “The Cholera no Judgment! The Efficacy, Philosophy, and Practical Tendency of the Prayer by the Archbishop of Canterbury, ordered to be used during the Prevalence of Cholera, examined;” London, 1849. See also *ante*, pp. 293, 313.

NOTE N, page 13.

The Scottish Memorials against Sunday Trains.

We have already seen how forced and hollow was the show, created by the Sabbath Alliance, of wide-spread enthusiasm against Sunday trains,*—and how little that body was sympathised with by the generality of those who, by their intelligence and knowledge, naturally give the tone to public opinion in Scotland.†

The memorials which supplied the directors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company with so convenient a pretext for giving out that public opinion had imposed upon them the duty of abandoning the conveyance of passengers on Sundays,‡ were the fruit of clerical agitation, at the instance of the Alliance, throughout the country, but chiefly among the ignorant in remote districts, including the Highlands and Islands, whose inhabitants are for the most part ludicrously incompetent to judge whether Sunday trains are right or wrong, and, when they actually wrote the names appended to the memorials, were usually made to believe that the running of those trains was the first step to the utter abolition of the Sabbath.§

The perusal of a pamphlet entitled *The Church and her Accuser in the Far North, by Investigator*,|| or of an article headed "Puritanism in the Highlands," in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxxix., p. 307 (Sept. 1851), will enable any one to judge what value ought to be attached to expressions of theological or other opinion by the Celtic population of Scotland. Nobody who has read either of these publications can feel the slightest surprise in perusing the following report, which was brought up in the House of Commons on 19th February 1850, from the Committee on Public Petitions:—

"Your Committee have, from time to time, published, for the information of members, the orders and practice of the House, which regulate the framing and presentation of public petitions. Amongst other rules are the following:—Every petition must be signed by at

* *Ante*, pp. 358–362; 389, 409–410.

† Pp. 400–404, 410.

‡ P. 361.

§ "Not they that are wisest at a distance," says Baxter, "but they that are nearest the people, and are always with them, are most likely to prevail to make disciples of them, and bring them to their mind: so great an advantage it is to talk daily and confidently to ignorant souls, when there is none to talk against them, and to make their folly known."—(*Works*, vol. xv., p. 408.)

"The generality of mankind," says Archdeacon Daubeny, "are governed by words and names, often without, and sometimes even against their knowledge; whilst the ignorant multitude are led backward and forward, this way and that way, like a drove of cattle, by the cry to which their drivers have familiarised them. This has been the case from the beginning of the world to the present day, and must be the case so long as men continue to be what they are—more disposed to act than to think."—(*Guide to the Church*, Discourse vii., p. 99.)

|| Glasgow, 1850.—The author of this pamphlet is a clergyman who spent his youth in the Far North, but has since been happily transferred to a parish in one of the southern counties.

least one person on the skin or sheet on which the petition is written. Every petition must be signed by the parties whose names are appended thereto by their names or marks, and by no one else, except in case of incapacity by sickness.

“Your Committee regret to observe, that, notwithstanding such publicity, and that they have repeatedly brought under the notice of the House irregularities which they have discovered, a too frequent disregard of the above-mentioned orders still occurs.

“Your Committee have had before them the following petitions for abolition of Sunday labour in the Post-Office :

“From inhabitants of Stornoway, purporting to be signed by 646 persons ; of these names, only a very small number appear to your Committee to be genuine.

“From inhabitants of the parish of Knock, county of Ross, purporting to be signed by 1037 persons ; in this case, it appears to your Committee that not more than the first 10 signatures have been written by the individuals bearing the respective names, those following being on different sheets, and each sheet written by one and the same person.

“From inhabitants of the parish of Lochcarron, county of Ross, purporting to be signed by 931 persons ; of these very few appear to be signed by the parties whose names are attached.

“From inhabitants of the burgh of Oban, purporting to be signed by 845 persons ; of these a large proportion are obviously not in the handwriting of the persons whose names are appended.

“Your Committee hope that members, by a more careful examination of the petitions intrusted to them, will co-operate with the Committee in their attempts to guard the right of petition from abuse.”

About a month afterwards the committee found it necessary to make a second report on the same class of Sabbatarian petitions about the Post-Office. The examples selected for exposure on this occasion were “those from Logie Easter, Shisken, and about a dozen of other barbarous places, the bulk of signatures to which, as in the cases formerly enumerated, and indeed the petitions of the party generally, are forgeries or fabrications. The offenders, however,” adds the *Scotsman* (13th March 1850), “are long since seared and hardened by previous convictions. The few of their organs that have not carefully omitted all mention of the Committee’s report, make light of the exposures. Their Aberdeen paper, for instance, says,—‘We are quite satisfied of the correctness of the fact stated by the Parliamentary Committee, that there are very few *bona fide* signatures attached to these petitions.’ But that, he argues, shews nothing more than the ‘*deplorable ignorance*’ of the alleged petitioners. Supposing, for the moment, that the accused persons are entitled to plead ignorance, it is surely hard that the whole community should submit to the sway of what is admitted to be its ‘deplorably ignorant’ portion.”

Some years ago, I examined a Sabbatarian memorial which had been presented to a Scottish railway company by the inhabitants of a district the centre of which is only about six miles from Edinburgh ; yet, even to that document, got up in a comparatively civilized part of the country, there were scores of signatures written by one hand.

Previously to that time, the following article appeared in the *Glasgow Saturday Evening Post*:—"Sir Andrew Agnew and his friends refer to the number of the memorials and other representations against the trains. This is tender ground for the party to tread upon. We would willingly draw a veil over the disgraceful means adopted by them to get up these documents, and the infamy which must for ever attach to them from the exposures which have taken place. But truth compels us to show, especially to distant shareholders, the value of such pretended expressions of opinion. On the occasion already referred to in 1842, when a pile of these documents was laid on the table at a meeting of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Company, Mr M'Neil, a director, upon opening one of the memorials, was astonished to observe that large portions of the signatures were written in one and the same hand, without a particle of authority being produced for such an act;—in other words, that the signatures were forgeries. This he proclaimed to the meeting. The charge, after being loudly denied, was investigated and proved to be but too well founded. It was afterwards taken up and probed to the bottom by one of our contemporaries, who brought to light the monstrous fact, almost incredible had it not been well attested, that in one memorial alone one-third of the signatures were forged, 'some of the persons having been dead five years, and others never having been heard of.' Those who entertain any doubts upon the subject are referred to the columns of the *Scotch Reformers' Gazette* for the months of May and June (and particularly 25th June) 1842, where they will find most damning proof, followed up by an admission of the fact. Nor, unfortunately for the cause of religion and morality, was this a solitary instance; for the deputy-chairman, Mr Hamilton, declared that the whole of those memorials which he had been able to examine were of the same disgraceful character. This exposure at once explained to him the cause of the great anxiety and repeated efforts which had been made (and which had appeared to him so unaccountable), to get the papers withdrawn before their *prestige* was taken away by too close an inspection. Farther, we have strong grounds for believing that a similar charge may be brought against the memorials presented to the shareholders in 1846, when the trains were discontinued on the strength of this demonstration of 'public opinion.' Of course, no one who knows Sir Andrew Agnew for a moment supposes that he personally was cognizant of, or would have sanctioned such proceedings; but while he identifies himself with parties using such pious frauds, he must not be surprised if no very nice distinction is made between him and his adherents. But let us put the most charitable construction upon the matter, and assume that the signatures were authorised to be made. What does this prove? Scotland is accustomed to boast of the extent of education given to her sons and daughters. But when we find Sir Andrew compelled to resort to distant and obscure parishes in the Highlands and islands of Scotland to fill his petitions with the names of persons so devoid even of the rudiments of education as not to be able to write their own names,—nine-tenths of them having probably never seen a railway, if they ever even heard of one,—is this not a tacit admission that he must have found the great bulk of the intelligent, well-informed classes of his countrymen opposed to him, before

he would attempt to bolster up his cause by such support? There are exceptions no doubt, but if our statement is disputed, we challenge Sir Andrew to an examination of these precious documents from first to last, and we have a notion that some rather curious revelations will be made. Indeed, we have no hesitation in saying that we think many of the signatures to the monster petition to Parliament last year, such as six or eight Queen Victorias, seventeen Dukes of Wellington, and twenty-five Punches, quite as genuine and affording quite as correct an indication of public opinion as many of those attached to the memorials against the Sunday trains. If some of these Ossianic productions could find a voice, they might aptly describe themselves by a slight alteration of Campbell's line:—

‘Our names are a hundred—our hands they are *one*.’

And yet it is such documents as these, manufactured, as numbers of them were, at headquarters—being literally word for word the same—and sent down to country parishes to be hawked about for signature, as has been partially admitted, and yet containing sometimes only 6 or 8 names,—it is such documents as these that the ‘friends of the Sabbath’ assure us represent moral and religious Scotland! And it is against shovelfuls of such rubbish that they tell us the solemn and deliberate representations of the constituted authorities of the great communities of the country are to weigh as nothing!”

I have perused in the *Scotch Reformers' Gazette* the whole controversy above referred to, and can corroborate what is here stated respecting it. After some tortuous evasion, and even a plain denial of guilt, a reverend gentleman was convicted not only of adding or getting added many false signatures to the memorial, but of forging a letter to the editor in the name of a person made to appear as confessing the crime and exonerating the true perpetrator! Messrs J. Haldane and William Ferguson, two skilful engravers, and Mr Archibald G. Macdonald, lithographer to Her Majesty, all of Glasgow, after comparing the reverend gentleman's avowed productions with the pretended manuscript of his exonerator, reported that they were unanimously and decidedly of opinion that although there was obviously an attempt to disguise the handwriting, and so to falsify it, yet the letter in question was in the handwriting, not of the man by whom it professed to be written, but of the reverend gentleman whom it was designed to whitewash, and whose name I here omit, in the hope that he has long since repented of his sin. “We have the strongest reasons,” they added, “for coming to this conclusion, and these we are ready to give, if required.”

The report of the engravers was published in the *Scotch Reformers' Gazette* of 25th June 1852, with the following editorial remarks:—“After this we leave the Rev. Mr ——— to his own meditations. If he or any of his friends are dissatisfied with this truly clenching evidence against him, we are willing to submit the documents to the inspection and decision of any other respectable engravers in the kingdom, *selected by themselves*, and by the result we are ready to stand or fall.” The accuracy of the judgment which had been pronounced was, however, left unchallenged.

The public spirit displayed by the editor of the *Gazette* on this occasion is worthy of all praise, and I can bear witness to the unimpeachable fairness with which he conducted the controversy.

After the foregoing exposition of facts, will anybody say that Dr M'Crie is blameless in having written as follows in his *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew*, p. 375? He is speaking of the above-mentioned meeting of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, held on 22d February 1842:—

“There were,” says he, “213 memorials from public bodies, including about 40,000 names, presented against the unholy proposal of Sabbath traffic, while only six other bodies were hardy enough to come forward on the other side. . . . Irritated at the immense phalanx of memorials laid on their table, the supporters of Sabbath traffic, headed by Mr Alexander M'Neil, charged their opponents with unfair methods in procuring them, and denounced the signatures as forgeries. *It is hardly necessary to say that the only circumstance which gave AN AIR OF PLAUSIBILITY to this charge was, that in rural districts, some people, on coming forward to sign, had foolishly employed one individual to save them the trouble of writing their names*”!!

I submit that it was the duty of Dr M'Crie, before writing thus, to inquire diligently into the facts of the case, instead of implicitly adopting *the statements made by the culprit* in a letter which he published in the *Witness* of 2d March 1842. But the purpose of the *Memoirs* being to glorify Sir Andrew Agnew and his adherents, everything conducive to that end is at once made welcome, while the sayings and doings of “God's enemies” are, with equal readiness, set down as, of course, deceitful and impious.*

Strangers may well be astonished to learn that “public bodies” are so numerous in Scotland as to be capable of furnishing 213 memorials against Sunday trains. But the mystery will disappear when it is understood that under this imposing appellation Dr M'Crie ranks the *ecclesiastical* bodies, great and small, (including congregations, kirk-

* “An ecclesiastical historian,” Le Clerc satirically observes, “ought to adhere inviolably to this maxim, that whatever can be favourable to heretics is false, and whatever can be said against them is true; while, on the other hand, all that does honour to the orthodox is unquestionable, and every thing that can do them discredit is surely a lie. He must suppress, too, with care, or at least extenuate as far as possible, the errors and vices of those whom the orthodox are accustomed to respect, whether they know any thing about them or no; and must exaggerate, on the contrary, the mistakes and faults of the heretodox to the utmost of his power. He must remember that any orthodox writer is a competent witness against a heretic, and is to be trusted implicitly on his word; while a heretic is never to be believed against the orthodox, and has honour enough done him, in allowing him to speak against his own side, or in favour of our own. It is thus that the Centuriators of Magdeburg, and thus that Cardinal Baronius have written; each of their works having by this means acquired an immortal glory with its own party. But it must be owned that they are not the earliest, and that they have only imitated most of their predecessors in this plan of writing. For many ages, men had only sought in ecclesiastical antiquity, not what was really to be found there, but what they conceived ought to be there for the good of their own party.”—(*Parrhasiana*, vol. i., p. 168; quoted by Hallam, *Introd. to the Lit. of Europe*, vol. ii., p. 132.)

sessions, and deacons' courts,) which abound in this favoured and highly enlightened corner of Christendom.

NOTE O, page 15.

Protestant Principle and Protestant Practice.

“Mild and genteel people,” says the Rev. Sydney Smith, “do not like the idea of persecution, and are advocates for toleration; but then they think it no act of intolerance to deprive Catholics of political power.* The history of all this is, that all men secretly like to punish others for not being of the same opinion with themselves, and that this sort of privation is the only species of persecution, of which the improved feeling and advanced cultivation of the age will admit. Fire and faggot, chains and stone walls, have been clamoured away; nothing remains but to mortify a man's pride, and to limit his resources, and to set a mark upon him, by cutting him off from his fair share of political power. By this receipt insolence is gratified and humanity is not shocked. The gentlest Protestant can see, with dry eyes, Lord Stourton excluded from Parliament, though he would abominate the most distant idea of personal cruelty to Mr Petre. This is only to say that he lives in the nineteenth instead of the sixteenth century, and that he is as intolerant in religious matters as the state of manners existing in his age will permit. Is it not the same spirit which wounds the pride of a fellow-creature on account of his faith, or which casts his body into the flames? Are they any thing else but degrees and modifications of the same principle? The minds of these two men no more differ because they differ in their degrees of punishment, than their bodies differ because one wore a doublet in the time of Mary, and the other wears a coat in the reign of George. I do not accuse them of intentional cruelty and injustice: I am sure there are very many excellent men who would be shocked if they could conceive themselves to be guilty of anything like cruelty; but they innocently give a wrong name to the bad spirit which is within them, and think they are tolerant because they are not as intolerant as they could have been in other times, but cannot be now. *The true spirit is to search after God and for another life with lowliness of heart; to fling down no man's altar, to punish no man's prayer; to heap no penalties and no pains on those solemn supplications which, in divers tongues, and in varied forms, and in temples of a thousand shapes, but with one deep sense of human dependence, men pour forth to God.*

“It is completely untrue that the Catholic religion is what it was three centuries ago, or that it is unchangeable and unchanged. These are mere words, without the shadow of truth to support them. If the

* Or to exclude from Parliament Her Majesty's loyal subjects of the Hebrew faith, and from chairs in universities the very large body of scientific and literary men who, in the exercise of the right, and performance of the duty, of private judgment, interpret Scripture otherwise than the divines who assembled two centuries ago at Westminster to give the Long Parliament their humble advice concerning true religion.

Pope were to address a bull to the kingdom of Ireland excommunicating the Duke of York, and cutting him off from the succession, for his Protestant effusion in the House of Lords, he would be laughed at as a lunatic in all the Catholic chapels in Dublin. The Catholics would not now burn Protestants as heretics. In many parts of Europe, Catholics and Protestants worship in one church—Catholics at eleven, Protestants at one; they sit in the same Parliament, are elected to the same office, live together without hatred or friction, under equal laws. Who can see and know these things, and say that the Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged?

“I have often endeavoured to reflect upon the causes which, from time to time, raised such a clamour against the Catholics, and I think the following are among the most conspicuous:

“1. Historical recollections of the cruelties inflicted upon the Protestants.

“2. Theological differences.

“3. A belief that the Catholics are unfriendly to liberty.

“4. That their morality is not good.

“5. That they meditate the destruction of the Protestant Church.

“6. An unprincipled clamour by men who have no sort of belief in the danger of emancipation, but who make use of No Popery as a political engine.

“7. A mean and selfish spirit of denying to others the advantages we ourselves enjoy.

“8. A vindictive spirit or love of punishing others, who offend our self-love by presuming, on important points, to entertain opinions opposite to our own.

“9. Stupid compliance with the opinions of the majority.

“10. To these I must, in justice and candour, add, as a tenth cause, a real apprehension on the part of honest and reasonable men, that it is dangerous to grant further concessions to the Catholics.

“To these various causes I shall make a short reply, in the order in which I have placed them.

“1. Mere historical recollections are very miserable reasons for the continuation of penal and incapacitating laws, and one side has as much to recollect as the other.

“2. The State has nothing to do with questions purely theological.

“3. It is ill to say this in a country whose free institutions were founded by Catholics, and it is often said by men who care nothing about free institutions.

“4. It is not true.

“5. Make their situation so comfortable, that it will not be worth their while to attempt an enterprise so desperate.

“6. This is an unfair political trick, because it is too dangerous: it is spoiling the table in order to win the game.

“The 7th and 8th causes exercise a great share of influence in every act of intolerance. The 9th must, of course, comprehend the greatest number.

“10. Of the existence of such a class of No Poperists as this, it would be the height of injustice to doubt, but I confess it excites in me a very great degree of astonishment. . . .

“You talk of their [the Catholics'] abuse of the Reformation—but

is there any end to the obloquy and abuse with which the Catholics are upon every point, and from every quarter, assailed? Is there any one folly, vice, or crime, which the blind fury of Protestants does not lavish upon them? and do you suppose all this is to be heard in silence, and without retaliation? Abuse as much as you please, if you are going to emancipate; but if you intend to do nothing for the Catholics but to call them names, you must not be out of temper if you receive a few ugly appellations in return.

“The great object of men who love party better than truth, is to have it believed that the Catholics alone have been persecutors; but what can be more flagrantly unjust than to take our notions of history only from the conquering and triumphant party? If you think the Catholics have not their Book of Martyrs as well as the Protestants, take the following enumeration of some of their most learned and careful writers:—

“The whole number of Catholics who have suffered death in England for the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion since the Reformation:

Henry VIII.	59
Elizabeth	204
James I.	25
Charles I. and Commonwealth	}	23
Charles II.	8
Total	<hr/> 319

“Henry VIII., with consummate impartiality, burnt three Protestants and hanged four Catholics for different errors in religion on the same day, and at the same place. Elizabeth burnt two Dutch Anabaptists for some theological tenets, July 22, 1575, Fox the martyr-ologist vainly pleading with the queen in their favour. In 1579, the same Protestant queen cut off the hand of Stubbs, the author of a tract against popish connection, of Singleton, the printer, and Page, the disperser of the book. Camden saw it done. Warburton properly says it exceeds in cruelty any thing done by Charles I. On the 4th of June, Mr Elias Thacker and Mr John Capper, two ministers of the Brownist persuasion, were hanged at St Edmund’s-bury, for dispersing books against the Common Prayer. With respect to the great part of the Catholic victims, the law was fully and literally executed: after being hanged up, they were cut down alive, dismembered, ripped up, and their bowels burnt before their faces; after which they were beheaded and quartered. The time employed in this butchery was very considerable, and, in one instance, lasted more than half an hour.

“The un candid excuse for all this is, that the greater part of these men were put to death for political, not for religious crimes. That is, a law is first passed, making it high treason for a priest to exercise his function in England, and so, when he is caught and burnt, this is not religious persecution, but an offence against the state. We are, I hope, all too busy to need any answer to such childish, un candid reasoning as this.

“The total number of those who suffered capitally in the reign of

Elizabeth, is stated by Dodd in his Church History,* to be one hundred and ninety-nine; further inquiries made their number to be two hundred and four: fifteen of these were condemned for denying the queen's supremacy; one hundred and twenty-six for the exercise of priestly functions; and the others for being reconciled to the Catholic faith, or for aiding and assisting priests. In this list, no person is included who was executed for any plot, real or imaginary, except eleven, who suffered for the pretended plot of Rheims; a plot, which, Dr Milner justly observes, was so daring a forgery, that even Camden allows the sufferers to have been political victims. Besides these, mention is made, in the same work, of ninety Catholic priests, or laymen, who died in prison in the same reign. 'About the same time,' he says, 'I find fifty gentlemen lying prisoners in York Castle; most of them perished there, of vermin, famine, hunger, thirst, dirt, damp, fever, whipping, and broken hearts, the inseparable circumstances of prisons in those days. These were every week, for a twelve-month together, dragged by main force to hear the established service performed in the Castle chapel.' The Catholics were frequently, during the reign of Elizabeth, tortured in the most dreadful manner. In order to extort answers from Father Campian, he was laid on the rack, and his limbs stretched a little, to shew him, as the executioner termed it, what the rack was. He persisted in his refusal; then for several days successively, the torture was increased, and on the last two occasions, he was so cruelly rent and torn, that he expected to expire under the torment. While under the rack, he called continually upon God. In the reign of the Protestant Edward VI., John Knell was burnt to death, and the year after, George Parry was burnt also. In 1575, two Protestants, Peterson and Turwort (as before stated), were burnt to death by Elizabeth. In 1589, under the same queen, Lewis, a Protestant, was burnt to death at Norwich, where Francis Kett was also burnt for religious opinions in 1589, under the same great queen; who, in 1591, hanged the Protestant Hacket for heresy, in Cheapside, and put to death Greenwood, Barrow, and Penry, for being *Brownists*. Southwell, a Catholic, was racked ten times during the reign of this sister of bloody Queen Mary. In 1592, Mrs Ward was hanged, drawn, and quartered, for assisting a Catholic priest to escape in a box. Mrs Lyne suffered the same punishment for harbouring a priest; and in 1586, Mrs Clitheroe, who was accused of relieving a priest, and refused to plead, was pressed to death in York Castle; a sharp stone being placed underneath her back.

"Have not Protestants persecuted both Catholics and their fellow Protestants in Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, France, Holland, Sweden, and England? Look to the atrocious punishment of Leighton, under Land, for writing against prelacy: first his ear was cut off, then his nose slit; then the other ear cut off, then whipped, then whipped again. Look to the horrible cruelties exercised by the Pro-

*The total number of sufferers in the reign of Queen Mary, varies, I believe, from 200 in the Catholic to 280 in the Protestant accounts. I recommend all young men who wish to form some notion of what answer the Catholics have to make, to read Milner's 'Letters to a Prebendary,' and to follow the line of reading to which his references lead. They will then learn the importance of that sacred maxim, *Audi alteram partem*."

testant Episcopalians on the Scottish Presbyterians, in the reign of Charles II., of whom 8000 are said to have perished in that persecution. Persecutions of Protestants by Protestants, are amply detailed by Chandler, in his History of Persecution; by Neal, in his History of the Puritans; by Laing, in his History of Scotland; by Penn, in his Life of Fox; and in Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries; which furnishes many very terrible cases of the sufferings of the Anabaptists and Remonstrants. In 1560, the Parliament of Scotland decreed, at one and the same time, the establishment of Calvinism, and the punishment of death against the ancient religion: 'With such indecent haste (says Robertson) did the very persons who had just escaped ecclesiastical tyranny, proceed to imitate their example.' Nothing can be so absurd as to suppose, that in barbarous ages the excesses were all committed by one religious party, and none by the other. The Huguenots of France burnt churches, and hung priests wherever they found them. Froumonteau, one of their own writers, confesses, that in the single province of Dauphiny they killed two hundred and twenty priests, and one hundred and twelve friars. In the Low Countries, wherever Vandemerk, and Sonoi, lieutenants of the Prince of Orange, carried their arms, they uniformly put to death, and in cold blood, all the priests and religious they could lay their hands on. The Protestant Servetus was put to death by the Protestants of Geneva, for denying the doctrine of the Trinity, as the Protestant Gentilis was, on the same score, by those of Berne; add to these, Felix Mans, Rotman, and Barnevald. Of Servetus, Melancthon, the mildest of men, declared that he deserved to have his bowels pulled out, and his body torn to pieces. The last fires of persecution which were lighted in England, were by Protestants. Bartholomew Legate, an Arian, was burnt by order of King James in Smithfield, on the 18th of March 1612; on the 11th of April, in the same year, Edward Weightman was burnt at Lichfield, by order of the Protestant Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; and this man was, *I believe*, the last person who was burnt in England for heresy. There was another condemned to the fire for the same heresy, but as pity was excited by the constancy of these sufferers, it was thought better to allow him to linger on a miserable life in Newgate. Fuller, who wrote in the reign of Charles II., and was a zealous Church of England man, speaking of the burnings in question, says, 'It may appear that God was well pleased with them.'"

The writer proceeds to depict most skilfully, in the manner of Nathan the prophet, the unjust and barbarous usage which the Irish Catholics so long received from the Protestants, under the authority of laws which were not repealed till 1782. He then goes on to observe—

"With such facts as these, the cry of persecution will not do; it is unwise to make it, because it can be so very easily, and so very justly retorted. The business is to forget and forgive, to kiss and be friends, and to say nothing of what has passed; which is to the credit of neither party. There have been atrocious cruelties, and abominable acts of injustice, on both sides. It is not worth while to contend who shed the most blood, or whether (as Dr Sturges objects to Dr Milner) death by fire is worse than hanging or starving in prison. As far as England itself is concerned, the balance may be better preserved.

Cruelties exercised upon the Irish go for nothing in English reasoning; but if it were not uncandid and vexatious to consider Irish persecutions* as part of the case, I firmly believe there have been two Catholics put to death for religious causes in Great Britain for one Protestant who has suffered: not that this proves much, because the Catholics have enjoyed the sovereign power for so few years between this period and the Reformation; and certainly it must be allowed that they were not inactive, during that period, in the great work of pious combustion.

“It is, however, some extenuation of the Catholic excesses, that their religion was the religion of the whole of Europe when the innovation began. They were the ancient lords and masters of faith, before men introduced the practice of thinking for themselves in these matters. The Protestants have less excuse, who claimed the right of innovation, and then turned round upon other Protestants who acted upon the same principle, or upon Catholics who remained as they were, and visited them with all the cruelties from which they had themselves so recently escaped.”†

It is hardly necessary to illustrate farther the way in which Protestants have in practice respected the great principle by which alone the secession of Luther and his followers from the Church of Rome is capable of being vindicated. The Reformers, no doubt, “strenuously contended for the free exercise of private judgment;”‡ but, as we formerly saw, and as the Rev. Sydney Smith so well remarks, it was only for *themselves* that this “free exercise” was demanded or thought proper; nor had they any idea that it was their duty to allow such freedom to the Roman Catholics, the Socinians, or the Baptists.§

* Thurloe writes to Henry Cromwell to catch up some thousand Irish boys to send to the colonies. Henry writes back he has done so; and desires to know whether his Highness would choose as many girls to be caught up: and he adds, ‘doubtless it is a business in which God will appear.’ Suppose *bloody Queen Mary* had caught up and transported three or four thousand Protestant boys and girls from the three Ridings of Yorkshire!!!!!!”

† Letter to the Electors on the Catholic Question; in Works of the Rev. Sydney Smith, ed. 1850, pp. 583-4, 586-590.

“The fact,” says Archbishop Whately, “is, that the disposition of the heart will always in practice predominate either for the better or the worse, over the professed creed; which men will always contrive somehow or other to explain away (before they formally renounce it) when at variance with their habitual temper. Without the sedulous cultivation of a Christian spirit, no doctrinal system can afford any security against the natural tendency to persecution.”—(*Essays on the Errors of Romanism, &c.*, 4th ed., p. 167).

Again: “There is, I believe, no religion existing, respecting which I have not seen an elaborate proof that it leads to mischievous consequences in practice, and that its professors are either likely to be, or, consistently with their principles, ought to be, the worse citizens; and again, I have seen the direct contrary inferred respecting every one of them.”—(*Ib.*, p. 173.)

‡ Cook’s Hist. of the Church of Scotland, vol. iii., p. 65.

§ See *ante*, pp. 378-9, and the previous pages there referred to; also the works named in note §. Farther illustrations of the history of religious liberty, and reflections on the slowness with which its principles have taken root in men’s minds, may be found in Robertson’s History of Charles V., Book xi., *anno* 1555 (vol. iv., p. 185, ed. 1806);—Watson’s History of Philip II., vol. iii., p. 423;—Hallam’s Introduction to the Literature of Europe, 1st ed., vol. i., pp. 513-16, 521-5; ii., 111-116; iii., 102-118; iv., 135, 165;—Dr Cook’s Gene-

Among the very few of them who *practised* as well as *advocated* the principles of religious liberty, were Zuinglius of Zurich,* and Dudith a Hungarian. Dudith, who is characterised by Dr Maclaine as "certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century,"† had a very clear perception of the guilt which his brother-Reformers incurred by persecuting those who differed from them; and he addressed to Beza an expostulation, which, as a clear and cogent plea for the rights of conscience, has never since been surpassed. "You contend," says he, "that Scripture is a perfect rule of faith and practice. But you are all divided about the sense of Scripture, and you have not settled who shall be judge. You say one thing, Stancarus another. You quote Scripture, he quotes Scripture. You reason, he reasons. You require me to believe you. I respect you: but why should I trust you rather than Stancarus?"

ral and Historical View of Christianity. vol. i., p. 437; ii., 144-9; iii., 450-463;—Dr Robert Lee's preface to his translation of the Theses of Erastus touching Excommunication, p. liv.;—Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution, 1614-1661, edited for the Hanserd Knollys Society, with an Historical Introduction by Edward Bean Underhill (London, 1846);—Barelay's Apology for the Quakers, prop. xiv.;—Macaulay's History of England, 5th ed., vol. i., pp. 160, 661;—Brook's History of Religious Liberty, *passim*, but especially vol. i., pp. 213, 220, 269, 271, 285, 286, 288, 290, 323-328;—Brook's Lives of the Puritans;—Tayler's Retrospect of the Religious Life of England, *passim*;—D'Israeli's Curiosities of Literature, 9th ed., vol. vi., p. 1, art. TOLERATION;—Article on Luther in Blackwood's Magazine, May 1853, p. 540;—Dyer's Life of Calvin, ch. x.;—Calvin and Servetus, by the Rev. W. K. Tweedie (Edin. 1846);—Toulmin's Memoirs of Socinus, ch. ii., sect. 3, and ch. iii., sect. 3;—Cox's Life of Melancthon, 2d ed., pp. 509-514;—Orme's Life of Owen, ed. 1826, pp. 72-81;—Elrington's Life of Usher, p. 73;—Lord King's Life of Locke, ed. 1830, vol. ii., p. 68;—Bishop Hoadly's sermons "Of Judging One Another," and "Of Persecution on Account of Religion," in his Works, vol. iii., pp. 716, 763;—Dr Ibbot on "The Benefits and Advantages of Private Judgment," in the Boyle Lectures, vol. ii., p. 826-7;—Archdeacon Blackburne's Works, vol. iv., p. 59;—Six Letters on Intolerance (attributed to Sir George Colebrook, Bart.) (London, 1791);—Paley's Moral Philosophy, B. vi., ch. x.;—Vinet's Mémoire en Faveur de la Liberté des Cultes, ch. xix.;—Dr Aikin's Essay on Cant, appended to his Life, vol. ii., p. 449;—Edinburgh Review, vol. xxvi., p. 52; xxvii., 164; xliv., 493; lxxvi., 395; xci., 525; xcii., 347;—Quarterly Review, vol. x., p. 97; xiv., 238;—The chapters entitled "The History of Religion" in Knight's Pictorial History of England;—Encyclopædia Britannica, 7th ed., vol. xiii., p. 415;—Penny Cyclopædia, vol. ix., p. 22, art. DISSENTERS;—Martineau's Rational of Religious Enquiry, 3d ed., p. 50;—Bailey's Essay on the Formation of Opinions, particularly sect. viii.; and Essay on the Pursuit of Truth, 2d ed., pp. 184, 227;—the Rev. Joseph Blanco White's Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy;—Whately's Essay on Persecution, being the fifth on the Errors of Romanism, &c.;—Notes, by the same writer, "On the Supposed Duty of using Coercion in Matters of Faith," and "On Monopoly of Civil Rights by the Professors of the True Faith," in his Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c., 2d edition, pp. 201, 211, and particularly p. 223;—M'Crie's Life of M'Crie, pp. 381-3;—Sir William Hamilton's Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, pp. 487, 491;—the Duke of Argyle's "Presbytery Examined," 2d ed., p. 23;—Lewis on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, p. 293;—the Rev. George Armstrong's "Infallibility Not Possible, Involuntary Error Not Culpable," 2d ed., pp. 65, 117, 140, 147-152, 159;—and Joseph Adshead on The Progress of the Religious Sentiment (Lond. 1852), *passim*.

* See his Life by Hess, translated by Lucy Aikin, pp. 148, 159-161, 240. The passages may be seen in M'Crie's Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 472, 473.

† Note to his translation of Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., cent. xvi., sect. ix.

You say he is a heretic; but the Papists say you are both heretics. Shall I believe them? They quote historians and fathers, so do you. To whom do you all address yourselves? Where is the judge? You say the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets: but you say I am no prophet; and I say you are not one. Who is to be judge? I love liberty as well as you. You have broken off your yoke; allow me to break mine. Having freed yourselves from the tyranny of Popish prelates, why do you turn ecclesiastical tyrants yourselves, and treat others with barbarity and cruelty for only doing what you set them an example to do? You contend that your lay hearers, the magistrates, and not you, are to be blamed; for it is they who banish and burn for heresy. I know you make this excuse: but tell me, have not you instilled such principles into their ears? Have they done anything more than put in practice the doctrine that you taught them? Have you not told them how glorious it was to defend the faith? Have you not been the constant panegyrists of such princes as have depopulated whole districts for heresy? Do you not daily teach, that they who appeal from your Confessions to Scripture ought to be punished by the secular power? It is impossible for you to deny this. Does not all the world know that you are a set of demagogues, or (to speak more mildly) a sort of tribunes, and that the magistrates do nothing but exhibit in public what you teach in private? You try to justify the banishment of Ochin, and the execution of others, and you seem to wish Poland would follow your example. God forbid! When you talk of your Augsburg confession and your Helvetic creed, and your unanimity, and your fundamental truths, I keep thinking of the sixth commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill.'**

In England, the persecution of the Nonconformists by Elizabeth and James I. naturally led to discussion of the rights of the magistrate touching the religious faith and practice of the subjects, and drew plenty of expostulation, founded on more or less tenable grounds, from the oppressed. Mr Orme has claimed for the Brownists of James's reign the honour of entertaining "*the first correct views of religious liberty*;"† but the groundlessness of this claim (evident enough from what has just been said) is demonstrated by Dr M'Crie in the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor* for 1821, where it is shewn, moreover, that the views of toleration commonly entertained by the early Independents were less remarkable for liberality than Mr Orme, and others after him, have affirmed.‡

* Quoted in Martineau's *Rationale of Religious Enquiry*, 3d ed., p. 51. The same mode of illustrating the foundation of religious liberty is very successfully adopted by Dr Owen in his *Works*, vol. xv., pp. 78-79, 224, Russell's ed.

† *Life of Owen*, p. 74. See their writings in the above-mentioned volume of *Tracts* reprinted for the Hanserd Knollys Society.

‡ See Dr M'Crie's *Miscellaneous Writings*, pp. 468-486, 502-513; where the articles in the *Christian Instructor* are reprinted. For additional evidence against the claim of priority for the Brownists, see Toulmin's *Memoirs of Socinus*, p. 115; Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, quoted *ante*, p. 249; and Hallam, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 112-116, and vol. iii., p. 103. Sully writes liberally in his *Memoirs*, B. xvii., vol. iii., p. 312, Edin. ed., 1819.

A like ill-founded claim is made by Mr Bancroft, in his *History of the United States*, chap. ix., for Roger Williams of Salem, in New England (who published, in 1644, a tract of which some account is given in that chapter), to the honour of having been "the first person in modern Christendom to assert

The writings of these sectaries on toleration, along with those of Hales, Chillingworth, Milton, Taylor, Baxter, Howe, and Barclay, paved the way for Locke's immortal *Letters*, quoted so frequently in the present volume, and which are still the best of our many excellent treatises on religious liberty. Among the distinguished followers of Locke during the 18th century may be enumerated Hoadly, Ibbot,

in its plenitude the doctrine of the liberty of conscience—the equality of opinions before the law; and in its defence," continues Mr Bancroft, "he was the harbinger of Milton,—the precursor and the superior of Jeremy Taylor. For Taylor limited his toleration to a few Christian sects; the philanthropy of Williams compassed the earth: Taylor favoured partial reform, commended lenity, argued for forbearance, and entered a special plea in behalf of each tolerable sect; Williams would permit persecution of no opinion, of no religion, leaving heresy unharmed by law, and orthodoxy unprotected by the terrors of penal statutes. Taylor still clung to the necessity of positive regulations enforcing religion and eradicating error; he resembled the poets, who, in their folly, first declare their hero to be invulnerable, and then clothe him in earthly armour! Williams was willing to leave Truth alone, in her own panoply of light, believing that if, in the ancient feud between Truth and Error, the employment of force could be entirely abrogated, Truth would have much the best of the bargain. It is the custom of mankind to award high honours to the successful inquirer into the laws of nature, to those who advance the bounds of human knowledge. We praise the man who first analysed the air, or resolved water into its elements, or drew the lightning from the clouds; even though the discoveries may have been as much the fruits of time as of genius. A moral principle has a much wider and nearer influence on human happiness; nor can any discovery of truth be of more direct benefit to society, than that which establishes a perpetual religious peace, and spreads tranquillity through every community and every bosom. If Copernicus is held in perpetual reverence, because, on his death-bed, he published to the world that the sun is the centre of our system; if the name of Kepler is preserved in the annals of human excellence, for his sagacity in detecting the laws of the planetary motion; if the genius of Newton has been almost adored for dissecting a ray of light, and weighing heavenly bodies as in a balance,—let there be for the name of Roger Williams at least some humble place among those who have advanced moral science, and made themselves the benefactors of mankind." For advocating the liberty of conscience, this excellent man (whose merit is but little diminished by the fact of his not having been the *first* to proclaim it, and to respect it in others) was banished from Salem by men who themselves had lately fled from persecution in England.

Sir James Mackintosh, again, in his Review of the Causes of the Revolution of 1688 (*Miscellaneous Works*, ed. 1851, p. 361), says of the Independents, that "the government of Cromwell, more influenced by them than by any other persuasion, made as near approaches to general toleration as public prejudice would endure; and Sir Henry Vane, an Independent, was probably the first who laid down, with perfect precision, the inviolable rights of conscience, and the exemption of religion from all civil authority." The title of Vane's work is not given by Sir James, nor do I recognise it among the publications specified in the article VANE in Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*; but Williams probably preceded him by ten years at least. A brief account of the liberal sentiments of Vane will be found in Bancroft, ch. xi.—When Cromwell occupied Scotland, the principle of toleration was disseminated by the Independents in his army, in a manner which excited the horror and alarm of the Presbyterians (*ante*, pp. 150, 315); and, among others, of the Rev. James Fergusson, minister of Kilwinning, whose *Brief Refutation of the Errors of Toleration, Erastianism, &c.*, was posthumously published at Edinburgh in 1692 (forty years after it was written), and forms a remarkable contrast to Locke's Letter concerning Toleration, which had appeared in 1689. For some just remarks upon Fergusson's intolerant views, see Dr Robert Lee's preface to the *Theses of Erastus*, p. xvii.

Gordon, Jortin, Balguy, Campbell, Law, Blackburne, Paley, and Watson; who in their turn were worthily succeeded in our own age by Sydney Smith, and others of the Edinburgh Reviewers. With respect to the *living* advocates of religious freedom—Whately and Baden Powell among the clergy, and Samuel Bailey among laymen, may be said to stand pre-eminent; nor will the occupation of such writers be gone till the arrival of that distant day when the much-lauded but little-heeded maxim shall be reduced to practice,—“All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”*

In the United States of North America, great progress has been made in reducing this grand principle to practice in ecclesiastical matters. Thus the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights (quoted in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xcii., p. 356) sets forth—

“It is the right, as well as duty, of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship.” (*Art. 2.*)

“All religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.” (*Amendments to the Constitution of Massachusetts. Art. 11.*)

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” (*Constitution of the United States. Amendments, Art. 1.*)

“The School Committees shall never direct to be purchased or used, in any town schools, any school books which are calculated to favour the tenets of any particular sect of Christians.” (*Revised Statutes, c. xxiii., sec. 23.*)

Some defects which still adhere to the laws of the United States in regard to religious liberty are pointed out by Mr Hurlbut;† nor

* “There are,” says Locke, “fundamental truths that lie at the bottom, the basis upon which a great many others rest, and in which they have their consistency. These are seeming truths, rich in store, with which they furnish the mind; and, like the lights of heaven, are not only beautiful and entertaining in themselves, but give light and evidence to other things, that without them could not be seen or known. Such is that admirable discovery of Mr Newton, that all bodies gravitate to one another, which may be counted as the basis of natural philosophy; which of what use it is to the understanding of the great frame of our solar system, he has to the astonishment of the learned world shown; and how much farther it would guide us in other things, if rightly pursued, is not yet known. Our Saviour’s great rule, that *we should love our neighbour as ourselves*, is such a fundamental truth for the regulating human society, that, I think, by that alone, one might without difficulty determine all the cases and doubts in social morality.”—(*Conduct of the Understanding, § 43.*)

† Essays on Human Rights, &c., by E. P. Hurlbut, pp. 26–29, Edin. ed. As to the complete religious liberty secured by the constitution of Louisiana, see p. 83 of the same work, Note E. The celebrated Act for establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia may be seen in Brown on Civil Obedience, p. 503, or the New Annual Register for 1786, p. (63).

have the Americans yet learned universally to abstain from *social* persecution for difference of theological opinion.* But there seems to be far *less* inclination to such conduct in America than where one sect is politically dominant over the others. Mr James F. W. Johnston, in his travels in the United States, says that "The equality of all religious sects in the eye of the law, the equal personal bearing of all denominations, and their independence of each other in all respects, is a point which early strikes the European. All have an equal right to their religious opinions, whatever they may be; few hesitate to avow them; and though I have often heard people differ and argue on religious points, I do not recollect to have anywhere observed a single expression, either by word or feature, which seemed to imply that one of the disputants thought himself superior to the other because of the opinions he entertained, or that he had a better right to entertain them. I was most struck with this circumstance in the State of Massachusetts, where the freedom of speech upon religious matters will often startle the orthodox stranger."† Mr Johnston, however, could not *know* that "few hesitate to avow their religious opinions." Where a sect is numerous and influential, its adherents are not unwilling to be known; but in America, as elsewhere, highly disreputable opinions are no doubt extensively concealed. It will be long before the multitude in any part of Christendom will act upon the principle that *no* opinion ought to be infamous which does not necessarily imply defective moral feeling in its holder.

"In Scotland," says Dr Cook, "not a shade of penal statute or of hardship remains;‡ and the full liberty of worship and of opinion which is happily enjoyed, is in general prized as an invaluable blessing, which men in the Church and out of it would cordially unite to preserve. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that there are still vestiges of what may be called speculative intolerance, to which allusion has been already made, and from which it is extremely difficult, in our present imperfect state, wholly to emancipate the human mind. It is not unusual to find sects and denominations of Christians arrogating to themselves exclusively the title of the Church of Christ, and maintaining that those who differ from them, however sincere, and however zealous, are merely nominal Christians, if they be Christians at all; and as this proceeds from a state of mind which may exist with equal reason in all parties, it might, under peculiar circumstances and states of society, have led to the renewal of active persecution. This, fortunately, is not the case in our days; and it may be hoped that we see in such theoretical antipathy the expiring struggle of intolerance. Whilst it becomes every man firmly to adhere to what he is convinced has been taught by revelation, it is no less his duty not to wrest from others what he esteems his own most valuable privilege. Every deviation from this, in whatever manner it may be disguised or defended, and however it may be represented as proceeding from the most tender concern for the spiritual and eternal

* See *ante*, p. 394.

† Notes on North America, vol. ii., p. 242; Edinburgh, 1851. See also the Edinburgh Review, vol. xcii., p. 342.

‡ The law that chairs in universities could be occupied only by persons subscribing the Confession of Faith must have escaped the Doctor's memory.

interests of mankind, is an approach to the temper and spirit from which all the evils of persecution proceeded. This will become, we may trust, more and more evident, till Christians everywhere unite in the conviction, that genuine principle, sincere love of truth, and the persuasion of mind enforced by St Paul, are the evidences of that temper and disposition which all ought to cherish, and which all ought to respect and to revere.”*

Although the Christian spirit here spoken of does not appear to have increased in Scotland during the thirty years which have elapsed since the work of Dr Cook was published, there is reason to hope that the next generation will shew a better knowledge of the principles of religious liberty. By and by, it is likely, the very word “toleration” will *cease to be tolerated*—a word implying in him who uses it, the notion that he is *entitled* to withhold from his neighbours that freedom, which, nevertheless, he *graciously permits* them to enjoy. Dr Parr used to exclaim against the employment of this term, as an outrage to common sense and decency. “Surely,” he would say, “it is high time that a word which denotes falsehood should be exchanged for one that speaks truth; and that the abject spirit which implores or accepts toleration, should give place to the nobler spirit which claims and demands as a just, sacred, inalienable right, in all religious concerns, ‘absolute liberty—just and true liberty—equal and impartial liberty.’”† To call one’s self an “orthodox” or “evangelical” Christian, and such as interpret the Scriptures differently “heretics,” will in due time, also, be discovered by most people to be a sign of arrogant folly on the part of men who, by professing themselves Protestants, deny the existence of an infallible earthly judge of truth.

NOTE P, page 15.

The Duty of acting according to one’s Religious Belief.

“Where a man is mistaken in his judgment, even in that case it is always a sin to act against it. Though we should take that for a duty which is really a sin, yet so long as we are thus persuaded, it will be highly criminal in us to act in contradiction to this persuasion: and the reason of this is evident, because by so doing, we wilfully act against the best light which at present we have for the direction of our actions. So that when all is done, the immediate guide of our actions can be nothing but our conscience, our judgment and persuasion. If a man, for instance, should of a Jew become a Christian, whilst yet in his heart he believed that the Messiah is not yet come, and that our Lord Jesus was an impostor: or if a Papist should renounce the communion of the Roman church, and join with ours, whilst yet he is persuaded that the Roman church is the only catholic church, and that our reformed churches are heretical or schismatical;

* General and Historical View of Christianity, vol. iii., p. 461.

† Field’s Life of Parr, vol. ii., p. 383.—This sentiment is illustrated by Dr John Brown in his work on the Law of Christ concerning Civil Obedience, 3d edition, pp. 468-470. See also Hints on Toleration, by Philagatharches, 2d edition (London, 1811), Essay 1.

though now there is none of us that will deny that the men in both these cases have made a good change, as having changed a false religion for a true one, yet for all that I dare say we should all agree they were both of them great villains for making that change, because they made it not upon honest principles, and in pursuance of their judgment, but in direct contradiction to both.”*

To the objection which may be brought by some, that if a man be so far mistaken in his judgment as to think it his duty to act injuriously to others, the reply is sufficiently obvious:—he is a madman or an idiot, and must be taken charge of as a person unfit to be trusted with liberty.†

Analogous to the duty of *acting* according to our opinions, is that of endeavouring to *disseminate* them among others whom we think they may benefit. On this subject Mr Samuel Bailey has written excellently in one of his essays:—

“It may be said in general terms,” he remarks, “that every one who has taken due pains to master a subject, who feels persuaded that he can present it in a new light, and who is not destitute of the obvious qualifications for the task, lies under an obligation to communicate his knowledge to his fellow-creatures, provided they are in a sufficiently civilised and virtuous condition to receive it without destroying the happiness or the existence of their instructor. Not to do it, if the matter were of importance, would be reprehensible selfishness; it could be only to avoid trouble, or shrink from responsibility, or maintain a solitary superiority over the rest of the world.

“It is true, he may be deceived in his estimate of his own achievements; an exaggerated opinion of the value of what we ourselves accomplish, is perhaps inseparable from human nature; but if he has taken due pains, and is actuated by a proper spirit, his conduct is on every principle entitled to unmixed approbation. It may happen, too, that, by communicating the result of his inquiries, he may be instrumental in promulgating error; his views may wander widely from the truth, and he may lead many astray by the same misconceived facts or illusive reasonings which have deceived his own mind. These are things which, according to the constitution of man and the present state of society, cannot be avoided. Even in this case, nevertheless, he is doing good. His errors are in all probability such as have, with more or less distinctness, presented themselves to other minds as well as his, in the character of truths. To bring them openly forward, with the premises from which they are deduced and the train of reasoning by which they have established themselves as truths in his own understanding, is giving them the best chance of being refuted, and refuted in so full and luminous a manner, that their real character will be conspicuous to every future inquirer.

“Had they been kept back by indolence or timidity, had they and the arguments in their support not been openly produced and examined,

* A Discourse concerning Conscience, by Dr John Sharp, Archbishop of York, 1687, p. 18; quoted in Locke's Third Letter for Toleration.

The following saying is ascribed to Henry IV. of France:—“Ceux qui suivent tout droit leur conscience, sont de ma religion; et moi, je suis de celle de tous ceux-la qui sont braves et bons.”

See *ante*, pp. 161, 265-6.

† See Note B, *ante*, p. 26.

they would have continued to haunt other minds as well as his, to delude other thinkers besides himself, and create those casual and vague disputes, which are perpetually arising when a question has not been thoroughly canvassed.

“When the circumstances here described have made it a man’s duty to communicate his opinions to the public, the manner of doing it can admit of little controversy. He is quite as much bound in this case to honesty of statement and fairness of proceeding, as when he is giving private instruction. The object to be kept in view is to assist the progress and prevalence of truth, which it is almost tautology to say cannot be promoted by either concealment or exaggeration of evidence, by the colouring of facts or the sophistication of reasoning. While he who with upright intentions and after adequate examination is unfortunate enough to be the instrument of disseminating error, merits our esteem, no reprehension can be too severe for the conscious promulgator of false assertions and fallacious arguments.*

“From the fallibility of which even the most sedulous and honest inquirer partakes, it also behoves every one who publishes his opinions to the world to suspect the possibility at least of his being in the wrong, and to refrain from arrogantly assuming on his own part that exemption from error which he will not grant to another. Above all, he should avoid the offensive practice of affecting superior moral excellence in virtue of the doctrines he maintains, and casting odium upon others because they differ from him. He should keep aloof from what has been well designated as ‘that dogmatical assumption of the upper ground in controversy, which entrenches itself in supposed rights and prerogatives; treats as a violation of decorum the free use of language in its opponents; and even while it condescends to employ arguments, seasons them with arrogant and uncharitable reflections on the motives and intentions of the adversary.’†

“The substantial duty, in a word, of the man who makes known his researches or speculations to the world, is to take the trouble of due preparation, to be honest in his communications, and to arrogate nothing to himself as an inquirer which he will not grant to others exercising the same function. Instead of demanding from them the deference due to an indisputable oracle from whose declarations it is criminal to dissent, he should point out, whenever the occasion requires it, the urgent duty, and animate them with the manly spirit of impartial investigation; and warn them against receiving on authority any conclusions the evidence for which is open to their own scrutiny.”‡

Every sect seems to think it a duty to convert the members of

* “‘Is it,’ asks Mr Stewart, ‘more criminal to misrepresent a fact, than to impose on the world by what we know to be an unsound or a fallacious argument?’ ‘Is it in a moral view more criminal, or is it more inconsistent with the dignity of a man of true honour, to defraud men in a private transaction by an incorrect or erroneous statement of circumstances, than to mislead the public to their own ruin by those wilful deviations from truth into which we see men daily led by views of interest or ambition, or by the spirit of political faction?’—(*Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers*, vol. ii., p. 338.)”

† “Aikin’s Letters to his Son, vol. ii., p. 95.”

‡ Essay on the Pursuit of Truth, 2d ed., pp. 132–5.

other sects to its own opinions; but when *they* reciprocate the benevolent endeavour, what abuse and indignation are in general poured out against them! But how can the reproaches of *Protestants* against any sect proselytizing by fair means be justified? Has he who calls himself an "evangelical Christian" any better title to proselytize the Catholics, Puseyites, or Unitarians, than these have to undermine the faith of evangelical Christians? In influencing the latter, it is true, "heterodox" persons are accused of *perverting*, not *converting*, the proselytes; but, since every sect regards its own apostates as *perverts*, the Catholics, Puseyites, and Unitarians can with equal justice accuse the evangelical missionary of leading *their* brethren astray.—Each party may properly strive to counteract the efforts of its opponents to draw men from the belief of what it regards as truth; but this is quite different from viewing them as poachers on a domain to which there is an exclusive right. Archbishop Whately observes with great fairness that "we could not pass any censure, except in reference to the object itself, on a society of Mahometans that should be formed for the distribution of the Koran. We disapprove, indeed, of the book itself; but the example of circulating what they believe to be divine truth is one which all men ought to follow in reference to the books which they respectively hold sacred."* "It is impossible," he elsewhere says, "to draw a line to any effectual purpose between forbidding a man to propagate his religion and compelling him to abjure it, on the ground that the one does, and the other does not, offer violence to his conscience; which was perhaps the distinction set up by the Jewish Elders, when they were content merely to 'charge the apostles not to preach in the name of Jesus.' Peter and John replied, that they could not but 'declare what they had seen and heard;' and it is not surely impossible, or even unlikely, that others also may think themselves bound in conscience to teach, at least, their families and their friends, what they conceive to be essential truths."†

Milton, in his most eloquent *Areopagitica*, made it clear that free discussion, far from endangering Truth, only adds to her purity and strength. By none has this been better illustrated than by Mr Bailey. "The people," says he, "are not left to the inundation of falsehood without a remedy or protection. Restraints on the promulgation of opinions, even if they were proper and expedient on the supposition of their efficacy, and of the infallibility of those who imposed them, seem peculiarly unnecessary, since there is always a powerful means of counteracting what we conceive to be errors. Fallacies may be exposed, misstatements detected, absurdities ridiculed. These are the natural and appropriate modes of repression; and while they must be ultimately successful amongst all classes of people, unless the human mind is better adapted to the reception of falsehood than of truth (in which case the pursuit of knowledge would

* Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith, &c., 2d ed., p. 119.

"True and false religion," says Michaelis, "have like rights with respect to each other; for every one holds his own religion to be true: and hence, whenever I ascribe any right to true religion, every other man may claim the same right for his religion."—(*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. i., p. 117.)

† Essays on the Errors of Romanism, &c. Essay V., on Persecution, § 3, vii.

be folly), they possess the additional recommendation of contributing to the detection of those fallacies which have mingled themselves with the sentiments of the most accurate judges. Here we have a legitimate method of disseminating our tenets, in which we may indulge without restraint, assured that whether right or wrong we shall contribute to the ultimate triumph of truth. In detecting falsehood and exposing it to general observation, we are far more effectually guarding all ranks from its influence, than by mysterious reserve and timorous precautions, which are always suspected of being employed in the support of opinions not capable of standing by their own strength. . . . Whoever," he adds, "has attentively meditated on the progress of the human race cannot fail to discern, that there is now a spirit of inquiry amongst men, which nothing can stop, or even materially control. Reproach and obloquy, threats and persecution, will be vain. They may embitter opposition and engender violence, but they cannot abate the keenness of research. There is a silent march of thought, which no power can arrest, and which it is not difficult to foresee will be marked by important events. Mankind were never before in the situation in which they now stand. The press has been operating upon them for several centuries, with an influence scarcely perceptible at its commencement, but daily becoming more palpable, and acquiring accelerated force. It is rousing the intellect of nations, and happy will it be for them if there be no rash interference with the natural progress of knowledge; and if, by a judicious and gradual adaptation of their institutions to the inevitable changes of opinion, they are saved from those convulsions, which the pride, prejudices, and obstinacy of a few may occasion to the whole."*

In both extremities of our Island the publication of "blasphemous" works is punishable by law; but except in peculiarly offensive cases (such as those before spoken of, p. 250), the press is now wisely left unfettered both in England and Scotland, however hostile the published opinions and arguments may be to the Christian religion. The tendency of prohibition to increase rather than diminish the circulation of books, is now well understood; while the power of Truth to vindicate herself is pretty generally recognised by those intrusted with the duty of executing the law. In *England*, however, the celebrated maxim that "Christianity is part and parcel of the law" of that country (a maxim which, according to President Jefferson, attained its high position purely in consequence of a mistranslation of the words "*ancien scripture*," in an old law-book, into "holy scripture" instead of "ancient writing"†), continues to operate as a bar to the free propagation of opinion, in a manner which it is impossible for a moment to defend. In 1743, for example, there occurred a case in

* Essay on the Formation and Publication of Opinions. 2d ed., pp. 155, 165.

† See Letters and Correspondence of Major Cartwright, vol. ii., pp. 271–274; quoted in the Supplementary Notes to Dr John Brown's treatise on the Law of Christ respecting Civil Obedience, p. 93. The letter, which is dated 5th June 1824, may be seen also in Jefferson's Memoirs, vol. iv., p. 406. Dr Brown subjoins to his extract from it the opinion of an acute and learned friend of his own, that, notwithstanding all that Jefferson has said on the subject, the whole stress of this famous legal dictum ought to be laid upon the shoulders of Lord Chief-Justice Hale. "The doctrine," this gentleman thinks, "is the issue of his

which a sum of money having been left to found an institution for reading the Jewish law, Lord Hardwicke decided that the bequest was illegal and void, *as being for the propagation of a religious belief contrary to Christianity, which is part of the law and constitution of England.* * A similar decision was given by the Vice-Chancellor so lately as 4th June 1850, in a very remarkable case, of which the particulars are these:—William Jones Hartley, by his will dated 4th October 1843, after bequeathing several legacies, gave all his personal property not specifically bequeathed, to Major-General Briggs, upon trust for the payment of debts and legacies, and the residue to “lay out and apply £300 sterling of the said residue as a prize remuneration, to be given and awarded by the said Major-General Briggs, according to his discretion and judgment, for the best original essay which he can procure on the subject of Natural Theology, treating it as a science, and demonstrating the truth, harmony, and infallibility of the evidence on which it is founded, and the perfect accordance of such evidence with reason; also demonstrating the adequacy and sufficiency of Natural Theology, when so treated and taught as a science, to constitute a true, perfect, and philosophical system of universal religion (analogous to other universal systems of science, such as astronomy, &c.), founded on immutable facts and the works of creation, and beautifully adapted to man’s reason, and tending, as other sciences do, but in a higher degree, to improve and elevate his nature, and render him a wise, happy, and exalted being.” Another sum of £200 was directed to be paid for a prize essay on emigration; and the surplus to be applied in maintaining and forwarding the publication and circulation of the two essays in England. The case came before the Vice-Chancellor of England’s Court, when “Wray, for the Attorney-General, submitted that, whatever might have been the notions of the testator, the bequests for the encouragement of the essays were good, since it could not be contended that the doctrines therein contained were inconsistent with those principles and views upon which the Bridgewater Treatises, and several other publications unexceptionable in their character, were founded, and which had been recognised as good in law.—The Vice-Chancellor said he was of opinion that the words which the testator had, in his first bequest, chosen to adopt could not mean any thing that was at all consistent with Christianity; and, as to the other, it was perfect nonsense, and must therefore be held void for uncertainty.” Both bequests were consequently found to be null—the one as “*repugnant to revealed religion,*” and the other for uncertainty. †

In *Scotland*, we have no such legal maxim as the preposterous one for which credit is given to Sir Matthew Hale; nor is it likely that the judges of the Court of Session would feel themselves under the new brain, and was owing to his education among the Puritans; for you know how they jumbled the two Testaments together, and made up a mixture of the Civil, and Christian, and Jewish laws, which shewed itself in their speeches and sermons, and in their conduct to those who differed from them. Judge Hale enforced the laws against witchcraft,” &c.

* Facts and Observations respecting the situation of the Jews in England; in Collection of Testimonies in Favour of Religious Liberty (London, 1790), Art. XX., where reference is made to Vezev’s Reports, vol. ii., p. 274.

† Case of Briggs v. Hartley; Law Times, vol. xv., p. 273. See also Edin. Review, vol. xci., p. 525.

cessity of doing violence to common sense and equity, by annulling any such legacy as Mr Hartley's. This opinion is, I think, warranted by a decision pronounced by Lord Jeffrey in 1811, the principles stated by him in its support being applicable to both cases alike. Mr David Taylor, a builder in Perth, who died in 1832, had bequeathed £1000 to the General Unitarian Baptist Assembly for the endowment of a preacher of that connexion in Perth. The executor declined to pay the legacy, and was summoned before the Court of Session, where the case came before Lord Jeffrey as "Ordinary." One of the executor's pleas was, that "the action is not maintainable, inasmuch as its object is the promotion of purposes reprobated by law—the object of the legacy being the propagation of tenets which are not only not recognised by the State, but are condemned by the law of the country as directly and inveterately hostile to the creed which forms part and parcel of the law of the land." This and the other pleas were repelled by his Lordship; who stated among the grounds of his decision, "that the purpose for which the legacy is left is not a criminal or illegal purpose, or one which can, in any sound sense, be regarded as dangerous to good morals, or offensive to decency or good order." In an explanatory note, he added: "The last (plea), if it could be successfully maintained, would lead to serious consequences. Where there is nothing in the tenets of any religious sect which is contrary to express law, to good morals, or to public decency, the Lord Ordinary can see no ground upon which any distinction can be taken in a civil court between one tolerated sect and another. There can be no doubt that, by the existing law, the sect of Unitarians is entitled to the fullest measure of toleration, and it would be absurd to hold that there was anything to corrupt virtue, or outrage decency, in tenets which have been advocated in our own day by men of such eminent talents, exemplary piety, and pure lives, as Price, Priestley, and Channing; and to which, there is reason to think, that neither Milton nor Newton was disinclined. If this legacy may be withheld on account of the reprobation to which the opinions of the legatees are supposed to be liable, the Lord Ordinary does not see how any congregation of that communion could obtain decret for a sum of money which they had raised among themselves for building a chapel, or paying a preacher, if they had lent it, on bond or bill, to an orthodox borrower, or even deposited it, on receipt, with a banker belonging to the establishment. For an executor, with free funds in his hands, is full debtor to the testator's legatees, and is as much bound to pay, under the testament, as a borrower is under his bond. Those who belong to the great establishment of the Church of England, it should also be considered, are but sectaries in Scotland, and depend for their protection on the same toleration which has now been extended to Unitarians. It would probably startle even the defender, however, if it were made a question, whether a legacy could be recovered, or a loan reclaimed, for the purpose of building or repairing an Episcopal chapel, or paying the salary of an officiating clergyman."* In this part of the decision the executor wisely acquiesced.

* The General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches &c., *v.* Taylor, 17th June 1841; Dunlop and Bell's Reports, vol. iii., p. 1030.

Socinus says:—"I would apprise Volanus, and all others who are displeased

Putting altogether out of view men's right to disseminate their opinions in any peaceable way, expediency itself seems to dictate to the advocates of Christianity that in a country where so many have renounced *all religion* along with the *orthodoxy* which disgusted them, the efforts of those who would persuade such people to embrace natural religion, as being very much better than none at all, should, to say the least, meet with no discouragement from anybody. The religion of Socrates and Cicero, of Anthony Collins and Adam Smith, of Franklin and Jefferson, is infinitely preferable to theoretical or practical Atheism. If natural religion be (as divines and philosophers have represented it†) not only the test by which the claims of every professing revelation must be tried, but also the guide to a true interpretation of what is proved to be revealed, then the more zealously we cultivate a branch of knowledge so transcendently important the better; and, instead of throwing obstacles in the way of teaching even the *sufficiency* of natural religion when matured‡ and well applied, we should rejoice to see this opinion asserted and defended with the utmost learning and ingenuity, confident that thus the advocates of revelation would be furnished with the best opportunities to maintain their cause, and to impress upon attentive multitudes the most effective arguments which could be brought forward on the side of Christianity. Heretofore the attacks of the Deists have led to the production of many valuable works, which have taken high places in theological libraries; and if Christianity is divine, may may not the like effect be expected in future? Besides, the remark of Grotius, that to enforce the belief of a doctrine by violence and intimidation is to confess distrust in the fairer field of argument,§ may be applied with a slight variation here: if there is a way upon earth to render a doctrine suspected, it is to throw impediments in the way of its being a subject of controversy.

with me for the opinion I defend relative to the essence and person of Christ, that whether they know me or not, by God's help I will not be deterred by such invectives and calumnies, nor by the fear of death itself, from defending it, unless it be first shewn to be erroneous; which it can never be. Nay, I am fully persuaded that it is consonant to truth, and of the greatest importance to promote the glory of God, and to unfold to men more fully the way of salvation."—(*Opera*, tom. ii., p. 422; quoted in Toulmin's *Memoirs of Socinus*, p. 136.) Now, suppose a great majority of the people of England, and consequently the bulk of the Legislature, to hold the theological opinions of Socinus, and to perform the duty said by the Agnewites and many others to be incumbent upon nations and rulers as such, of promoting *God's glory and the true religion* (by which everybody always understands *his own religion*), how would the evangelical minority relish a law making the Socinian phase of Christianity "part and parcel of the law of England,"—compelling *them* to contribute to the expense of its inculcation in schools and churches,—and annulling all legacies for the teaching of "evangelical truth"?

† See the extracts from Prideaux and Butler, *ante*, p. 204; from Beattie, p. 263; and from Taylor, &c., pp. 265-7.

‡ See *ante*, pp. 206-7.

§ On the Truth of the Christian Religion, B. vi., § 7, where he contrasts the methods respectively employed in the propagation of it and Mohammedanism.

NOTE Q, page 16.

Curiosities of the Sabbath Alliance.

The Sabbath Alliance, of whose sayings and doings we have had several opportunities of seeing samples,* was instituted at Edinburgh on the 1st of November 1847. At a meeting of its founders then held, some discussion occurred as to the precise scriptural basis on which it should be placed. One of the lay members suggested the propriety of taking for its foundation "not only the Fourth Commandment, but various other passages of Scripture, which shewed that the Sabbath was instituted from the creation of the world." But the Rev. Dr Begg and Mr Blackadder objected to this proposition, "and contended that the Alliance should be founded mainly on the Fourth Commandment. *There* (they urged), all that had previously been enjoined and observed was re-enacted, and the peculiar nature of the Sabbath was fully explained. Besides, it was part of the everlasting law of God, binding on all men as such, and especially on all Christians. It was important in fighting this battle to take our stand on clear and unquestionable ground."†

Accordingly, in the first of their series of Tracts, we read that—

"The Alliance rests upon the Fourth Commandment. And why? Not because the Fourth Commandment instituted the Sabbath; nor because the rest of the Bible, particularly the New Testament, is silent about it; but because the whole Moral Law, binding upon all men, at all times and in all places, is summed up in the Ten Commandments. To keep holy to God one whole day in seven, is as much a duty of universal obligation as to reverence parents and not to take God's name in vain. Much light is thrown by other parts of Scripture on the origin of the Sabbath, and on the right way of observing it; but it is on Sinai that the Sabbath receives its highest sanction. It is there that it is incorporated and imbedded in that comprehensive rule of morality which must last while the world stands. *The divine law of right and wrong, and the Sabbath, must now stand or fall together. If the Fourth Commandment goes, all the others go with it; henceforth the love of God and the love of man cease to be commanded duties, and are left merely to the impulse of feeling.* The Sabbath, in the Fourth Commandment, is the great safe-guard of both tables of the law.

"All experience bears witness to this. Let men give up keeping the Sabbath as a moral duty, exactly on the same footing with the other duties to God and man taught in the Ten Commandments; and what follows? They may profess and try for a little to keep the Sabbath on the footing of expediency or the authority of the Church, or some other reason of decency or devotion; but it is no longer kept in obedience to an express law of God. And this is always the beginning of great evil. It leads to a lax exercise of private judgment as to the

* *Ante*, pp. 170, 196, 367, 389, 410, 457. See also Note R, p. 494-5.

† Report in the *Witness*, Nov. 6, 1847.

way of keeping the Sabbath; for it is all now matter of discretion together. The habit of obedience is broken; men learn to act upon the promptings of their own minds, instead of the formal commands of God; even the best are injured in the whole tone of their religion by this sort of assumed independence; and how rapidly, in the case of the vast majority, it runs into universal lawlessness, the records of every criminal court in the country can tell.

“The Alliance, therefore, stands forth for the Sabbath, not merely as good for man, but as made by God; and good for man, because made by God: the Sabbath was made for man.

“Hence the Alliance can consent to no compromise—it can pursue no half-measures. The entire day, of twenty-four hours, is the only Sabbath the Alliance knows, for it is the only Sabbath the law of God knows. The fiction of canonical hours, or hours of church service, and the notion of restricting the Sabbath-rest to them, is a mere unauthorized invention, either of the god of this world, or of the Man of Sin.”

It was thus made abundantly manifest, that the Alliance had not lapsed a hair's breadth from the sabbatarian principles of their Puritan forefathers.

But it is curious that the ground which appears so “clear and unquestionable” to them, and which constitutes their main support, is precisely that which has been most generally rejected by *learned* theologians from the Reformation to the present day;* while those passages of Scripture on which Bishop Horsley† and his followers have argued for a Christian *Sabbath* (or day of *rest from labour*), are thrust aside by the Alliance as of comparatively little importance. Nor is the fact less remarkable, that notwithstanding the satisfaction of the Sabbath Alliance with the clearness of their ground, the discovery was made at the Conference of the *Evangelical Alliance* on Christian Union, at Liverpool, that there was “such variety of opinion respecting the scriptural ground and authority on which the Sabbath was to be based, that it was deemed prudent and forbearing not to introduce it amongst the various topics that form the doctrinal statement of the common faith” of the association.‡

At the above-mentioned meeting in Edinburgh, something was said as to the sinews of war, without which, of course, the sabbatarian battle could not be efficiently fought. The Rev. Dr Candlish stated, that “in making a calculation of the numbers who had signed the various petitions on the subject lately, he found, that if each were to give one shilling, the sum of £10,000 would be realized. The Alliance should therefore take a stand, as did the Anti-Corn-Law League, with the determination to persevere until the end they had in view was accomplished.” In Tract No. I., the estimated income was a little less definitely spoken of—“the revenue,” it is said there, “must be commensurate with the greatness of the work to be performed; *funds to the extent of several thousands a-year are indispen-*

* See *ante*, pp. 119-124, 170, 221, 226, 282, 286-9, 327, 363; also Limborch's *Theologia Christiana*, lib. v., cap. xxviii., § 7, &c.

† *Ante*, p. 335.

‡ See Mr Jordan's Report, quoted *ante*, p. 367.

sable." These, however, it is intimated, it would be impious and unpatriotic to doubt the possibility of collecting; for "is the appeal not made to Scotland, and is not the cause the Sabbath of her God?" Then follows the devout exclamation—"May the Lord of the Sabbath give wisdom, and courage, and faith to his servants, and crown their exertions with his blessing!"

With what share of the Divine blessing their exertions to collect several thousands a-year were crowned, will appear from a statement of the revenue received during the periods concerning which I have been able to obtain information:—

From 1st Nov. 1847 to 30th Dec. 1848 (including £100 received from each of Mr John Hope of Edinburgh, and Mr Henderson of Park)	£1390	9	8
From 1st Jan. to 31st Dec. 1849	964	1	9½
From 1st Jan. to 31st Dec. 1850	814	0	5¼
From 1st Jan. to 31st Dec. 1852	237	10	8

The last two sums include £300 from Mr Hope, and £100 from an anonymous donor.

In a circular of the Alliance, dated 11th June 1849, after mentioning the expense of their general operations, and saying that a large outlay had been incurred in promoting the opposition to Mr Locke's Bill, the Committee proceed to lament that "At the same time, the receipts since the commencement of the year to meet the whole expenditure amount only to £250; so that the Committee have been obliged to suspend the continuation of their tracts, and the printing of documents which they consider essential to the advancement of the cause, as well as the visits of the Organization Secretary to various parts of the country." This appeal had the effect of bringing up the year's revenue to £964, 1s. 9½d., as we have seen above. Regarding that of 1851, I am destitute of information; but in 1852 the amount collected was miserably small, and, small as it was, suffered diminution to the extent of £203, 12s. 6d., due to the treasurer on the previous year's account,—so that only a pittance of £34 remained to meet the expenses of 1852. What the financial condition of this once magniloquent Alliance was in February 1853, is disclosed by the following postscript to a circular to the clergy of Scotland, soliciting them to sign a memorial against the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sundays:—"It would materially contribute towards payment of the expense of this movement, *if you would kindly enclose a few postage stamps when you return this document, or be the means of transmitting any sum which any member of your congregation might be inclined to give.*" How are the mighty fallen!

In a printed *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Alliance, for the Years 1849 and 1850*, p. 6, there is an account of the attempt made by certain proprietors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway (myself included) to bring about the re-attachment of passenger-carriages to the Sunday trains.* A circular which we issued in 1849, and which bore my signature as secretary of the agitators, is characterized in that *Narrative* as "replete with misstatements," which, however, were

* See *ante*, p. 17.

“refuted” by the Committee of the Alliance in a reply which they immediately drew up. Some who at the time perused both documents, along with a rejoinder by the authors of the circular, were of opinion that the refuted “misstatements” had a good deal more truth in them than the “refutation.”

The scrutineers’ report on the votes given at the Company’s meeting in August 1849,* is quoted in the *Narrative*, without the slightest allusion to the fact, that, at the adjourned meeting to which it was presented, two of the four scrutineers formally declared that, in their view, the “majority of votes” was a majority not “*against trains*,” but only “for the amendment” which the Directors had contrived to carry by that unfair device which Sir James Gibson-Craig and others protested against as “incompetent, irregular, and illegal.”† The Committee of the Alliance are thus guilty of a flagrant “misstatement” in saying that they give in their *Narrative* “the result of the division, *as reported by the scrutineers.*”

They characterize this result as “evidence conclusively manifested, that the Scottish shareholders were opposed to the running of Sabbath trains;” and after stating the results of the two subsequent divisions, as if these had really been trials of strength (which it is evident on the very face of the results they were not‡), they conclude the subject by reporting that “the sentiments of the proprietary *having been thus unequivocally declared*, Mr Cox expressed his intention of refraining from continuing the discussion at the next statutory meeting.”

If anything has been “unequivocally declared” by the people of Scotland, it is that the Sabbath Alliance is unworthy of their support; and the reader will judge whether, in withholding that support from an association which in its own opinion deserves so well to prosper, they have not merely maintained that character for sagacity and practical sense which the inhabitants of North Britain have so long enjoyed.

The humility of the Alliance is one of its shining virtues. “It is alleged by some,” says Tract No. IV., “that the Sabbath was an exclusively Jewish institution, and never meant for this more advanced dispensation. *This statement is most discreditable to those who make it, CLEARLY PROVING, as it does, either their dishonesty, or ignorance, or inability to comprehend a very plain and simple subject.* The Sabbath was instituted at the creation, more than 2500 years before the Jewish economy was set up, and therefore it has nothing peculiarly Jewish about it,” &c.§

Now, as the “most discreditable statement” in question has been made, either expressly or in effect, by Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Bucer, Zuinglius, Cranmer, Ridley, Tyndale, Fryth, Knox, Chillingworth, Taylor, Milton, Baxter, Barrow, Barclay, Limborch, Paley, Whately, and Arnold;|| these, and such as these, are the men of whom the modest and erudite Alliance pronounces, *ex cathedra*, that

* *Ante*, p. 20.

† *Ante*, p. 21.

‡ *Ante*, p. 25.

§ Tract No. IV., entitled “The Sanctification of the Sabbath the Duty and the Privilege of All,” p. 2.

|| See the references in note *, p. 482.

in making it they have clearly shewn themselves to be knaves, fools, or most discreditably ignorant persons!

Again, in the same Tract, page 3, we read: "With respect to the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, *there is ample evidence to satisfy any reasonable inquirer* that the apostles, by whom it was introduced, acted under the authority of Christ. There is no special enactment in the New Testament regarding this change; but there are several circumstances which, taken together, *clearly shew* that it was of Divine appointment."

Here every one of the eminent theologians just named is by a stroke of the pen excluded from the category of "reasonable inquirers," able to appreciate "clear" evidence set before them! Not only did these blind men fail to discover in the "circumstances" referred to, any proof of a change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, but even if they had been satisfied that the change was "clearly shewn" by those circumstances, they would still have been so unreasonable as to ask for proof that the Sabbath, so changed, had been imposed upon *the Gentiles*.

But, allowing that the Alliance may lawfully form as low an estimate as they please of the reasonableness of those theologians who cannot find in Scripture what *they* see so clearly in its pages, still they are by no means entitled to indulge in such a gigantic misrepresentation as the following, which is contained in No. I. of their *Tracts for the Train*, page 4:—"That there is," they say, "sufficient evidence to prove that this (the changing of the day) was done by divine authority, IS ADMITTED BY THE COMMON CONSENT OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, and need not, therefore, be enlarged upon"!!!

In Tract No. III. they say, "It has been frequently observed as matter of surprise, that our opponents, while they denounce our interference in this matter as unreasonable and intolerant, uniformly decline entering into the controversy with us." But the publication of sundry books and pamphlets by their opponents during the last few years has removed this ground of surprise; and it must be allowed that on *my* part, at least, there is no unwillingness to gratify the Alliance by entering deeply enough into the controversy they court.

NOTE R, p. 16.

*The Scriptural Grounds of the Sabbath.**

In *The Shorter Catechism* of the Church of Scotland, drawn up by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and adopted by the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain as an accurate exposition of God's truth, the following clear and concise statement of doctrine concerning the Sabbath is to be found:—

* Before perusing this article, the reader is solicited to consider attentively the observations of Locke which are quoted *ante*, p. 130-1. He may thus be helped to dismiss prepossessions, and to weigh the evidence and arguments with a pure desire to *know the truth*.

“ Q. 40. *What did God at first reveal to man for the rule of his obedience?*

“ A. The rule which God at first revealed to man for his obedience, was the moral law (a).

“ Q. 41. *Where is the moral law summarily comprehended?*

“ A. The moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments (b).

“ Q. 42. *What is the sum of the ten commandments?*

“ A. The sum of the ten commandments is, To love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our strength, and with all our mind; and our neighbour as ourselves (c).

“ Q. 43. *What is the preface to the ten commandments?*

“ A. The preface to the ten commandments is in these words, ‘ I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage’ (d).

“ Q. 44. *What doth the preface to the ten commandments teach us?*

“ A. The preface to the ten commandments teacheth us, That because God is the Lord, and our God, and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep all his commandments (e). . . .

“ Q. 57. *Which is the fourth commandment?*

“ A. The fourth commandment is, ‘ Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth,

(a) “ Rom. ii. 14. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Ver. 15. Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while excusing or else accusing one another. Rom. x. 5. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

(b) “ Deut. x. 4. And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me.

(c) “ Mat. xxii. 37. Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. Ver. 38. This is the first and great commandment. Ver. 39. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Ver. 40. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

(d) “ Exod. xx. 2.

(e) “ Luke i. 74. That he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear. Ver. 75. In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. 1 Pet. i. 15. But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Ver. 16. Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. Ver. 17. And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man’s work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear: Ver. 18. Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; Ver. 19. But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.

the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath-day, and hallowed it' (*f*).

"Q. 58. *What is required in the fourth commandment?*

"A. The fourth commandment requireth the keeping holy to God such set times as he hath appointed in his word; expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy sabbath to himself (*g*).

"Q. 59. *Which day of the seven hath God appointed to be the weekly sabbath?*

"A. From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly sabbath; and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian sabbath (*h*).

"Q. 60. *How is the sabbath to be sanctified?*

"A. The sabbath is to be sanctified by a holy resting all that day (*i*), even from such wordly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days (*k*); and spending the whole time in the public

(*f*) "Exod. xx. 8-11.

(*g*) "Deut. v. 12. Keep the sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Ver. 13. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work; Ver. 14. But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou.

(*h*) "Gen. ii. 2. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. Ver. 3. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Ver. 2. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. Acts xx. 7. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.

(*i*) "Exod. xx. 8. Remember the sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Ver. 10. But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, &c. Exod. xvi. 25. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Ver. 26. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none. Ver. 27. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. Ver. 28. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?

(*k*) "Neh. xiii. 15. In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine-presses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath-day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. Ver. 16. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. Ver. 17. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the sabbath-day? Ver. 18. Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel, by profaning the sabbath. Ver. 19. And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the sab-

and private exercises of God's worship (*l*), except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy (*m*).

“ Q. 61. *What is forbidden in the fourth commandment?*

“ A. The fourth commandment forbiddeth the omission or careless performance of the duties required (*n*), and the profaning the day by idleness (*o*), or doing that which is in itself sinful (*p*), or by unnecessary thoughts, words, or works, about our worldly employments or recreations (*q*).

bath : and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the sabbath-day. Ver. 21. Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? if ye do so again, I will lay hands on you. From that time forth came they no more on the sabbath. Ver. 22. And I commanded the Levites, that they should cleanse themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates, to sanctify the sabbath-day. Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy.

(*l*) “ Luke iv. 16. And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up : and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. Acts xx. 7. And upon the first day of the week, &c. [*See letter h.*] Psal. xcii. [*title, A psalm or song for the sabbath-day.*] Isa. lxvi. 23. And it shall come to pass, that from one new-moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord.

(*m*) “ Mat. xii. *from verse 1 to 31.* At that time Jesus went on the sabbath-day through the corn ; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. Ver. 2. But when the Pharisees, &c. Ver. 12.— It is lawful to do well on the sabbath-days.

(*n*) “ Ezek. xxii. 26. Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things : they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them. Amos viii. 5. Saying, When will the new-moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? Mal. i. 13. Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness is it ! and ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts : and ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick ; thus ye brought an offering : should I accept this of your hand? saith the Lord.

(*o*) “ Acts xx. 7. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow ; and continued his speech until midnight. Ver. 9. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep : and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead.

(*p*) “ Ezek. xxiii. 38. Moreover, this they have done unto me : they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my sabbaths.

(*q*) “ Jer. xvii. 24. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the sabbath-day, but hallow the sabbath-day, to do no work therein ; Ver. 25. Then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem ; and this city shall remain for ever. Ver. 26. And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt-offerings, and sacrifices, and meat-offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise, unto the house of the Lord. Isa. lviii. 13. If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day ; and call the sabbath a de-

“ Q. 62. *What are the reasons annexed to the fourth commandment?* ”

“ A. The reasons annexed to the fourth commandment are, God’s allowing us six days of the week for our own employments (*r*), his challenging a special propriety in the seventh, his own example, and his blessing the sabbath-day (*s*).”

This doctrine coincides with that formerly quoted from the Confession of Faith, drawn up by the same Assembly.*

The first thing here taught, then, is, that when God created man He gave him, for the regulation of his conduct, “the moral law,” to which every human being (whether he *have* or “*have not* the law” of Moses or of Christ besides) is bound to render obedience.†

This view, I think, is agreeable alike to Scripture and philosophy; although the Sabbath Alliance says contemptuously of the duties dictated by God through the sole medium of man’s conscience and understanding, that they are not “commanded duties,” but “left merely to the impulse of feeling.”‡ As the great majority of mankind are, and ever have been, ignorant of supernatural revelation, the Sabbath Alliance must be understood as asserting that the Deity has always left, and at this moment leaves, the most of his intelligent creatures destitute of a moral law worthy of the name.

The next averment in the Catechism is, that “the moral law is summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments.”

If this mean that the Decalogue enjoins *all* the duties commanded by the law of nature, and *no other* than those natural duties, the assertion is liable to be controverted on most solid grounds; for not only is the Decalogue plainly *imperfect* as a summary of moral obligation,§ but a portion (at least) of the Fourth Commandment is on all

light, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words.

(*r*) “Exod. xx. 9. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work.

(*s*) “Exod. xx. 11. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath-day, and hallowed it.”

* See *ante*, p. 325.

† For another statement of this doctrine, see the Confession of Faith, ch. xix., sects. 1, 2.

‡ See *ante*, pp. 196, 481. In Tract No. III. it is *repeated*, as if to prevent the possibility of mistake, that “if the Decalogue is discharged as a moral code, we are left without any definite standard of moral practice” (p. 2); and, far from concurring with the Apostle Paul and the Westminster Divines as to the *universal* promulgation of the law of nature, the Alliance more than insinuates that it is only upon the hearts of “*all Christ’s renewed ones*” that the moral law is written! The entire passage will be found *infra*, p. 494–5.

§ See Taylor’s *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. ii., Ch. ii., Rule iv., entitled, “The Ten Commandments of Moses, commonly called the Moral Law, is not a perfect Digest of the Law of Nature;” Baxter’s Appendix to his Treatise on the Lord’s Day, ch. iv., entitled, “Whether every Word in the Decalogue be of the Law of Nature, and of Perpetual Obligation? And whether all that was of the Law of Nature was in the Decalogue?” (*Works*, vol. xiii., p. 504); Barrow’s Exposition of the Decalogue, at the beginning; Holden on the Christian Sabbath, p. 201; and Hengstenberg on the Lord’s Day, translated by James Martin, (Lond. 1853,) p. 81.

hands allowed to be positive,* and it is not to be denied that the duty of sabbath-observance is by the very words of the precept confined to the Israelites, and their slaves, cattle, and proselytes;† while the *Third* Commandment again, prohibiting the utterance of the word *JEHOVAH* except upon very solemn occasions, refers to a circumstance exclusively Jewish, and so cannot be a portion of the law of nature.‡ The word occurs not once in the Christian Scriptures.

* Even in so orthodox a journal as the *Presbyterian Review* the following broad admission is made:—"And here, we readily admit that the Sabbath is a ceremonial institution, and that the Fourth Commandment cannot be strictly termed a *moral* law. It forms no part of the law written on the heart, and has no natural and inherent obligation upon the conscience. This would never have been disputed had it not been for its position among the ten commandments, which are essentially moral. But that which is in its own nature positive and ceremonial, can never become otherwise by any solemnity of announcement, or by any association with what is moral. The reluctance of good men to admit so plain a point is easily accounted for, and has led Owen and others to attempt a compromise between the two opinions, affirming that it is both moral and ceremonial; moral, because it is a duty to give some portion of our time to God, and ceremonial as to the seventh portion. The same, however, might be said of the Levitical law regarding tithes, since it is a moral duty that those who serve at the altar should live by the altar. The whole Jewish ritual is, in this respect, moral; for that God is to be worshipped in some way is a moral duty, and that he is to be worshipped in the way of his own appointment is an equally clear moral principle; yet what is ceremonial if the Jewish ritual be not? The spirit of the Fourth Commandment is not the acknowledgment of God's right to some portion of our time, for this is acknowledged in every act of worship; but it is an acknowledgment of his right to the seventh portion of it,—an arrangement in which there is nothing moral,—a fifth or a tenth portion of our time being, for ought we know beforehand, as acceptable to God. To prove the ceremonial and positive nature of the Fourth Commandment, it is only necessary to adduce our Saviour's declaration, 'That the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' This could never have been said of any of the other ten [nine?] commandments. They were not made for man, but man was made for them, that thereby he might glorify God; and heaven and earth shall pass away, nay, God himself be changed, ere one jot or tittle of the moral law can be departed from."—(Vol. i., p. 503, Jan. 1832.) The writer adds truly, that a ceremonial law *may*, however, be of perpetual and universal obligation. The question is simply, whether God has made it such?

These views coincide with mine, as stated *ante*, pp. 181-7, 217-221, 228-9.

† See *ante*, pp. 164, 187.

‡ See Michaelis's *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. iv., p. 64; *The Mosaic Sabbath*, by a Layman, p. 5; and Godfrey Higgins's *Horæ Sabbaticæ*, 2d ed., p. 26 (Lond. 1833).—As to the declaration, "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God," in the Second Commandment, Mr Higgins observes that this also is a clause applicable only to the Jews, and that the term "jealous," as used by us and applied to God, is absurd. "*My* God," says he (p. 77), "is not a jealous God, but a God of benevolence and mercy, long-suffering and great kindness. The term had a peculiar meaning as applied to the Jews, and related to idolatry, and the worship of other gods than Jehovah. But it is actually ridiculous when applied to us, and this shews the wisdom in the Catholic Church of abandoning this code of Jewish law, and depending upon the commands of Jesus Christ. Not a word of Jesus Christ can be shewn favourable to this command"—or at least to the words here quoted from the reason annexed to it.

It has been well remarked that "the remind given to the Israelites in the Fourth Commandment (in Deuteronomy), that they had been servants in Egypt,

If this be a correct view of the matter, and if the question which immediately follows in the Catechism be there rightly answered, then the meaning of the phrase "sum of the Ten Commandments" in that succeeding question, can be nothing more definite than "the spirit and general object of the Ten Commandments."

The preface to the Decalogue is next recited; and here the authors of the Catechism deserve the credit of giving it in an ungarbled shape; for the framers of the Communion Service of the Church of England have chosen to quote only the words "I am the Lord thy God"—thus concealing (as Dr Graves also does, while pretending to give the passage as it stands in Scripture*) the fact that those to whom the Decalogue was addressed were *the Israelites alone*, who had just been brought by Jehovah "out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."† In the *Catechism* of the Church of England, however, the whole sentence is honestly inserted.

and were on that account to keep the Sabbath, is a strong indication, or rather, I ought to say, a conclusive proof, that the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue could not have been designed for observance by any other people."—(*The Mosaic Sabbath*, p. 7.) Milton, who makes a similar observation on the passage, adds—"Or if, as is contended, it is applicable to us inasmuch as we have been brought out of the slavery of a spiritual Egypt, the Sabbath ought to be such as the deliverance, spiritual and evangelical, not bodily and legal; above all, it ought to be a voluntary, not a constrained observance, lest we should be merely substituting one Egyptian bondage for another; for the spirit cannot be forced. To contend therefore that what, under the new dispensation, ought to be our daily employment, has been enjoined as the business of the Sabbath exclusively, is to disparage the Gospel worship, and to frustrate rather than enforce the commandments of God."—(*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 607-8.)

Every body knows that the reason annexed to the *fifth* Commandment refers to the land of Canaan, and hence applies exclusively to the Jews.

Lastly, the Ten Commandments are expressly called "the words of the covenant" (Exod. xxxiv. 28), *i.e.* that covenant between Jehovah and the Israelites, of which the Sabbath was the "sign."

Yet the Rev. Mr Holden, in his treatise on the Christian Sabbath (one of the ablest and fairest of its class), declares, after the usual fashion, that "because the Ten Commandments occupy so prominent a place in the sacred code, and are in all respects so conspicuously distinguished from all the other laws of Moses, it would be irrational to suppose them designed for the purposes of a temporary dispensation."—(*The Christian Sabbath; or an Inquiry into the Religious Obligation of Keeping Holy one Day in Seven*. By the Rev. George Holden, A.M. Lond. 1825, p. 185). In a feeble attempt which he makes to get rid of the contrary indications, he overlooks the inapplicability of the epithet "jealous" to the Heavenly Father of the Christian Scriptures.

* See *ante*, p. 182.

† "This passage being a part of the words which God spake, and occurring as it does in the very middle of the sentence which God spake, the officiating minister is by the forms of the church service made to say, in effect, that which is false. True it is that God did speak the words which the minister repeats, but equally true is it that God spake others also: and what, I ask, would be thought of the witness who, in giving testimony to that which he heard another person say, should state very faithfully a portion of what was said, but for a purpose of his own omit to state the whole of it? Now the passage in the Commandment omitted by the minister, because it relates only to the Jews, is omitted for the purpose of turning the attention of the congregation aside for the time from the inference which might otherwise present itself to them, that the Decalogue was addressed to and intended for the Jews alone."—(*The Mosaic Sabbath*, by a Layman, p. 8).

This preface to the Decalogue, the Westminster Catechism proceeds to say, "teacheth us, that because God is the Lord, and our God, and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep all his commandments." On which I shall only remark, that *our* obligation to keep all the commandments of God is too plain to need the support of so fanciful an argument as that we, being God's *spiritual* Israel, redeemed by him from a spiritual Egypt and house of bondage, are as much bound to obey the commandments given to us, as the Israelites were bound to obey those given to them.

The next question above quoted is, "Which is the Fourth Commandment?" in answer to which is repeated the copy of the law in Exod. xx. 8-11, in preference to that in Deut. v. 12-15.* It thus appears that the Westminster Assembly considered only *one* of the editions to be genuine; nor believed, like a modern Presbyterian critic, that the reasons annexed to *both* copies were uttered at Sinai, and inscribed by the Deity on the tables of stone.† Their inducement to prefer the copy in Exodus, was no doubt its coincidence with the narrative of the creation in Genesis: but had they known all

* Both copies are quoted *ante*, p. 95.—A *third* copy, greatly different from these, is found by Mr Newman in Exodus xxxiv. 14-28. See his *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* (London, 1847), p. 134.

† See an article on the Rev. Baden Powell's Connection of Natural and Divine Truth, in the *Presbyterian Review*, vol. x., p. 732 (May 1838). With reference to Mr Powell's suggestion, that the narrative of the creation in Genesis, being flatly at variance with geological facts, cannot now be reasonably regarded as more than an "apologue and parable," for instructing the Jews in the "greatness and majesty of the Divine power and creative wisdom," the reviewer asks—"May not the plagues of Egypt, and the giving of the law, be the 'dramatic action' of a fable intended to convince us of the Divine justice? And can we even be sure that the gospel history does not employ 'figure and poetry' throughout 'for the better enforcement of its objects?' Mr Powell has not defined the limits, because he could not. If one serious narrative of Scripture is to be treated as a fable, so must the whole. Their's is a common cause and one position. Thus, if from its place in the Decalogue, the six days' creation is not entitled to be received as literal history, so neither is the deliverance from Egypt. Both are given as reasons for the observance of laws,—*both were uttered in the course of that short but most solemn address that ever came from heaven to earth,—and both were recorded by the finger of God on the same table of stone, without the slightest hint that the one was not equally real with the other.* And if such sanction shall not procure acceptance for the statement, no explicitness of language, nor solemnity of assertion can. Mr Powell is an advocate for the right of reason to judge of the anterior probability of revelation. We would ask him what notions regarding it such a system of accommodated fables and groundless sanctions is fitted to inspire? Does it not reduce it to a series of disclosures where the sagacity of the creature presses hard upon the concessions of the Creator; and by detecting the inconsistencies of the history and the futility of the sanctions, is continually superseding the old, and calling for new precepts and revelations, which, on undergoing similar scrutiny shall become antiquated in their turn? If the Jew was bound to observe the Sabbath, because he believed the world to be created in six days; whilst the geologist is, according to Mr Powell, released from this obligation; what security is there that the historical enforcement of other precepts shall not be made equally void, and their consequent obligation nullified?"

These are serious questions for all who think the Hebrew Scriptures an indispensable part of the foundation of moral duty, or (like the Sabbath Alliance) the *only stable foundation* thereof.

that Astronomy and Geology have since revealed to *us*, their choice would probably have been different; they would have adopted *that* edition which assigns the deliverance from Egypt as the reason for instituting the Sabbath—instead of *that* other edition which, if the Pentateuch be an inspired production, must henceforth be added to the list of vitiated passages which, for centuries past, every biblical scholar has recognised as occurring in the Mosaic writings.* It is remarkable that on the only recorded occasion on which Jesus alluded to the creation in connexion with the Sabbath, he discountenanced, in pointed language, the notion that God had ever rested from his work: “*My Father worketh hitherto,*” said he, “and I work;”† —a declaration not easily reconciled with the passages we have been considering, or with the remarkable statement in Exod. xxxi. 17, that “in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested *and was refreshed.*” That the labours of creation were executed in a very different order, and during an immensely longer time, than the Hebrew narrative represents to us, is now readily confessed and explicitly promulgated even by Scottish writers of unquestionable attachment to the orthodox theology of their country.‡

It is next stated in the Catechism, that “the Fourth Commandment requireth the keeping holy to God *such set times* as he hath appointed in his word; expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy Sabbath to himself.” Here the mention of “set times” in general, seems intended to meet the views of some who, like Philo and others,§ might regard the Fourth Commandment as a summary of the ceremonial law, and who might think the observance of *all* the Mosaic festivals incumbent, if not upon the whole Christian Church, at least upon its Hebrew members. But whatever the Divines may have intended by the words in question, there is no possibility of misunderstanding why they say “one whole day in seven,” instead of “the seventh day;” the phraseology adopted being well fitted to avoid the inconvenience of limiting the application of the precept to the original Saturday. Accordingly, in answer to Question 59th, we read that “from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God

* See *ante*, pp. 94, 182.

† John v. 17. See *ante*, pp. 75, 76.—The pious and very eminent naturalist Ray, in the preface to his *Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation*, says,—“By the works of creation, in the title, I mean the works created by God at first, and by him conserved to this day in the same state and condition in which they were at first made; for conservation, according to the judgment both of philosophers and divines, is a continued creation.”

‡ See Mr Hugh Miller’s *First Impressions of England and its People*, ch. xvii.

§ See *ante*, p. 186.—“With regard,” says Milton, “to the doctrine of those who consider the Decalogue as a code of universal morality, I am at a loss to understand how such an opinion should ever have prevailed; these commandments being evidently nothing more than a summary of the whole Mosaic law, as the fourth, in particular, is of the whole ceremonial law; which therefore can contain nothing applicable to the Gospel worship.”—(*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 608.) Calvin also appears to have viewed the Decalogue as such a summary; as Hengstenberg observes, in his treatise on the Lord’s Day, p. 81.

appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly sabbath ; AND the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath.”

Here it is affirmed that in virtue of the Fourth Commandment, altered, as to the day of the week, by God himself at the resurrection of Jesus, all Christians are bound to keep holy the Sunday, precisely as the Jews were ordered to keep holy the Saturday. This implies, 1. That the Fourth Commandment was imposed upon all men ; 2. That it is still in force ; and, 3. That we have sufficient proof that the day to be kept holy was changed by the Divine Legislator, at the resurrection of Jesus, from the seventh day of the week to the first.

As to the *first* of these assumptions, reference is made to my former attempt to shew that the Law of Moses (including the Decalogue) never having been promulgated to the Gentiles, cannot be binding upon any but the Jews, if indeed now even upon them.* Supposing that attempt to have been successful, the *second* assumption may freely be granted ; since, on the supposition made, the question whether laws which have never bound the Gentiles, continue (wholly or partially) in force, is important to only the Jews. It is a general opinion among theologians that the entire Mosaic law came to an end with Christ ;† but in the standards of the Churches of England and Scotland, followed in this particular by the Sabbath Alliance, the Decalogue is excepted from the abrogated mass.‡ It has however been

* *Ante*, pp. 164–198. See also 222–225.

† See *ante*, pp. 119–122, 166, 184.

‡ “ Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men” (*i. e.* whether Jews or Gentiles), “ nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth ; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from obedience of the Commandments which are called moral.”—(*Article VII. of Church of England.*)

The omission to *specify* here the “ Commandments which are called moral” is very remarkable. It indicates, I think, that the framers of the Article wished to avoid the difficulties which the Fourth Commandment must have occasioned had the Decalogue been explicitly named. See *ante*, p. 289. But no such obscurity was found needful by the Puritans—whose doctrine is thus expressed :—

“ Besides this law (the Decalogue), commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances ; partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits ; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.”—(*Westminster Confession of Faith*, ch. xix., § 3.)

This view is adopted by the Sabbath Alliance, who, in their Tract No. III., p. 2, say—“ We maintain that the Sabbath [law] is a moral statute, because it is embodied in the moral law of the Decalogue, which is of perpetual and unchanging obligation. This, we are aware, has been denied ; but that denial goes to unsettle the very foundations of morality. If the Decalogue is discharged as a moral code, we are left without any definite standard of moral practice ; we have no rule by which we can determine what is moral and what ceremonial in other parts of Scripture—what was of temporary, and what is of eternal obligation. But is this the case ? Is it not, on the contrary, apparent that the law of the Decalogue STANDS OUT APART from all the prescriptions of the Levitical economy ? Is not this apparent from the very form in which it was given—uttered out of the midst of the fire, and the cloud, and

argued with great ingenuity, by Dr Taylor of Norwich and Dr Priestley,* that *no* part of the Jewish law has been repealed; although

thick darkness, by the voice of the great Lawgiver himself, inscribed by His own fingers on tables of stone, and ordered to be kept enshrined in the ark of the covenant? Is it not said that He ‘gave the law of the Ten Commandments, and he added no more?’ He added a great many more ceremonial, but no more moral precepts than these ten, *for it is a perfect standard, comprehending all moral duty*; and he gave no less than these ten, for it is an unalterable and inviolable standard, and no man dare diminish the number. And is not the same apparent from the very nature of the commandments? So different from the ceremonial and civil enactments of the ancient law, which are founded on the good will and pleasure of the legislator, this law contains the very sum and substance of morality—love to God, and love to man; and its precepts are based, not on the positive will, but the pure nature of God himself—unchanging and immortal as his own holiness, of which it is the transcript. And what proof have we that any part of this Decalogue was ever altered or abolished? Is it not, on the contrary, the very law which the Apostle declares is holy, and just, and good; the law which man had broken, and which the Saviour of man obeyed—which He ‘came not to destroy, but to fulfil;’—that law which was written on his own heart, *and which is written on the hearts of all his renewed ones*—that law which faith does not make void, but establishes—the same law, in short, by which men shall be judged at the last day, and of which it is said, that ‘whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all?’ In this eternal code of duty is the precept of the Sabbath embodied—we might say imbedded, and that so firmly that it cannot be wrenched out without destroying the unity and endangering the stability of the whole fabric. There is something positive or arbitrary, we grant, in the fourth precept—even the precise portion of time appointed—the seventh; but the foundation of the precept lies deep in the moral nature of God, that a certain portion of our time must be devoted to his service; and even the selection of the seventh portion, being the dictate of infinite wisdom, and not left to human caprice, must be regarded as having a moral bearing towards us, founded on the very constitution of man, and the very nature of things. But not only does the law of the Sabbath form part of the Decalogue, it occupies a place in its very centre, and may be said to be the connecting link between the duties of the first and second tables. It partakes of the piety of the one, and the benevolence of the other. While it enjoins us to take rest ourselves, it commands us to give rest to all that belongs to us,—‘On it thou shalt not do not any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.’ Thus it corresponds with the sum of the second table,—‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.’ *If this precept were to be dropped from the Decalogue, we then would have laws against robbing people of their money, of their lives and good name, but none against robbing them of their time. The working man would be entirely at the mercy of his master, who might, without infringing on any law, EXACT FROM HIM a life of unremitting toil.*”

Both the wisdom of the Sabbath Alliance, and the rate at which they appreciate the law of nature and the law of Christ, are here extremely conspicuous. But how comes it that in a memorial which they induced certain “masters, mates, engineers, stewards, seamen, firemen, and others, belonging to the port of Leith,” to address to the shipowners there in order to promote the better observance of the Sabbath, the Alliance so entirely forgot the separation of the Decalogue from “all the prescriptions of the Levitical economy,” that they made the memorialists declare that “God has commanded us to keep his Sabbaths, and to reverence his sanctuary; but, as we are presently situated, we are unable to do either”?—(*Narrative of the Proceedings of the Sabbath Alliance for the Years 1849 and 1850*, p. 33.) The Presbyterian skippers of Leith who signed this memorial (probably without reading it), have a right to be informed by the Alliance where God’s sanctuary is, which they are commanded to reverence.

* See Dr Taylor’s opinions *ante*, p. 167; and Dr Priestley’s “Attempt to

these celebrated theologians never dreamt for a moment that the Gentiles are anywise interested in the question. On the other hand Dr Hengstenberg, an eminent German "evangelical" divine of the present day, maintains, as some of our own Puritans do,* that the Mosaic ritual was indeed temporary, but yet the spirit of the code is a thing which all Christians are greatly concerned to study and conform to. "If once," says he, "we acknowledge this law as truly divine, we cannot possibly regard it as repealed, like the Code of Napoleon, or its precepts as no more affecting us than those of the Koran. Since the will of God is the expression of his nature, no caprice can be attributed to him, and it is impossible that any *merely temporary* laws can be given by him. Melancthon's expression, 'The law of Moses is not binding upon us, though some things which the law contains are binding, because they coincide with the law of nature,' is only partially correct. There certainly existed a temporary ingredient in the Mosaic law, and for this reason it has no longer any force as an outward letter, and may often be neglected with propriety, so far as the letter is concerned. But if this form, which was only intended to last for a time, be removed, and thus the spiritual element be obtained in its purity, the latter is of no less importance to us than to the people of the Old Testament. We are not free to choose whether we will follow it or not. To reject it, would be to resist God.

"This view of the importance of the Mosaic law to the Church of the New Testament," continues Hengstenberg, "has been assented to by M. Weber, amongst modern theologians, but not fully developed. He confines it to the Decalogue, instead of extending it to the whole of the Mosaic law, not excluding that part of it which is commonly called the ceremonial law. The separation of the Decalogue from the rest of the Pentateuch, of the moral law from the ceremonial, is here also an arbitrary proceeding. The moral law is no less abolished than the ceremonial; the ceremonial law is as eternally binding as the moral. To maintain the opposite is to deny the divine origin of the former. For if it be divine, it must contain revelations of the nature and will of God, which are simply clothed in a form suited to the peculiar necessities of the people of Israel. But Weber's fundamental idea is perfectly correct, that the commandments are not simply binding because they are coincident with the law of nature, but also because they are repeated by God in the Old Testament Scriptures. Bialloblötzky has attempted in vain a refutation of this. 'If,' says he, 'a man observes only those laws of a legislator which appear good to him, and leaves the others at his pleasure, he does not follow this outward legislation, so much as himself, even though his actions express at times the purport of the law, in such a manner that he appears to

Prove the Perpetual Obligation of the Jewish Ritual," in his *Theological Repository*, vol. v., p. 403, and vol. vi., p. 1. He makes no exception even of sacrifices; but should the temple ever be rebuilt, still, if it be true (as Bishop Burnet intimates in his *Exposition of Article VII. of the Church of England*), that, from the loss of their genealogies, the Jews can no more know whether they are of the seed of Abraham or not, or whether there are any left among them of the tribe of Levi, or of the family of Aaron, then not only sacrifices, but many of the other ceremonies, are become impossible.

* See *ante*, pp. 174, 179, 224, 225.

regulate his life by it.' If in this argument the supposition applies to the present case, the conclusion would be equally applicable. But is this the fact? It is not at pleasure that the eternal substance is separated from the temporal form, but according to fixed laws. To the latter, only that can belong which can be proved from the nature of the theocracy to refer especially to it. There may be differences of opinion as to particular points; but where these do not arise, it is not left to a man's own pleasure to obey or not. He who does not obey, manifests his contempt of God as clearly as a disobedient member of the old covenant. Upon this view, the entire question of the validity of the Decalogue in the Christian church rests. The effect which it has produced upon the church in every country proves that its commands are something very different from friendly counsels. They are not subordinate to the law of nature, but on a par with it; the manner in which they are drawn up, the events which attended their promulgation, and the solemn sanction which they received from God, secure for them effects which the law of nature, however drawn up, will never produce. Many a man has been kept from the sin by the law of Sinai, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' echoed loudly within him, when the law of nature, which is so easily obliterated and silenced, would never have preserved him from it.

"We have so striking a confirmation of the views we have just stated, in an expression of Christ's, that we need not look for any further Scriptural proofs. It is the passage contained in Matt. v. 17-19, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.' The prophets are mentioned here, not as foretellers of the future, but as preachers of the law, as in ch. vii. 12; xxii. 40. This appears from the use of the word *or*, not 'and,' and is confirmed by the whole connection, especially by the word *for* in ver. 18, in which the law and the prophets are classed under the general name of law. In ver. 19, too, only the commandments are mentioned; and the design of the whole paragraph, to which these verses serve as an introduction, is evidently to prevent a false opinion as to the relation of the law to the new economy, so that a reference to prediction would here be out of place. Destroying and fulfilling are the direct opposites the one of the other, and, therefore, the explanation given of the latter, that it consists in *doing* and *teaching*, shews that destroying denotes not doing, and not teaching. The former are performed first by Christ himself, and partly by his members. The parallel passage in Luke xvi. 17, explains what the Saviour means by 'till all be fulfilled,' where he says, 'it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail.' From this it is evident that the simplest meaning is the correct one, namely, the law will continue for ever, and not fail in any point till it is entirely satisfied.

"Here, then, the perpetuity of the law, and its demands upon the

members of the New Testament, are expressly maintained. And we have no right, arbitrarily, to restrict to one part of the law, the moral law, what is said of the *whole*. But there is just as little reason to understand 'one jot or tittle,' as meaning 'one jot or tittle' of the letter. The words of Christ would then stand in direct and evident contradiction to other statements of the New Testament; but the discourse of Christ which immediately follows, demonstrates the fallacy of such an opinion. The Saviour, in this discourse, goes far beyond the letter of the Mosaic Law, whilst he unfolds the idea which Moses himself could not fully express, on account of the hardness of the people's hearts. But if that which is contained in the idea is to be regarded as a real ingredient of the law, this mode of treatment must be consistently carried out, and the accidental be separated from the essential—the conditional from that which is independent of all conditions. And thus no jot or tittle of the true spirit of the law can fail."*

Now there is a grand fallacy which pervades and vitiates the whole of this reasoning: It proceeds upon the baseless assumption, that a law given to a particular nation demands the obedience not only of the nation on which it has been imposed, but of *every* nation which becomes acquainted with it, though without being subjected to its authority.† By this obvious flaw, the argument is so effectually deprived of all semblance of force, that it might here be left to its fate without a syllable of farther comment. Nevertheless I shall add the observation, that the followers of Hengstenberg must, if they *reason* at all, often find themselves greatly and unpleasantly perplexed. For, by what trustworthy rule can they guide themselves in the delicate work of separating those portions of the Mosaic law which are but "temporary ingredient," having no longer any force as an outward letter, and the removal of which leaves in its purity "the spiritual element" that "is of no less importance to us than to the people of the Old Testament"? The only aid with which Hengstenberg furnishes the anxious interpreter is this: "It is not at pleasure," says he, "that the eternal substance is separated from the temporal form, but according to fixed laws. *To the latter, only that can belong which can be proved from the nature of the theocracy to refer especially to it.*" Good!—but who is to decide whether a thing can or cannot be proved to have such a special reference? Hengstenberg himself foresees the difficulty, and adds: "There may be differences of opinion as to particular points; *but where these do not arise, it is not left to a man's own pleasure to obey or not.*" A wide exception indeed!—leaving all men at liberty to obey or disobey, for instance, the Fourth Commandment, whose special relation to the theocracy is with many a subject not merely of doubt, but of utter disbelief.‡

Again: a time was when nobody suspected that the Mosaic law against

* The Lord's Day. By E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Berlin. Translated by James Martin, B.A. Pp. 88–91.

† See *ante*, p. 164.

‡ As to the differences of opinion which have prevailed about the applicability of the Fourth Commandment to Gentile Christians, see *ante*, pp. 119–124, 322–330.

taking interest for money could be “proved from the nature of the theocracy to refer especially to it.” Did Calvin, then,—who, according to Hales of Eton, “was the first good man that ever pleaded the lawfulness of it.”*—commit a sin in accepting interest from his debtors, in spite of the universal belief of other good men that he was contravening God’s law? And if all good men who preceded Calvin might err so grievously on this point, may not all good men now err as grievously on other points? Nay, if any one man differ from all the world in opinion, has not a case arisen, in which, according to Hengstenberg, it is left to at least *that* man’s pleasure to obey or not? One good man of the present century, Dr Graves, has said that the Mosaic laws enacting the capital punishment of sons who curse their fathers or mothers, or who persist in a career of debauchery and drunkenness in defiance of parental control, were intrinsically “just and moderate,” the crimes being such as “surely merited infamy and death;”† and, be the fact so or not, who will undertake to “prove from the nature of the theocracy” that those laws “refer especially to it,” and therefore have ceased to be binding? Yet unless this be shewn, the consistent follower of Hengstenberg must be an advocate for the enactment of such laws in every Christian country.‡ The Mosaic law for the cleanliness of the camp, on the other hand, although the substance of it might with signal advantage be made a rule of conduct in every age and among every people, must be rejected as one that has passed away, because *expressly stated* to have an especial relation to the theocracy. Immediately after it we read thus, in Deut. xxiii. 14—“For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee: therefore shall thy camp be holy, that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee.”

The remark of Hengstenberg that “many a man has been kept from sin” by the prohibition of adultery in the Seventh Commandment, seems to be made in forgetfulness that the law of Christ against unchastity is no less explicit, and much more extensive, than the law of Sinai. Why should Christians resort for knowledge of their duty to the Mosaic law, when, as Milton says, “the will of God is *best* learnt from the Gospel itself?” §

* See *ante*, p. 180.

† See *ante*, p. 196.

‡ So far as I am aware, Massachusetts is the only part of Christendom where any thing like these Mosaic statutes has been enacted. In the Laws of that Colony, 1646, ch. viii., § 13, it was decreed “that if any child or children above sixteen years old, and of sufficient understanding, shall curse or smite their natural father, he or they shall be put to death.” But this humane qualification was added: “unless it can be sufficiently testified, that the parents have been very unchristianly negligent in the education of such children.” The modern legislators of the Commonwealth, says Mr Combe, “have wisely repealed this and many other barbarous and bloody laws for punishing offences, and have adopted the more Christian and the more effectual method of endeavouring to prevent crimes by the universal instruction of the people.”—(*Notes on the United States*, vol. i., p. 67.)

§ Treatise on Christian Doctrine, p. 421. As to the sufficiency of the Gospel, see the extracts from Chillingworth, Sherlock, and Watson, *ante*, pp. 197–8. How little the ancient Gentile Christians thought themselves obliged to obey or even study the Jewish law, appears from a remarkable fact mentioned by

In saying that "he who does not obey manifests his contempt of God as clearly as a disobedient member of the old covenant," Dr Hengstenberg is right to this extent—that whoever believes any part of the Mosaic law to be binding on the members of the *new* covenant, and yet disobeys that part, manifests his contempt of God. But no Gentile who believes that the Mosaic law was given solely to the Jews, and no Jew who concurs with such theologians as hold the Mosaic law to be *entirely* abrogated, can be guilty of impiety in disregarding what seems to them a thing of no effect.

With great reason, too (though in opposition to the Established Churches of Britain), he pronounces the practice of making a distinction between the Decalogue and the rest of the Mosaic law, to be "an arbitrary proceeding." When Jesus told his Jewish hearers that he was come not to destroy but to fulfil the law, they must have understood him to speak of *the entire Mosaic code*, this being among them the sole meaning of "the law;" and to say that he meant but the fragment of it composed of the Ten Commandments, is virtually to charge him with the incredible act of wilful deception. If, then, it is more likely that the modern system-builders are mistaken, than that our Lord deliberately spoke in a way calculated to mislead his hearers, his declaration, that "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v. 18), presents to our choice only this alternative: either, *first*, that the whole law of Moses continues binding at the present day (*i. e.*, upon the Jews and their proselytes, whom it anciently bound); or, *secondly*, that it has *all* been "fulfilled," and is now displaced by the Christian law which the Apostles promulgated to both Jew and Gentile. Of these two conclusions, the second is so decidedly the more eligible, that it cannot but be generally preferred; and for those who choose it, the questions regarding the Sabbath will be, Whether the duty of observing it was imposed by the Apostles upon the Gentile

Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, B. iv., c. 26. We there learn that about A.D. 170, a bishop named Onesimus, who had never even seen the Books of the Old Testament, and was ignorant of their number and names, wishing to get information about them, and copies of passages bearing on the Christian faith, applied for these to Melito, bishop of Sardis, who was unable to satisfy him without going to Palestine for the express purpose of investigation, but by this means enabled himself to send Onesimus the earliest catalogue now extant of the Hebrew Scriptures. With this he wrote in the following terms: "Melito sends greeting to his brother Onesimus. Since in thy zeal for the Word, thou hast often desired to have selections from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the whole of our faith, and hast also wished to obtain an exact statement of the ancient books, how many they were in number, and what was their arrangement,—I took pains to effect this, understanding thy zeal for the faith, and thy desire of knowledge in respect to the Word, and that, in thy devotion to God, thou esteemest these things above all others, striving after eternal salvation. Therefore, having come to the East, and arrived at the place where these things were preached and done, and having accurately acquainted myself with the books of the Old Testament, I have subjoined and sent them to thee, of which the names are these." The original Greek letter may be seen in Theodore Parker's translation of De Wette's Critical and Historical Introduction to the Old Testament, vol. i., p. 87; and the foregoing English version of it (characterized by Parker as "faithful and beautiful") is from Palfrey's Acad. Lect., vol. i., p. 32.

Christians? and, if so, *How*, and *upon what day of the week*, ought this new Gentile-Sabbath to be observed?

Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of the Seventh Article of the Church of England, says: "It is evident, from the whole scope of the New Testament, that the Ten Commandments oblige Christians as well as Jews." But what is meant here by the ambiguous word "Christians"? No man knew better than Bishop Burnet how differently the *Jewish* and *Gentile* Christians were situated in relation to the law of Moses; why, then, has he thus vaguely contrasted Jews with *Christians*, instead of with *Gentile* Christians? Was it from reluctance to *affirm*—what, nevertheless, as the Expositor of the Thirty-nine Articles, he was compelled to *insinuate*—that the Ten Commandments are as obligatory upon Gentile Christians as they were upon the ancient Jews? And may not Arnold, too, have been tempted by the professional necessity of shewing respect for the Seventh Article, to express himself about the obligation of the Fourth Commandment with that unusual want of precision which was formerly remarked?*

Dr Wardlaw says: "It has, to my mind, much the appearance of quirk and evasion to allege—and yet it has been alleged with all seriousness by men of sound judgment and acute discrimination,—that it is not *as given to the Jews* that the precepts of the Mosaic law are binding upon Christians. This is very true; but it is a mere truism; it has the sound of an argument, but no more. For, to what does it amount? Only to this, that it is not as given to one man, that a command is binding upon another. The law of God is not obligatory upon you, when considered as enjoined upon me. As given to the Jews, it was, of course, binding upon the Jews only. This is too self-evident to be worthy of formal statement. The sole question ought to be, whether the Ten Commandments, uttered from Sinai by the voice of God, and by his finger written on the tables of stone, do, or do not, contain a summary of the leading articles of moral duty. If they do, they were binding before, they have been binding since, and they must be binding to the end. They have never been binding, however, either before or since, because they were given to the Jews; but they were given to the Jews, because they were the principles, universally and perpetually obligatory, of moral rectitude."†

What does Dr Wardlaw mean by saying that the Ten Commandments, if they contain a summary of the leading articles of moral duty, were binding *before* they were delivered? How can a law bind before it is enacted? The law of nature, indeed, of which the moral portions of the Decalogue were a republication, "was binding before, has been binding since, and must be binding to the end;" and *this*, no doubt, is what Dr Wardlaw intends to say, if his strangely inaccurate phraseology has any signification at all. That such is its meaning appears from the succeeding sentences, in which he even goes so far as to intimate that the obligation of the Decalogue upon the very Jews, was nowise dependent upon the fact of its having been imposed on them at Sinai. In short, he falls back upon *the law of nature* ("the mere impulse of feeling" of the Sabbath Alliance), as the law *really* in force

* See *ante*. p. 221. Holden also speaks ambiguously of "Christians," pp. 197, 202.

† Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 44.

with respect to Jew and Gentile alike ; and reduces the Decalogue to a position of secondary importance—that of a mere reminder of duties already known to be incumbent. If, then, it was thus subordinate in relation to the Jews to whom it was given, how can it be so vitally important as it is generally represented to be, to *us*, upon whom it has never been imposed—who know the law of nature as well as the Jews did—and to whom the law of Christ has been superadded for the *enforcement* of our natural duties, as the less perfect law of Moses was to the Jews ?*

The opinions of Luther on the subject before us have to some extent appeared from the brief extracts formerly given from his writings.† Other passages are adduced by Hengstenberg, who observes : “ The distinction, so current in later times, between the moral and ceremonial laws, according to which only the latter has been abolished by Christ, whilst the former is valid in all ages and binding upon all men, received no support from Luther. He looked upon the *whole law* as an outward compulsory letter, *only intended for the Jews* ; a view, which, as we shall shew in the second chapter, can only be objected to by those who misunderstand it. Thus he says, in the work entitled ‘ Instruction to Christians how to make use of Moses,’ ‘ The law of Moses belongs to the Jews, and is no longer‡ binding upon us. The words of Scripture prove clearly to us, that the ten commandments do not affect us ; for God has not brought us out of Egypt, but only the Jews. We are willing to take Moses as a teacher, but not as our lawgiver, except when he agrees with the New Testament and with the law of nature. . . . No single point in Moses binds us. . . . Leave Moses and his people alone. Their work is done. He has nothing to do with me. I listen to the Word which concerns me. We have the gospel. . . . We do not read Moses because he concerns us, because we have to obey him ; but because he agrees with the law of nature, and has expressed this law better than the heathen ever could. In this way the ten commandments are a mirror of our life, in which we see our defects.’

“ To the same effect he says, in the explanation of the ten commandments : ‘ We must remark at the outset, that the ten commandments do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt. If he says, No, then say, How then does Moses concern me, since he speaks to the people that have been brought out of Egypt ? In the New Testament Moses comes to an end, and his laws lose their force. He must bow in the presence of Christ. . . . The words, ‘ I am the Lord thy God,’ apply to all of us, to the whole world, not because Moses has written them, but because God has created, and preserves and governs all.’ And in another passage of the same work, he says : ‘ We must stop the mouths of the factious spirits, who say, “ Thus says Moses.” Then do you reply, Moses does not concern us. If I accept Moses in one command-

* This point was illustrated *ante*, p. 222–3.

† See p. 121.

‡ This phrase, “ no longer,” is clearly inaccurate, and may be a mistranslation of Luther’s words. See the remarks of Ostervald, *ante*, p. 165.

ment, I must accept the whole Moses. In that case I should be obliged to be circumcised, and to wash my clothes in a Jewish manner, and to eat and drink, and dress, and do everything of this kind, in the manner in which the Jews are commanded to do them in the law. Therefore, we will not obey Moses, or accept him. Moses died, and his government terminated when Christ came.'

"Luther's opinion of the Sabbath, in harmony with this general view, is so clearly expressed in his larger Catechism, that there is no necessity to bring forward other passages from his writings. 'God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are now left free by Christ. But, in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe that we keep a festival, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for these have no need of it; but first *for the sake of the body*, because Nature teaches that the working-classes, servants and maids, who have spent the whole week in their work and occupation, absolutely require a day in which they can leave off work, and rest and refresh themselves; and, chiefly, in order that men may, on such a day of rest, *have time and opportunity*, such as they could not otherwise have, *to attend to the worship of God*, that so they may come in crowds, to hear the word of God and practise it, to praise God, and sing, and pray. But this is *not bound to any particular time*, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other, but it ought to be performed daily; only, because this would be impossible to the mass of the people, we must at least devote one day to this purpose. And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelties.' "*

* Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day, pp. 61-63. The italics in the above extracts from Luther are as in the translation of Hengstenberg.

The same volume supplies some interesting particulars of the Sabbatarian controversies in Holland and Germany during the 17th and 18th centuries (pp. 69-76). Had the work appeared a few months earlier in an English dress, I should have been able to include them in the History of Modern Sabbatarianism, in Note F. Among other things, he mentions that it was *from England* that "the doctrine of the obligation of the Mosaic Sabbath spread to Holland. Some English Puritans, who sought an asylum in Zealand, introduced it. It was first published in two works on Ethics, by Udemann in 1612, and Teelling in 1617." A long and violent controversy ensued—the same which Dr Lorimer (*ante*, p. 56) represents as having been "the signal and the instrument of spreading relaxed views": It thus appears why the Sabbatarianism of the Puritans was called by Dutchmen "*pigmentum Anglicanum*," and how much reason I had to be sceptical about Dr Lorimer's "old Presbyterian Sabbath of Holland" (*ante*, p. 62).

Luther, then, (and with him the distinguished theologians named in p. 484, as well as Dr Owen, Bishop Horsley, and many others,) teach the repeal of the entire Mosaic law at the introduction of the law of Christ; while the few divines by whom it is thought to continue in force, confine its operation within the original limits.

But the Sabbath, it is said, *was adopted by Jesus into the new dispensation*: portions of the Decalogue were cited by him *as laws binding on his followers*; and thus the Fourth Commandment (though never, it must be confessed, specially recommended by him to their obedience) was *by implication* confirmed with the others: in his own person he set the example of a strict observance of the Sabbath; and when the hypercritical Pharisees accused him of profaning it, the sanctity of the day was uniformly assumed by him in his defence—which was merely an application of the principle, admitted in the abstract by the Pharisees themselves, that “mercy” is better than “sacrifice;” in other words, that when a *positive* duty clashes with one that is *moral* (*i. e.* natural), the former must give way to the latter.*

This representation looks very plausible, as long as we forget that Jesus was a Jew, subject to the law of Moses;† and that from first to last he addressed only the Jews, who were equally subject to that law with himself.‡ But as soon as this fact strikes us, we must see that if the precepts and example of Christ inculcate upon *us Gentiles* the duty of Sabbath-observance, they inculcate upon us the observance of the entire Mosaic law; for to *every* part of it did he give obedience himself, and recommend obedience to his hearers. “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do” (Matt. xxiii. 2). This is a plain confirmation of the whole Mosaic law, as the law of *those he spoke to*; but will any one argue that therefore *we* ought to circumcise our children, or to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread? Again, in a discussion with the scribes and Pharisees, “he answered and said unto them, Why do you also transgress the commandment of God by

* See Holden on the Christian Sabbath, ch. iv.; Wardlaw on the Lord’s Day, pp. 142, 221; Oliver’s Prize-Essay on the Sabbath, pp. 41, 84; and Candlish’s Sermon on “The Son of Man Lord of the Sabbath,” 3d ed., p. 14.

Because Jesus ordered a sick man whom he had healed, to remove his bed on the Sabbath (John v. 10–12), and in curing a blind man “made clay” and “anointed” the man’s eyes (John ix. 6, 14), it is concluded by Whately that he thereby “decidedly and avowedly violated the Sabbath; on purpose, as it should seem, to assert, in this way, his divine authority.” “The objections of the Pharisees,” says he, “to such an act of charity as healing on the Sabbath-day, may be regarded as frivolous; but the man’s carrying his bed was a manifest violation of the Sabbath, and could not be called an act of necessity or charity; yet it was *expressly commanded*, on purpose, as it seems, to shew that the ‘Son of Man’ claimed to be the Lord of the Sabbath; that is, to have the Divine power of dispensing with *positive* enactments; of the *justness* of which claim the miracle he had wrought afforded proof.”—(*Thoughts on the Sabbath*, p. 17.) I cannot view the matter in this light: the act appears to me (as it does likewise to Dr Wardlaw, p. 148) to be one that may fairly be regarded as, in the circumstances of the case, one of necessity or charity.

† See *ante*, pp. 166, 329.

‡ See the remarks of Ostervald, *ante*, p. 165

your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother; *and he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.* But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition" (Matt. xv. 3-6). Now here also, if the Sabbatarian argument be good for any thing, are we not forced to conclude that Jesus expressly confirmed, and adopted as a law of Christianity, that article of the Jewish law which makes the cursing of parents a capital offence? Unquestionably we are; yet Mr Holden, who cites the passage, sees in the words of Jesus nothing more than a confirmation of *the Decalogue!* "The Fifth Commandment," says he, "is here cited, and those who made it of none effect are condemned; which implies the perpetual obligation of the whole moral law, of which it forms a conspicuous part."* But not a word does he say about the *other* law which "is here cited," and which, precisely as in the case of the Fifth Commandment, the scribes and Pharisees are condemned for making of none effect!

Again—much stress has been laid upon Matt. xxiv. 20, where it is recorded that Jesus, when foretelling to his disciples the destruction of Jerusalem, counselled them to pray that their flight might "not be in the winter, neither on the sabbath-day." From which injunction Dr Owen infers that he thereby "doth declare the continued obligation of the law of the Sabbath, as a moral precept upon all."† This argument, which has been generally adopted by the Sabbatarians, is mentioned by Hengstenberg as a sample of "the mass of untenable arguments which are put in circulation in support of the strict Sabbatarian view of the Sunday," and which, he declares, make him "tremble" for the Christian festival. "By these arguments," says he, "the observance of the Sunday is unhappily damaged by its friends; not less than its opponents." The injunction of Christ is brought forward, he adds, "as a proof of the stress laid upon the observance of Sunday in the New Testament, without the possibility of proving that the Sunday is ever called the Sabbath by the New Testament writers. It is also overlooked, that, if the meaning which is here attached to the words be the correct one, the Saviour is but helping to build up, what he always aimed to overthrow, the scruples of the Pharisees with regard to the outward observance of the Sabbath. All that can be gathered from this advice is, that the Sabbath was likely, from the arrangements of that time, to present as great an impediment to their flight as the winter itself. But if the modes of expression peculiar to the Saviour's discourses are lost sight of in this way, we shall be brought to the conclusion that, under certain circumstances, it is our duty to pluck out the right eye, and cut off the right foot or right hand."‡ This reasoning appears to be conclusive.

* The Christian Sabbath, p. 196. † Exercitation xxxvii., § 47, p. 681-2.

‡ The Lord's Day, p. 106.—Mr Macfarlan says that "although *some* of the ritual observances did linger on till about the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, we scarcely expect to find our Lord *so carefully guarding his disciples against any breach* of what must by this time have lost all its meaning and pro-

There is a passage in Heb. iv. 9, 10, from which Owen, Wardlaw, and others, have inferred the Divine institution of a Christian Sabbath. The words are,—“ There remaineth therefore a rest (sabbatism) to

per authority. And therefore we see, in this declaration of our Lord, his recognition of the Sabbath, as appointed to continue in force during the Christian as well as preceding dispensations.”—(*A Treatise on the Authority, Ends, and Observance of the Christian Sabbath*. By the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan, Minister of Renfrew. Glasgow, 1832. P. 56.) Now, even if Jesus had so guarded his disciples, still, to make this argument available, Mr Macfarlan should have maintained, not only that the Sabbath was “ appointed to continue in force ” during the Christian dispensation, but that, while appointed to *continue* in force among the Jews, it was moreover appointed to *become* in force among the Gentiles, during the Christian dispensation. For even if, with him, we suppose that the Sabbath was instituted at the Creation, still, as the Gentiles in general were ignorant of the primeval institution, and the few among them who were acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures regarded the Sabbath as a purely Jewish ordinance, which *they* (unless proselytes) were under no obligation to keep, the injunction of Jesus about flight on the Sabbath-day has, even on the footing of Mr Macfarlan’s unwarrantable interpretation of it, no bearing whatever upon the *Gentile* Christians.

By Mr Holden, this part of the Sabbatarian case is abandoned as untenable. He says: “ It appears to me very clear that Christ refers to the Jewish Sabbath alone, declaring it to be dangerous to fly on that day on account of the opinions, prejudices, and practices of the Jews of that age.”—(*The Christian Sabbath*, p. 215.) And to this judgment Mr Oliver gives in his adherence.—(*Price Essay*, p. 49.) In fact, the hearers of Christ *could not* understand the injunction in the Sabbatarian sense; for till the destruction of Jerusalem, and even long afterwards, the Christian Jews continued to sanctify the seventh day, and, as far as we know, recognised no other Sabbath (See *ante*, p. 279). Yet Dr Hamilton has the boldness to affirm, that “ immediately after the resurrection of Christ, ‘ when he came into his kingdom,’ we lose sight of the seventh day as the interval of rest, and find substituted for it the first” (*Horæ et Vindicæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 78); and that the first day of the week was the “ Sabbath ” spoken of on the occasion referred to: “ The name,” says he, “ changed it not; for whatever its modification, it was the holy rest, bringing with it the secular remission,—it was none other than the Sabbath of God.”—(*Ib.*, p. 62.)

Mr Godfrey Higgins has discussed this portion of the controversy with his usual vivacity and frankness. “ The Rev. Mr Grascomb (*Script. Hist. of Sabbath*, pp. 137–147) has justly observed,” says he, “ that if a man acknowledge himself bound to any one thing by virtue of a law, by virtue of that same law he must own himself bound to all it requires. Now when Jesus desired his hearers to pray that their flight might not be on the Sabbath-day, he could of course only mean the Jewish Sabbath-day. If this sentence be construed to imply a continuation of the Sabbath, it must mean a continuation of it in all its parts; it must necessarily bind Christians to all which the Jewish Sabbath requires. Of all the passages which have been produced by the Sabbatarians, this is the only one on which they can rest with the *slightest plausibility*, and this *slight plausibility*, in fact, exists only by our not being able clearly to shew what the text means; therefore, say the Sabbatarians, though against the context, it means the continuation of the Sabbath. Now it very often happens that it may be shewn what a passage does *not* mean, though it cannot be shewn what it *does* mean. The whole prophecy, when *taken altogether*, is full of difficulty.

“ It is impossible, upon any fair principle of reasoning, to permit a passage of a prophecy, the meaning of which is not understood, to be construed directly in opposition both to the actions and words of Jesus and Paul upon every other occasion. Besides, it proves too much. If it be admitted, then the Jewish Sabbath must be admitted in its utmost strictness, and on the Saturday; and this is what has led some well-meaning devotees, who happened to have a little re-

the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.* As, however, not only is the authorship of that Epistle a disputed point among scholars,† but the meaning of the passage is confessedly obscure,‡ and Dr Wardlaw acknowledges that the interpretation put upon it by most commentators is at variance with his, nothing can be safely built on so very loose a foundation. Accordingly, Mr Oliver wisely “deems it better to waive what after all must be confessed to be but dubious support.”§ With equal wisdom he dismisses also, as fanciful, an argument in favour of the Christian Sabbath from Ps. cxviii. 24, com-

gard for consistency, to maintain that it was as wrong for a man to feast on a Sunday as to cut the throats of his children, &c. It is the most absurd thing imaginable to suppose it was ever the intention of Jesus, that a rite of such immense importance as the Sabbath, the most important of any that ever was in the world to mankind, should be established on such a doubtful text, and by such a side-wind as this. If Jesus had intended the Sabbath to continue, he would have said so: and we may again safely say, with St Jerome upon another occasion, *Non credimus quia non legimus*. If it could be shewn that Jesus here meant the Christian Sabbath, it might be fairly concluded that a Christian must not flee from his house on a Sunday, even if it were on fire, and a powder magazine at the next door.

“St Chrysostom is a great authority. What says he upon this text? ‘Behold, how he addresseth his discourse to the Jews, and tells them of the evils that should befall them: for neither were the apostles bound to keep the Sabbath, nor were they there when these calamities fell upon the Jewish nation. Not in the winter, nor on the Sabbath; and why so saith he? Because their flight being so quick and sudden, neither the Jews would dare to flee on the Sabbath, nor would the winter but be very troublesome in such distresses.’—(*Heylin*, Part II., ch. i., p. 10.)

“Dean [Bishop?] Prideaux says, ‘that ’tis ridiculous for any to argue for a confirmation of the Sabbath from these words, which Christ foretold as an inconvenience that would arise from the superstition of the Jewish people.’—(*De Sabb. Orat.*; Morer, *Dial.* II., p. 186.)

“The mass of nonsense which has been written upon this text is inconceivable. The author of this work fairly avows his ignorance of its meaning. The wish that the flight of the Christians should not be on the Saturday, is a wish that evidently alludes to something exclusively Jewish. *The Saturday* must of necessity be the day spoken of; for the words THE SABBATH at that time applied only to certain days ordained to be observed by the Jews. It is neither A Sabbath, nor YOUR Sabbath, as it would have been, had the Christian Sabbath been meant. These prophecies are amongst the passages which no one understands. When any person can tell why, if this alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem, at the time of this flight, it should be said (Matt. xxiv. 29–31), that the elect should be gathered by the sound of the trumpet, that the Son of Man should come with great glory in the clouds, that the sun should be darkened and the stars fall from heaven, for these things are all in the same prophecy, the author will tell him why the flight was not to be on the Saturday. There are many texts which the author confesses he cannot understand; though village schoolmasters and sucking divines generally understand every thing.”—(*Horæ Sabbaticæ*, 2d ed., pp. 75–77.)

* Owen, *Exerc.* xxxix. § 11, &c.; Wardlaw, p. 105; Dwight, *Serm.* cvii.

† See Kitto’s *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature*, vol. i., p. 826. Neander’s opinion is, that most probably the Epistle was written in one of the last years of Nero’s reign, by “an apostolic man of the Pauline school.”—(*Hist. of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, p. 347.)

‡ Dwight, *Serm.* cvii., par. 4; Holden, p. 243. § Prize Essay, p. 49.

pared with Acts iv. 10, 11;* and treats with scornful silence the attempts which have frequently been made by Sabbatarians to derive support from Isa. lvi. 6-8,† and Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34.‡ The argument from the former passage is characterized by Hengstenberg as “so unimportant as to need no elaborate reply.” The brief one which he thinks sufficient is this:—“‘The perpetuity of the Sabbath,’ say our opponents, ‘is clearly taught in Isaiah lvi. 6-8. If the house of God is a house of prayer for all nations, then the Sabbath is a Divine institution. And the house of God first became a house of prayer for all nations under the New Testament.’ They might quite as correctly prove from this passage that the temple of Jerusalem is to continue under the New Testament, in its former dignity (‘I bring them—the heathen—to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer’); and also the whole of the sacrificial worship (‘their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar’). If, now, we must admit that, throughout, the prophet has clothed the idea, which belongs alike to the Old and New Testaments, in Old Testament drapery, according to the prophetic style; that he points out the kingdom of God by that which was its centre and seat under the Old Testament—the temple; and the acceptance of the homage rendered by a pure mind, by the well pleased acceptance of the sacrifices; how can any one be justified in, immediately after, pressing the *letter*, in reference to the Sabbath? The passage shews, undoubtedly, that the Old Testament commandment contains a germ which lives through all ages; but cannot prove, what is said to be proved, that the letter of this commandment retains its force in the Church of the New Testament.”§

But the stronghold of the Sabbatarians is the declaration of Jesus, “that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,” (Mark ii. 27). Could there be a plainer announcement that the Sabbath was not a mere Jewish institution, but coeval with the creation, and consequently imposed upon all men? “To me it appears indisputable,” says Dr Wardlaw, “that ‘MAN’ must here be understood *generically*, that is, of the human race.”|| “Jesus,” says Mr Oliver, “states emphatically, that the Sabbath was made for *man*, that is, *all mankind*. The term is *generic*, and does not admit of a *special* application without a qualificative; so that we cannot restrict it without violating the plainest rule of interpretation.”¶ And by Dr Bruce the same idea is enlarged on thus:—“Now, considering the occasion of this discourse of our Lord, as declared in the context, I will by no means affirm that this was said with express design to anticipate and refute the notion, that the Sabbath is an ordinance appointed principally for the Jews, or more strictly binding on the Jews than on the Christian Church which succeeds them. But

* Prize Essay, p. 49; Dwight, Serm. cv.; and Lorimer, p. 30, 58.

† Dwight, Serm. cv.; Holden, p. 149; and Tract No. VIII. of the Sabbath Alliance, entitled “The Sabbath in Gospel Times spoken of by the Prophets,” p. 2. See Mr Russell’s remarks in his pamphlet on the Lord’s Day, p. 17.

‡ Tract No. VIII. of Sabbath Alliance, p. 1.

§ The Lord’s Day, p. 83. See also Kitto’s Cyclopædia, vol. ii., p. 656.

|| Discourses on the Lord’s Day, p. 9.

¶ Prize Essay, p. 49.

it must certainly be allowed, in all fairness, that the language employed there is precisely such as one would most cautiously and scrupulously have abstained from, who believed the Sabbath to be the property of a particular age or a peculiar nation. Would any prudent or ordinarily judicious teacher, holding such an opinion about the temporary and restricted use of the Sabbath, have allowed himself to aver, in most solemn discourse, that the Sabbath was made for *man*? Would he not have avoided using language so exceedingly general, more especially if aware, as was this divine prophet of the church, that an opinion respecting the universality of the Sabbath was extensively to prevail, and to be transmitted continually from age to age? He must have seen that such language at least favoured very greatly the opinion which would prevail, and that by suffering himself to say, 'the Sabbath was made for *man*,' he was supplying its advocates with an argument on which they might take their stand, and plead that they had his authority," &c.*

Now, in reply to all this, I might be content to say with Mr Francis Russell, that to represent the words in question as decisive for Sabbatarianism, is to violate the sound canon of construction—-that nothing is to be held as decided which was not clearly in the mind of the judge. "For, in this instance," adds Mr Russell, "there was no question raised as to whether or not the Sabbath be of universal obligation, nor could the circumstances give rise to such a question. What were these? The Jewish Rulers blamed the disciples (Jews) and, by implication, their Master (himself an Israelite and under the law), for violating the Sabbath, by gathering and eating ears of corn as they walked through the fields. Here was plainly a question of the Jewish law (from which, in no instance, our Lord personally claimed exemption), and as such he treated it; justifying his conduct by reference to two Jewish examples—that of David eating the shewbread, and that of the priests, who blamelessly violated the Sabbatic rest by the requisite services of the temple. The real question, then, at issue was this: Where Man's necessities come in conflict with the law of the Sabbath, which shall give way? It was decided, the law of the Sabbath; because 'the Sabbath was made for Man, not Man for the Sabbath.' For this reason, too, He adds, 'the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.' I do not claim these words as decisive against the perpetuity of the Sabbath, although that appears to me the most natural reading. But so far is the law of the Sabbath from being here represented as a *Moral* law, and quite *above* the Levitical law, that it would seem clearly *inferior* to it. The law of the Sabbath is subordinate to the law of the Temple, for the requisite services of the temple supersede it; and the two examples are quoted as homogeneous, both being violations, justified by circumstances, not of *moral* but of positive or ceremonial law,—David's of the law of the Temple,—

* The Duty and Privilege of Keeping the Sabbath. By the Rev. John Bruce, A.M., one of the ministers of St Andrew's Parish. Edin. 1842. P. 10.

Substitute for "The Sabbath was made for man," the words, "This is my body which is broken for you," and consider with what a fine argument Dr Bruce has here furnished the advocates of transubstantiation!

the priests' of the law of the Sabbath. Our Lord uses another argument—intelligible to me, only when regarded as a covert intimation of the coming termination of the Mosaic dispensation, including the Sabbath—which may be stated thus: *If* the (law of the) Sabbath be subordinate to the (law of the) temple, here is *One* greater than the temple. It was never His way to plead his dignity as a ground of exemption from the law, but it was his manner obscurely to foreshew the completion and extinction of the Jewish economy. The other expression, 'Wherefore (*i.e.* because, like the temple-service, it was made for Man) the Son of Man is Lord *also* of the Sabbath,' may well contain a like meaning. If it be legitimate to combine the two narratives (Matt. and Mark), the word '*also*' may have the following effect: The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath as well as of the temple.

"Nor is it at all inconsistent with what has been stated, to hold that such words as 'the Sabbath was made for man,' &c., while they have a special application to the special case, may contain an indignant rebuke of the narrow, cavilling spirit of the Jewish rulers."*

These observations seem to me as sound as they are excellently expressed. But there is a fact which Mr Russell has overlooked, and which of itself completely deprives the Sabbatarian argument of the force which at first sight it seems to have. The Greek words translated "*man*" in the passage before us are ambiguous: literally, they are equivalent to "*the man*," but they may also be translated "*man*;" and which of these two meanings is the true one must always be gathered from the context. The passage in Mark is as follows: Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον—literally, "The Sabbath was made for *the man*, not *the man* for the Sabbath." In the Vulgate, where the language is one *destitute of articles*, the rendering is of necessity "Sabbatum propter *hominem* factum est, et non *homo* propter Sabbatum." But *homo* signifies either "*man*," or "*a man*," or "*the man*," according to circumstances: how pointedly it sometimes means "*the man*" we all know from the familiar phrase "*argumentum ad hominem*," which signifies an argument available, not against mankind, but only against a particular man, or class of men, to whom it applies by reason of some *peculiarity* in their position. The English translators of the Bible are

* The Lord's Day *Not* the Sabbath, pp. 18–20. Mr Russell adds in a note: "It would be too much to assert, that words so enigmatical as those here referred to,—'The Sabbath was made for man,' &c., will not bear a construction different from that which is here given. It is only contended, that they cannot afford a good foundation in reason, for the conclusions which have been, frequently with much confidence, derived from them."—(P. 38.) He farther observes: "If the Fourth Commandment be a law for Christians, it will stand in this singular position: That being the only *positive* or ceremonial (as opposed to *moral*) commandment in the Decalogue; not being deducible from those comprehensive maxims, in which, we are repeatedly told, all the law for His disciples is embraced; and being therefore just the very commandment which (if it was His design that it should survive, and extend to all His disciples) would require to be explicitly stated and enforced as a part of the Christian discipline; it shall still be the only commandment, which is on no occasion mentioned, with any reference to Christianity, as continuing, and obligatory, either by our Lord or by any one of the Apostles."—(P. 39.)

known to have adhered as closely as they could to the Vulgate; and it was moreover very natural for them, with the notion of a primeval Sabbath in their heads, to follow the Latin idiom in preference to the Greek. That they erred in doing so, is, I think, plain, even from the considerations propounded by Mr Russell; but when we take into account also the grammatical ambiguity, and, above all, the "great fact" that the doctrine of a primeval Sabbath is left *now* without a vestige of proof,* the inference contended for is to my mind irresistible.

* It is often said for the primeval Sabbath, that many traces of a custom of regarding the seventh day of the week as sacred are to be found among the ancient Gentiles; which custom, it is argued, must have descended by tradition from the Patriarchs, whose Sabbath must have been an institution which all men were and are bound to observe, though by degrees it was widely neglected and forgotten among the Gentiles. Dr Owen, who treats fully of this subject in his 36th Exercitation, §§ 13-16, was preceded by Grotius as an advocate of the notion referred to. By the latter it is affirmed that "the completion of the work [of creation] within seven days was a circumstance recorded not only among the people of Greece and Italy, in the particular observance of the seventh day, as we learn from Josephus, from Philo, from Ovid, from Tibullus, from Clemens Alexandrinus, and from Lucian (while at the same time the Hebrew observance of it is universally well known), but also among the Celtæ and the Indians, who all established an hebdomadal division of time; as appears from Philostratus, from Dion Cassius, from Justin Martyr, as well as from the oldest periodical distinctions."—(*On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, Sect. XVI.) Here are two assertions—1. That the seventh day of the week was particularly observed among the people of Greece and Italy; and 2. That the hebdomadal division of time is a monument of the creation of the world in seven days. As to the former assertion, it will be found on consulting the notes in which the evidence of it is adduced by Grotius (or Owen's Exercitation above referred to), that the passages collected from ancient writers by no means warrant the conclusion which has been drawn from them. The testimony of Josephus (near the end of his second book against Apion) is, "that there is no city, whether Grecian or Barbarian, in which the customary observance of rest on the seventh day, which we (Jews) keep holy, does not also prevail." And Philo's statement (*On the Formation of the World*, p. 15) is, that "the seventh day is a festival, not in one city or country, but in all." But, as Heylin well observes (*History of the Sabbath*, Part I., pp. 173-176, 182), these passages refer, not to the practice of the ancient world in general, but to the extensive observance of the Sabbath by Gentiles in later times, in imitation of the Jews; who, after the conquest of their country by the Romans, and even for two centuries before, had spread themselves in all directions through foreign countries, and also were visited in Judea by numbers of the Gentiles. (See Michaelis's *Com. on the Laws of Moses*, vol. iii., p. 428; and Neander's *Gen. Hist. of the Christian Religion*, vol. i., p. 92.) Josephus himself introduces the words above quoted with the statement (*which Grotius omits*), that "the multitude of mankind itself have had a great inclination for a long time to follow our religious observances" (*Works*, Whiston's transl., vol. iv., p. 359, ed. 1826); and he adds, that not only the Sabbath, but the Jewish fasts, and ordinances of meats and drinks, had been adopted by the Gentiles—many of those Romans who did so being circumcised proselytes to Judaism. To suppose that anything else was meant by Josephus and Philo, or that if they *had* intended to make the assertion attributed to them, they would have deserved to be listened to in the face of all authentic ancient history, is so inadmissible, that it is surprising to observe a theologian of such eminence as Bishop Law interpreting their words as indicating, nay proving, that the primitive Sabbath was in early times observed "in all nations of the world."—(*Law's Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, p. 52.) The testimonies cited by Grotius and Owen from other authors are equally

But this is far more than it is *necessary* to contend for here ; all that I am bound to shew is, that the Sabbatarian interpretation of the

unserviceable, even if genuine ; but as some of them have been found to be spurious, Mr Oliver abandons the alleged lines of Hesiod, Homer, Linus, and Callimachus, as useless to the Sabbatarian cause (*Price Essay*, pp. 17, 80 ; and see *Letter to Godfrey Higgins, Esq.*, by T. S. Hughes, B.A., of Cambridge.) Though some Gentiles indeed appear to have observed "the seventh day" as a festival, there is reason to believe that it was the seventh, not of the *week*, but of the *month* ; the first and fourth days of which are said to have been equally holy.—(Heylin, p. 82.) The statement of Lucian (*Παράλογιστής*, § 16), about the custom of boys playing on the seventh day, proves nothing : possibly he refers to the Jewish Sabbath, which in his time (about A.D. 150) had been extensively introduced as a holiday among the Gentiles ; or he may speak of the seventh day of the month—as to which I am assured by a friend whom, because of his eminence as a classical scholar, I requested to examine the matter critically, that "there is no evidence whatever that any of the Pagan nations observed every seventh day at any period previous to the introduction of the Jewish custom ;" and that "the only trace of a seventh day being sacred occurs at Athens, where the seventh day of every lunar month was dedicated to Apollo, because he was believed to have been born on the seventh day of some month." Hengstenberg, also, regards it as proved by Selden and others (of whom he names Gomerus, *De Sabb.*, c. 4 ; Spener ; and Ideler, *Chronol.*, th. i., p. 87), "that the seventh day has not been kept by a single people except the Israelites, and that where a seventh day has been observed, it has not been the seventh day of the week. The argument then," says he, "changes into one for the opposite side. If the Sabbath had been instituted at the first, we should expect to find traces of its observance elsewhere than amongst the Israelites. At any rate, this argument against the institution at the first, serves to strengthen the more important one, that, in the whole history of the times anterior to Moses, no trace of the observance of the Sabbath occurs."—(*The Lord's Day*, p. 78.) Besides, even if the Greek boys *were* let loose from school on the seventh day of the week, would this evince that the day was "sacred?"—or, if it did, should we be warranted to affirm (as Mr Jordan, for instance, does), that such a continued observance of the seventh day "*plainly* points back to the period when it commenced out of a general tradition of the Sabbath?"—(*Traces and Indications of the Primitive Sabbath in many of the Institutions and Observances of the Ancient World*, by the Rev. John Jordan, Vicar of Enstone, Oxon. ; in *The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 52.) Would it, in fact, do more than point to *some* common source of reverence for the seventh day ? Heylin (pp. 87, 88) quotes from Seneca, Tacitus, Juvenal, Persius, Martial, and Apion, passages illustrative of the notorious fact, that the Sabbath was a subject of general ridicule among the Romans ; and, to shew that other Gentile nations despised it at an earlier time, he cites from Lamentations i. 7, the complaint of Jeremiah that "the adversaries saw her (Jerusalem), and did mock at her Sabbaths." If the early Gentiles paid respect to the Sabbath, how could it serve as a "sign" of the covenant between God and the Jews ? And if the Gentiles *ought* to have observed it, why is there not a single allusion to its profanation as one of the sins for which they are said in the Old Testament to have been the objects of God's wrath ?

The second assertion of Grotius is, that the hebdomadal division of time is a monument of the creation of the world in seven days. In this he is followed by the whole body of Sabbatarian advocates, many of whom confidently affirm besides, that *no other* origin can possibly be assigned either for the week, or for the reverence in which the number *seven* was generally held in the East. Dr Owen, in particular, expresses himself strongly to this effect, in § 15 of his 36th Exercise ; and very recently Dr Kitto has written as follows :—"If the seventh-day Sabbath was observed from the time of man's creation, an observance which made so large a part in his life adequately accounts for all those phe-

passage is not certainly the true one: and as by $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ Jesus undeniably *might* mean, not *mankind*, but “*the man*” to whom the Sabbath was given (*i. e.*, the Jew), my point is sufficiently carried.

nomena in regard to the number seven which we witness. *But if that institution had no existence, we are completely at a loss on the subject,—nothing to say,—NOTHING TO CONJECTURE.*”—(*Daily Bible Illustrations*, “Moses and Judges,” p. 292.) In like manner we are told by Mr Jordan, that “the division of time into weeks of seven days is a system suited neither to their months, which consisted of thirty days, nor to their years, which consisted of 360 days, and which could not therefore result from any subdivision of these, nor they from multiplication of seven days. Such a week is, in fact, altogether unsuited to any natural year like the solar, or to a month such as the lunar; and could not, therefore, have originated with them. We seek in vain, therefore, among natural phenomena for such an origin of it; while the institution of the Sabbath, and the reasons of that institution taught by Moses, at once point to one which there is no disputing.”—(*The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 45.) And even so acute a writer as Dr Taylor of Norwich delivers the opinion, that the patriarchal custom of reckoning time by *seven days*, or *weeks*, “can be referred to no other supposable original but the institution of the Sabbath at the creation.”—(*Scheme of Scripture Divinity*, in Bishop Watson’s *Coll. of Theol. Tracts*, vol. i., p. 29. See also Dwight, *Serm.* cvii.; Holden, pp. 38–41; Wardlaw, pp. 11, 22, 101; Macfarlan, p. 14; Bruce, p. 21; Oliver, pp. 11–22; *North British Review*, vol. xviii., p. 400; and Eadie’s *Biblical Cyclopædia*, art. WEEK.) Now, as it has in these days become a demonstrated fact, that the reason assigned in the current edition of the Fourth Commandment for the institution of the Sabbath is untrue, so that the *other* edition must now be regarded as having a better title to be received as genuine, we are *forced* either to find a different reason, or to sit down content with being so “completely at a loss on the subject” as to have “nothing to say,—nothing to conjecture.” But although resignation under inevitable ignorance is a virtue which it is easy to practise, still it is pleasant to think that, in the present case, our reduction to a nonplus is hardly so complete as these learned writers represent. For, after all, a very plausible conjecture has often been given—one which Dr Kitto, who confesses himself at his wits’ end if the common theory be excluded, might have found no farther off than in his own excellent *Cyclopædia*! And it is simply this:—“The division of time by weeks, as it is one of the most ancient and universal, so is it one of the most obvious inventions, especially among a rude people, whose calendar required no very nice adjustments. Among all early nations, the *lunar* months were the readiest large divisions of time, and though the recurrence of the lunar period in about $29\frac{1}{2}$ days was incompatible with any *exact* subdivision, yet the nearest whole number of days which could be subdivided into shorter periods, would be either 30 or 28; of which the latter would of course be adopted, as admitting of division into 4, corresponding nearly to those striking phenomena, the phases or quarters of the moon. Each of these would palpably correspond to about a week; and in a period of about $5\frac{1}{2}$ lunations, the same phases would return very nearly to the same days of the week.”—(Kitto’s *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii., p. 655.) The preference of a subdivision of the ancient month into four weeks of seven days, rather than five weeks of six, might the more readily take place, because in ancient astronomy the number of the planets was considered to be seven—the Moon, Mercury, Venus, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn—here named in the order of their supposed distances from the earth. The names of these heavenly bodies were given to the days of the week, and we still find traces of them in the modern nomenclatures of the seven days. The *Dies Lunæ* of the Romans has become our *Monday*, and the *Lundi* of the French; *Dies Martis*, *Dies Mercurii*, *Dies Jovis*, and *Dies Veneris*, are *Mardi*, *Mercredi*, *Jendredi*, and *Vendredi* in French; but with us *Tuesday*, *Wednesday*, *Thursday*, and *Friday*—from the Scandinavian gods Tuiseo, Woden,

We now arrive at the time when the Apostles began to preach the Gospel to the *Gentiles* as well as Jews; and here the clearest evidence is met with, that the Sabbath was never intended to be imposed upon the converted Pagans. A dispute arose at Antioch between the Jewish and Gentile Christians; certain Jews maintaining that conformity to the Mosaic ceremonies was incumbent upon the Gentiles also, while Paul and Barnabas, with “no small dissension and disputation,” maintained the opposite view. The question was referred for

Thor, and Friga, whose names were given by our Saxon forefathers to the days in question (see the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 7th ed., vol. xviii., p. 337): *Dies Saturni* is *Saturday* and *Samedi*; while *Dies Solis* (called also *Dies Dominica*) passes with us into *Sunday*, and with the French into *Dimanche*. Whether the name *Dies Dominica* (ἡμέρα κυριακῆ, Rev. i. 10) originally had reference—as Mr Higgins (*Horæ Sabbaticæ*, pp. 51, 97) contends, though, it appears, on inadequate grounds (*The Sabbath; or an Examination of the Six Texts*, &c., p. 135)—to the Sun, which, he says, was anciently styled *Dominus Sol* (see also *Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions*, &c., from the *Westminster Rev.* for Oct. 1850, p. 47), or to the resurrection of our Lord upon a Sunday, deserves to be farther investigated; but the popular opinion is pretty generally accepted by the learned, as at least *probable*,—that the name *Lord's Day* or *Dies Dominica* originated from this great event in the Christian history.—(Paley, B. v., ch. vii.; and Kitto's *Cyclop.* vol. ii., p. 269.)

Mrs Sommerville, in her *Connexion of the Physical Sciences*, observes that “The period of seven days, by far the most permanent division of time, and the most ancient monument of astronomical knowledge, was used in India by the Brahmins with the same denominations employed by us, and was alike found in the calendars of the Jews, Egyptians, Arabs, and Assyrians; it has survived the fall of empires, and has existed among all successive generations—a proof of their common origin.” Although the clause here printed in italics is directly opposed to the popular notion contended for by Mr Jordan, that the seven days of creation *must* have been the origin of the week, yet in quoting the passage (in *The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 50) he seems to have been absolutely blind to this fact. And I cannot help suggesting besides, that the prevalence of the hebdomadal period indicates not so much what Mrs Sommerville thinks it does, the common origin of the *nations* by whom it was used, as that of the *week* itself which was so early and widely adopted. The astronomers of each nation were as likely as those of any other to employ the hebdomadal period as the most natural; and if any nation used it before the others, that nation might communicate it, and also the names of the days, to those around; from whom, again, it might pass to others still—as it did from the Egyptians to the Romans, two or three centuries after the birth of Christ. Till then their months were divided into three irregular parts.

With respect to the sacred, mysterious, and perfect character which in ancient times was so generally ascribed to the number *seven*, this might naturally arise from its being, as we have seen, the number of the so-called planets, which in the East were worshipped as gods. That it *could not* arise from any tradition of the creation, is certain from the fact that the work of bringing the universe into its present state is now known to have occupied an incalculably longer period than six days; the probability hence now being, that the sacredness of the number *seven*, instead of having been *derived* from the seven days mentioned in Genesis, was, on the contrary, the *cause*, direct or indirect, of the introduction of that period into the Hebrew cosmogony!

See generally, on the subjects of this Note, Selden, *De Jure Naturali et Gentium*, lib. ii., cap. xiv–xxii;—the *Ancient Universal History*, B. I., ch. vii.; 8vo ed., vol. iii., p. 231;—*Encyc. Brit.*, 7th ed., vol. vi., p. 3;—*Penny Cyclopædia*, vol. xxvii., p. 189, art. WEEK;—Kitto's *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii., pp. 268, 655, 738–9;—and Russell's *The Lord's Day not the Sabbath*, pp. 16, 36, where Bailly's *Hist. of Ancient Astronomy* is quoted.

decision to the Christian Church at Jerusalem, including the Apostles; and in the written judgment which they sent to Antioch, it was formally declared unnecessary that the law of Moses should be observed by the Gentiles, except to this extent: "That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well."* The observance of the Sabbath being here omitted, the Gentiles, it is plain, are declared to have no more concern with that institution than with circumcision. Accordingly, it is acknowledged by Horsley (with whom the Sabbatarians in general agree), that "had the Sabbath been a rite of the Mosaic institution," he "should hold this argument unanswerable:" he takes refuge however in the position, that sabbath-observance not only was imposed at the creation, and so must have been "a general duty at the time of the institution" by Moses; "but, in the nature of the thing, was of perpetual importance,—since, in every stage of the world's existence, it is man's interest to remember, and his duty to acknowledge, his dependence upon God as the Creator of all things, and of man among the rest."† But as the notion of a primeval Sabbath is now stripped of the little plausibility which it ever had, and as the importance of remembering and acknowledging our dependence upon God is nowise identical with the duty of resting from labour on the seventh day of the week (which is the duty, and the whole duty, imposed by the Fourth Commandment), the anti-sabbatarian argument from the apostolic decree must, on Horsley's own principle, be held by *us* to be unanswerable.

* Acts xv. 29. Why even *this* small amount of conformity to the law of Moses was enjoined, was considered before, p. 172. The doctrine there stated agrees with that of the Confession of Augsburg, which is quoted by Lieut.-Colonel T. Perronet Thompson, in his Exercises, vol. v., p. 115. (London, 1842.) At p. 118 of the same volume may be seen the original passage about the Lord's Day, of which a translation was given *ante*, p. 287.

By the word "fornication" in the Jerusalem decree, we probably should understand participation in the obscene rites which formed a portion of the worship of certain heathen gods; the practice being *in this respect* in opposition to the law of Moses. For fornication, in the abstract, was not forbidden to the Jews; and by their prophets the word was employed figuratively to express idolatry itself. (See Kitto's *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, vol. i., p. 715.) From the common phrase, "to go a-whoring after other gods," applied to the Israelites, we may learn what the temptation to idolatry was, to which they so readily yielded. Bishop Horsley, indeed, interprets literally the word in the decree; giving as a reason for the prohibition of the practice thereby, that "it hath been owing to that refinement of sentiment which the Christian religion hath produced, that this is at last understood to be a breach of natural morality. In the heathen world," says he, "it was never thought to be a crime, except it was accompanied with injury to a virgin's honour, or with violation of the marriage-bed. Abstinence, in this instance, was considered as a peculiarity of Judaism; and had it not been mentioned in the apostolical decree, the Gentile converts would not have been very ready to discern that the prohibition of this crime is included in the Seventh Commandment."—(*Sermon xxii.*) Now, in reality the Jews themselves discerned no such meaning in the Seventh Commandment; nor was there, until long after the time of Moses, any inculcation of that purity of the mind itself, which *indisposes* to licentious conduct. The interpretation above suggested seems therefore the only one admissible.

† Sermon xxii.

To the argument of Paley in support of the opinion for which I contend, Dr Dwight laconically answers: "Neither was abstinence from theft, murder, lying, coveting, profaneness, or idolatry, enjoined by the apostles upon the Christian Gentiles."* Nothing could shew more clearly than this, of what vital importance to Sabbatarianism is the notion that the Fourth Commandment is not a *positive* law, but a part of the law of nature; since except upon the assumption that *it is* a part, the reply of Dr Dwight, which he evidently thinks conclusive, would be silly and impertinent. For, in the words of Jortin, "this controversy was not about the moral law, the love of God and of our neighbour, and the like duties; it was only concerning the ritual law."† As the falsity of Dr Dwight's assumption has already been made evident, and is admitted by almost everybody but the Sabbath Alliance, the conclusion becomes inevitable, that the Apostles declared, in the most formal manner, the freedom of the Gentiles from the necessity of observing the only Sabbath which we know to have ever been appointed.‡

Independently of this decree, we are driven to the same conclusion by the writings of St Paul, addressed to the converts in Rome, Galatia, and Colossæ. "Those who favour the English opinion," says Hengstenberg, "find the expressions of Paul inconvenient, and seek by forced interpretations to explain them away. This is seen most clearly in the remarks of Haldane on 'certain expressions in the New Testament.' No one, on reading his work, can help feeling that the author would be glad if these 'certain expressions' were not there. In Rom. xiv. 5, 6, the apostle speaks indulgently of those who esteem one day above another. He has in his mind those who do not seek to enforce upon others the practices which they cannot relinquish themselves; Christians, who have come over from Judaism, and who, therefore, require time before the new principle can have its perfect power. In Col. ii. 16, however, he warns them to beware of those who wish to judge others in meat, and drink, and festivals, and new moons, and Sabbaths, 'which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ,' who gives his own people the power to rise above the Jewish, piecemeal religion—a religion not favoured by the Old Testament—and serve God without ceasing. But he speaks most strongly in Gal. iv. 9–11:—'How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.' The preference of certain days, whatever they may be, whether called Sundays or Sabbaths, or by any other name, appears here as a return to an elementary and child's religion, such as the Galatians had submitted to before, when in their heathen condition; and is denounced as unworthy of Christians, who are to be a godly people, walking constantly before God, and presenting themselves continually unto Him, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.

"These expressions are certainly opposed to every view of the Sun-

* Theology, Sermon cvii.

† Jortin's Works, vol. ix., p. 124.

‡ Holden says: "From the Jewish Sabbath, Christians, it is freely acknowledged, are released; but the objections of Paley cannot in justice be urged against the weekly festival, which was a divine appointment of a long anterior date, and never afterwards annulled."—(P. 175.)

day, which leads to its being regarded as the only day of religion, the 'pearl of days,' the 'light of the week,' if by this is meant that the other days belong to man, and this alone to God. They shew the fallacy of every view which supposes that God is satisfied with one day, and which, in order that this day may be invested with a brighter halo, allows deep shadows to rest upon the other days of the week. *Sacred days and hours are a part of Judaism*, not of the true religion even of the Old Testament; they are well suited for Rationalism, but not for the Christian Church. To seek to introduce them is to misunderstand Christ. It cannot, however, be doubted that those who hold the Sabbatarian view are inclined to this; although, by carrying it out, we frustrate the lofty aim which ought never to be lost sight of by the Christian Church.*

How seldom the Sabbatarians have the courage to face these words of Paul, even in order to explain them away, has already been abundantly shewn; † but *one* attempt in particular, to get rid of the passage in Rom. xiv. 4, 5, so far excels all others in boldness, that it deserves to be presented here. I find it in an article on the Sabbath in the *Eclectic Review* for June 1830, p. 497. "But here again," says the reviewer, "the ceremonial observance of particular days is referred to, chiefly as regarded fasting at such seasons; and as fasting was never practised by the Jews on the Sabbath-day, it seems unlikely that that day is alluded to"! Such an argument as this shews alike the writer's expectation that his readers would save themselves the

* The Lord's Day, p. 103-4. To the same effect see Milton's Christian Doctrine, p. 605; Barrow's Exposition of the Fourth Commandment; Jortin's Works, vol. ix., p. 124; Kitto's Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit., vol. ii., p. 657; The Mosaic Sabbath, p. 24; The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts, &c., pp. 176-203, 315-317; Neander's Hist. of the Planting, &c., of the Christian Church, vol. i., p. 156; Michaelis's Com. on the Laws of Moses, vol. iv., p. 44; and Col. Thompson's Exercises, vol. v., p. 102. For attempts to meet the argument, see The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects, pp. 81-85, 381.

The learned Bunsen, in his late work on Hippolytus and his Age, vol. iii., p. 349, expresses strongly his approval of Hengstenberg's treatise, and his own dissent from the Sabbatarian notions of the Puritans. "The celebration of the day of our Lord's resurrection," says he, "was already more solemnly observed than the Jewish Sabbath, considered as the eve of the great solemnity. We nowhere, however, find a trace of that relapse into Jewish ceremonial, the unchristian interruption of congregational church and social life, which some persons in the English and Scotch churches, amiable in other respects, maintain to be a divine institution binding upon all Christians; and who are not contented with defending a wise and free popular custom, which may be, within certain limits, a necessary *correctio* for many people, as Christian and moral in the idea. It is consolatory to see that a man so strongly attached to positive church doctrines, and so earnest as Hengstenberg, has voluntarily come forward to oppose the abuse of this custom, in a little work of his which has lately appeared, containing thoroughly sound principles upon the observation of Sunday. Judaism remains Judaism, and is both foreign and in opposition to the Gospel."

† *Ante*, pp. 56-61, 290, 326, 330, 439. To the treatises on the Sabbath where no mention whatever is made of Rom. xiv. 5, 6, I must add that of the late Rev. Duncan Macfarlan, minister of Renfrew, and formerly, I believe, one of the ministers of *Glasgow*. He was a worthy man, and seems to have preferred silence on the subject, to the employment of sophistry in a vain attempt to counteract the force of the passage.

trouble of looking at the passage itself, and the extremity of desperation to which the Sabbatarians are reduced when compelled to encounter St Paul. Here are the first six verses of the chapter: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." Let any man of sense and candour peruse these verses, and say, *first*, whether the apostle speaks of the observance of days *in relation to* fasting, or merely as *an additional and independent illustration* of the principle which fasting is introduced in connexion with; and *secondly*, whether, unless he intended to allude to the Sabbath, he could have used the words, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth EVERY day alike." These words, in truth, are fatal, not only to the supposition that there existed in Paul's time a *Sabbath appointed at the Creation*, but to the theory—which I now proceed to consider—that a *Christian Sabbath* had been appointed by Christ or his apostles, if not by altering the Fourth Commandment in regard to the day of the week (which is the notion of the Puritans), and extending its operation to the Gentiles (which the Puritans think was unnecessary); at least by instituting a new and independent festival in honour of the resurrection of Christ.

The evidence which the Puritans adduce in support of their opinion that the first day of the week was substituted for the seventh, is the same which is appealed to by the advocates of the Divine authority of a *new* institution called the Lord's Day—some of those advocates regarding the festival as in all respects equivalent to the Jewish Sabbath, while others (such as Paley) hold that nothing more has been divinely appointed than that Christians shall "*assemble* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction:" but that "the *resting* on that day from our employments longer than we are detained from them by attendance upon these assemblies, is to Christians an ordinance of human institution, binding nevertheless upon the conscience of every individual of a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established, for the sake of the beneficial purposes which the public and regular observance of it promotes, and recommended perhaps in some degree to the Divine approbation, by the resemblance it bears to what God was pleased to make a solemn part of the law which he delivered to the people of Israel, and by its subserviency to many of the same uses."*

* Paley's Moral Philosophy, B. v., ch. vii. Even this conclusion Paley offers as "probable," and nothing more. That he was conscious of having overstretched

On all hands it is admitted that “there is no special enactment in the New Testament regarding the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week,”* or the appointment of a new festival called the Lord’s Day; but the circumstantial evidence is asserted to be amply sufficient “to satisfy any reasonable inquirer,” that (as the Puritans say) the *seventh* day specified in the Fourth Commandment, which is to be considered as universally and for ever binding, was changed by Divine authority to the *first*; or (as others say) that the Lord’s Day was instituted by Christ, or by his apostles divinely commissioned to do so.

Six passages in the New Testament are appealed to as containing the circumstantial evidence which is said to be so clear and conclusive. These have frequently been discussed, but never more ably or thoroughly than by the author of a recent work already often referred to; † and nobody who wishes to understand the controversy in all its details, should omit to peruse a treatise in which the subject is handled so acutely, fairly, and comprehensively, that little or nothing of importance remains to be said by others.

Text No. I. is John xx. 19: “The same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.” Now, in the work referred to, not only is it proved beyond all question, from a comparison of sundry passages, that the appearance of Christ on this occasion was on the *second* day of the week (which began at sunset); but good grounds are stated for the inference that it was not until after the commencement of that day that the disciples *assembled*. Consequently it is, on the one hand, certain that *he*, by his appearing among them, could not intend to sanctify the *first* day of the week; while, on the other hand, it may reasonably be concluded that the disciples could not, by assembling, intend to celebrate the day of his resurrection. And this second conclusion is rendered as irresistible as the first, by the circumstance that as yet few of them had heard, and *not one of them believed*, that the Lord had risen. About his real purpose in appearing to the disciples at this time, we are left in no uncertainty by the Evangelists: it was to dissipate their doubts as to his resurrection, and to instruct them in the duties of their future mission as his apostles. ‡

Text No. II. is John xx. 26: “And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.” This shews that another meeting took place, and that Jesus appeared at it: but, in the first place, that it took place on the day

(with a very good intention) the evidence contained in the New Testament, I am disposed to believe with the author of “The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts,” &c., p. 317–330.

* These are the words of the Sabbath Alliance, as quoted *ante*, p. 485.

† The Sabbath; or, an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in Proof of a Christian Sabbath. By a Layman. London, 1849. Pp. 338. 8vo.

‡ Mark, xvi.; Luke xxiv.; John xx.

week after the first meeting, is a mere conjecture ; and, secondly, supposing the fact to be so, still, as his first appearance was on the *second* day of the week, the purpose of this other appearance on the second day of the week could not be to sanction the celebration of the day of the resurrection. As for the disciples themselves, it is a gratuitous assumption that they held no meetings in the interval between these two ; while, in regard to Christ, “there can be no doubt,” says Milton, “that he appeared on other days also, Luke xxiv. 36, and John xxi. 3, 4 : ‘Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing,’ which was not lawful on the Sabbath ; so that the day following, on the morning of which Christ appeared, could not have been the first day of the week. Even supposing, however, that it had been so, still the assigning this as a reason for the institution of a new Sabbath, is matter solely of human inference ; since no commandment on this subject, nor any reason for such institution, is found in all Scripture.”* In Acts i. 2, 3, it is recorded that after his resurrection Jesus “shewed himself alive unto the apostles whom he had chosen, . . . *being seen of them forty days*, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God ;” while Paul asserts that “*he was seen many days* of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people” (Acts xiii. 31). Can these expressions be fairly held to be compatible with the notion that he appeared to them only on Sundays ? † Paley, with every disposition to make out a case for the Divine institution of the Lord’s Day, finds in Texts I. and II., when viewed in connexion with each other, only something which “*looks like* an appointment and design to meet” upon the *first* day of the week. Suppose that there *was* an appointment and design to meet, and that the meetings *were* upon the *first* day of the week, still the passages neither jointly nor separately afford a tittle of evidence that the disciples met and Christ appeared *because* it was the first day of the week, and in order to signalize it as the Christian Sabbath. Had such been the intention of our Lord, is it credible that he should neither at these two meetings, nor on any other occasion of his appearing to the disciples before his ascension, have said one word to them respecting it, or that if he did, his historians should not have related what he said ?

“It is remarkable that St Matthew omits all notice of the meeting in the evening which followed the resurrection, and of that also which took place ‘after eight days ;’ yet as one of the eleven he must have been present at both. His silence on this subject contributes an additional inference that the disciples could not have met at either of these meetings for the purpose of instituting or celebrating a new religious rite. ‡

* Christian Doctrine, B. ii., ch. vii., p. 609.—The edition I quote from is the first, published in 1825 ; but the treatise has lately been reprinted as part of the edition of Milton’s Prose Works in Bohn’s Standard Library, where the chapter referred to will be found in vol. v., p. 64.

† See the confident way in which Mr Holden makes, and argues upon, the contrary assumption, in his treatise on the Christian Sabbath, p. 224 ; and the similar course of Mr Oliver in his Prize Essay, p. 53.

‡ The Sabbath ; or an Examination, &c., p. 45. See the extract from Chillingworth, *ante*, p. 197-8.

Text No. III. is Acts ii. 1: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." A confessedly uncertain calculation* makes it appear that this was also the first day of the week; but if so, the fact of the meeting being recorded simply as on the day of *Pentecost*, without mention either of *the first day of the week*, or of any act done by the disciples *in honour of that day*, indicates very clearly that the meeting was for a purpose connected with the great Jewish festival, and not for the purpose of keeping holy the day as a Christian festival. Had the incident been considered by the historian to have any connexion with the Sabbath, or the Lord's Day, he certainly would have *mentioned* the first day of the week; instead of leaving us to discover by a doubtful calculation that this meeting, held about thirty years before the time when he wrote, took place upon a Sunday. Indeed, so ridiculous is the attempt of the Sabbatarians to press the text before us into their service, that Paley, who must have seen at a glance its unfitness for such a purpose, has passed it over in utter silence.

Text No. IV. is Acts xx. 6, 7: "And we [St Paul and his companions] . . . came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together [*more precisely*, the disciples being come together] to break bread, Paul preached unto them." The Layman here observes: "Not till seven-and-twenty years after the Gospel had been proclaimed by the Apostles, is there any instance recorded of a meeting of Christians upon the first day of the week. At length we find one in the text before us. But it is a solitary instance; a very remarkable circumstance this, if, in the time of the Apostles, it was the constant custom of Christians to meet upon that day."—(P. 71.)—See also pp. 141, 160, 210.

That the meeting recorded in this text was held for *religious purposes*—that it was held *according to a weekly custom*—that the breaking of bread was the eating of *the Lord's Supper*—and that the disciples who assembled on this one occasion (or statedly on the first day of the week, if you will), kept as a Sabbath (*i. e.* season of rest from labour) the whole of the day on which they met, are one and all of them assertions unvouched by a particle of proof. By the phrase "breaking bread," used without qualification, the Jews meant the taking of an ordinary meal: that it has no other meaning here was the decided opinion of Calvin; † and to this view Paley, by forbearing to claim for it any other, has virtually given in his adherence. ‡ "Yet breaking bread," says the Layman, "is the only expression in the text which affords even a pretence for saying that the meeting at

* See Holden, p. 235; and Kitto's Cyclopædia, vol. ii., p. 239.

† *In Act. ii.*; quoted by Heylin, Part II., p. 24.—Milton speaks of it as, at all events, uncertain "whether this was a periodical meeting, or only held occasionally, and of their own accord; whether it was a religious festival, or a fraternal meal," &c.—(*Christian Doctrine*, p. 609.)

‡ See, in support of the interpretation contended for, Acts ii. 46; xx. 11.; xxvii. 35, 36.—Lightfoot, in his Journal of the Westminster Assembly, records a discussion which took place on 20th February 1644, when Mr Goodwin said " 'Breaking bread,' and 'eating,' is used in Scripture, Acts xxvii. 35, for common eating; Acts xx. 16 [11?] means the same."—(*Lightfoot's Works*, by Pitman, vol. xiii., p. 183.)

Troas was specially for a religious purpose. No mention is made of prayer or thanksgiving. Mention is indeed made of St Paul's preaching; but that St Paul, who was accustomed to preach on every day of the week when opportunity offered, should take this opportunity of preaching on the first day of the week, can yield no proof that the design of the disciples at Troas, in meeting to take a meal in common on the first day of the week, was also to perform some act of religious worship. . . . Moreover, the meeting at Troas, to be of any value to the Sabbatarian cause, must be proved to have taken place on the first day of the week, *because* it was the first day of the week." But there is no evidence either of this, or of the assumption that the disciples at Troas did not come together to break bread on *other* days of the week also, as those in Jerusalem are recorded to have done.* It is shewn by the Layman to be in the highest degree probable, from St Luke's ordinary manner of recording events, that had he here intended to notice a *custom*, he would have been more explicit, and not have left it to be inferred; and this he would have been the more careful to do, because the alleged custom was of such importance as to be peculiarly deserving of his notice. If the early Christians really observed the first day of the week as a stated season of worship, or as a Sabbath, is it possible that St Luke should not, in the whole course of his history of the Acts of the Apostles, comprising a period of thirty years, mention more than *one* meeting of Christians on that day? To crown all—it is discovered that in Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, the phrase translated "when *the disciples* came together to break bread," is corrected to another which signifies "*we* [*i. e.* Paul and his companions] being come together to break bread"—*συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον!* This, if admitted, at once extinguishes the inference of Paley, that we here "find the same custom (of holding religious assemblies upon the first day of the week) in a Christian church at a great distance from Jerusalem." But, independently of Griesbach's correction, there is no good ground for even this remark of Paley—that the "manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week, shews that the practice by this time was familiar and established."

It has already (*ante*, p. 59) been pointed out as probable that the meeting at Troas began after sunset on Saturday, and continued till break of day on Sunday—at which time the apostle addressed himself again to his journey.

Text No. V. is 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2: "Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." This text is dismissed by Milton as equally unsatisfactory with the others: "For what the apostle is here enjoining," says he, "is not the celebration of the Lord's Day, but that 'on the first day of the week' (if this be the true interpretation of *κατὰ μίαν σάββατων*, *per unam Sabbathorum*) each should 'lay by him' (that is, at home) for the relief of the poor; no mention being made of any

* See Acts ii. 46.

public assembly, or of any collection at such assembly on that day. He was perhaps led to select the first day of the week, from the idea that our alms ought to be set aside as a kind of first-fruits to God, previous to satisfying other demands, or because the first day of the week was most convenient for the arrangement of the family accounts. Granting, however, that the Corinthians were accustomed to assemble on that day for religious purposes, it no more follows that we are bound to keep it holy in conformity with their practice, without a Divine command to that effect, than that we are bound to observe the Jewish Sabbath in conformity with the practice of the Philippians, or of Paul himself. Acts xvi. 13, ‘On the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made;’ xvii. 2, ‘Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scripture;’ xviii. 3, 4, ‘He abode with them, and wrought, . . . and he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath,’—following his own occupation at home, as we have reason to believe, during the six remaining days.”*

This passage, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, has been very fully considered by the Layman,† who, like Milton, adheres firmly to the words “lay by in store,” as the true translation of *θησαυρίζω*. It may be still more literally translated “treasuring up;” a phrase, he observes, which would render it still more apparent that each contributor was to make the accumulation himself, and not to hand it over from week to week to any other person. The Vulgate, and the Geneva Bible (ed. 1588), give the same meaning to the word. Dr Macknight, who is followed by Burder and Wardlaw,‡ translates the passage thus: “On the first day of every week, let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, *putting it into the treasury*, that when I come there may be then no collections;” and his reason for introducing this common “treasury” without the slightest *grammatical* warrant for doing so, is, that the ordinary translation is inconsistent with the desire of Paul that there might be no gatherings when he came: for according to that translation, says Macknight, the collections would still have been to make at his coming. This, however, is to understand, without the least necessity, the word “gatherings” in a sense incompatible with the previous injunction, which is perfectly unambiguous: the Apostle’s wish may very well have been, that, at his coming, *each man* should have a gradually-accumulated *store* of money by him, ready to be delivered up at once—instead of waiting for his arrival, and then running about endeavouring to collect a sufficient sum from debtors who might not at the moment be able to pay. His use of the word “gatherings,” rather than “gathering,” gives countenance to this view. The collection was an occasional one, for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem.§ Neander, I see,

* Christian Doctrine, p. 609, 610. † Pp. 101, 162, 185.

‡ Wardlaw’s Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 98.

§ The injunctions of Paul to the churches of Galatia and Corinth to contribute to the relief of these poor brethren at Jerusalem, are represented by Dr Lorimer as encouragement of the observance of the first day of the week, “by

contends for the ordinary translation ; observing that the word *θησαυρορίζων* " is against the notion of a public collection," and speaking of the other interpretation as one to which some have been led by " a gratuitous supposition, not at all required by the connexion of the passage."* Moreover, it appears from 2 Cor. viii., that Paul, before going back to Corinth, was under considerable apprehension as to the success of his appeal ; whereas, if the putting of the contributions of individuals into a common treasury had been the thing enjoined, he needed not be in any doubt as to the amount brought in, for the church-officers who received them could, and of course would, have informed him of it. And lastly, it is argued besides, with great effect, by the Layman, that if the first day of the week had then attained a sacred pre-eminence over the other six, the Apostle, in recommending it for a purpose of charity, would not have failed to enforce his recommendation by a pointed reference to the estimation and respect in which it was held. " Let us but reflect a little," he observes, " and we shall not fail to perceive the fine topic it would have afforded to the fervid eloquence of St Paul, if, in naming the first day of the week, he could have appealed to it as a day then religiously observed" among Christians, in commemoration of the resurrection of their crucified Redeemer. . . . " That St Paul should neglect this opportunity, if it really offered itself, of appealing to the religious feelings of the Corinthians in aid of his appeal to their benevolent feelings, is an improbability which ought of itself to produce conviction in the mind of every unprejudiced person, that when St Paul named the first day of the week for laying by charitable contributions from the Christians of Corinth to the Christians of Jerusalem, he knew it not as a day that was more holy than any other."—(P. 112.)

Text No. VI., the last of the series, is Rev. i. 10 : " I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." Whether St John was the author of the Apocalypse, is a question among biblical scholars. Luther, in the preface to his translation of it, published in 1522, expressed in very strong terms his opinion on the negative side ; and though in the edition of 1534 he used milder and less decisive expressions, he still persisted in disbelieving that the Apocalypse was canonical, and recommended the interpretation of it to those who were more enlightened than himself.† Michaelis also, in the work referred to, concludes a long discussion by declaring, that, under all the circumstances, the authenticity of the book appears to him very doubtful, and that he cannot avoid suspecting that it is a spurious production, introduced probably into the world after the death of St John.‡ That, at all events, it was written about the close of the first or beginning of

calling upon *all* the churches to set apart appropriate sums on that day for the maintenance and extension of the cause of Christ"—(P. 32.)

* Hist. of the Planting, &c., of the Christian Church, vol. i., p. 158.

† See Michaelis's *Introd. to the New Testament*, Marsh's Transl., vol. vi., p. 458, 2d ed.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 487. For an account of this controversy, see also Lardner's *Credibility*, chapter on the Apocalypse (*Works*, ed. 1815, vol. iii., p. 447) ; *The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts, &c.* p. 118 ; and *Kitto's Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, vol. ii., p. 612.

of the second century, is unquestionable ; and I agree with the Layman, that, whether canonical or not, “ its high antiquity, and the esteem in which it was held by many among the early Christians, give it a fair claim to credence upon any matter of fact which is probable in itself and clearly stated ; as, for instance, that at the date of the book there were Christian Churches in seven of the principal cities of Asia.” But this concession of the historical value of the Book is of no advantage to the Sabbatarian cause ; for, as the Layman remarks, “ the alleged fact of the religious observance of the first day of the week at that date, whether probable or not in itself, is not clearly stated : *it is not stated at all.* The first day of the week is not mentioned, either in the text quoted (i. 10) or in any other part of the book ; nor is there anywhere in it any clear allusion made to a custom among Christians of observing any one day in the week more than another. Yet all Sabbatarians assume, even the logical Paley assumes, that the phrase of ‘ the Lord’s Day’ is intended by the writer to refer to the first day of the week, and to the religious observance of it. None of the Fathers of the Church, as I believe, and certainly none of the most ancient of them, attribute that intention to the writer ; and the prevalent disposition in our times to assume that he had that intention, seems to arise solely from the fact, that habit has familiarised us to the use of the phrase as a name for the first day of the week ; and, in consequence, most persons come to the perusal of the Book of the Revelation so strongly impressed with the modern meaning of the phrase, as to be thereby completely prevented from reflecting and exercising their judgment upon the question, what might be that of the writer, who it is in the highest degree probable had some other and very different meaning,—a meaning which, like the Book itself, is and ever has been a mystery.

“ It is true that the phrase of ‘ the Lord’s Day’ is very appropriate to the first day of the week, that being the day of the week on which the great event of the Resurrection occurred : but may not that very circumstance, the peculiar fitness of the phrase, have led to the adoption of it from the Book of the Revelation in after times, when the custom of religiously observing the first day of the week had become fully established ? The conjecture receives no inconsiderable support from the fact that *the phrase is not to be met with in any writing, scriptural or non-scriptural, of a date prior to that of the Revelation, nor in any writing for more than seventy years after that date.*”—(Pp. 121–2.) See also pp. 164, 212.

The author goes on to prove this assertion by shewing that neither in the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas, which are usually regarded (though, in the case of Barnabas, upon very insufficient grounds*) as having been written before or about the date of the Apocalypse, nor in the productions of Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and Justin Martyr—written between the beginning of the second century, and about the year 140—does the phrase “ Lord’s Day” occur. The argument with which the last-mentioned Father supplies us, in opposition to the belief that the first day of the week

* See *The Sabbath, or an Examination, &c.*, p. 217.

was observed by the Christians of his time as a *Sabbath*, was introduced in a former place;* and with respect to Ignatius, it was pointed out that the mention which is usually supposed to be made of the Lord's Day in the *genuine* part of his Epistle to the Magnesians, is in reality a mention of "the Lord's *life*,"—while the *spurious* part of it does the Sabbatarians the disservice of confirming the inference against them derived from the writings of Justin Martyr.† It is in the *Apology* of Justin, written between A.D. 139 and A.D. 150, that, as I observed before,‡ we have the *earliest* proof of the existence, among Christians, of a generally-established custom of observing Sunday as a stated day of public prayer and religious instruction. But the phrase "the Lord's Day" is not once to be met with, out of the Apocalypse, till about A.D. 170, seventy years after the book was written. The expression then occurs in a letter from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to the bishop of Rome; from which the conclusion may fairly be drawn, that by this time it was in use at both places, and that among Christians at large it probably had come to be applied habitually to the first day of the week.

The examination of the Six Texts being now concluded, what is the result? I shall give it in the words of the Layman:—"It is briefly this,—that there is no Scripture authority for believing that in the time of the Apostles the first day of the week (our Sunday) was observed either as a Sabbath-day or as a prayer-day.§

"That there is," he continues, "no instance recorded in the Six Texts of the Sunday having been observed as a Sabbath, is as indisputable as the fact that there is no command in the Christian Scriptures so to observe it. Equally indisputable is it that the Six Texts contain no evidence of a custom to observe the Sunday as a Sabbath. Sabbatarian writers, indeed, seem to advocate the belief, that in the time of the Apostles the Sunday was observed as a Sabbath; but they never, on any occasion that I am aware of, venture to assert in plain words that such was the fact. They are content, by the use of equivocal language, when arguing that the Sunday was observed as a prayer-day, to insinuate that it was also observed as a Sabbath. They speak of it as though it was of course so observed; but they never, so far as I am acquainted with their works, make this assumed

* See *ante*, p. 282.

† *Ante*, p. 283.

‡ P. 282.

§ "Whether the festival of the *Lord's day* (an expression which occurs only once in Scripture, Rev. i. 10) was weekly or annual, cannot be pronounced with certainty, inasmuch as there is not (as in the case of the Lord's Supper) any account of its institution, or command for its celebration, to be found in Scripture. If it was the day of his resurrection, why, we may ask, should this be considered as the Lord's day in any higher sense than that of his birth, or death, or ascension? why should it be held in higher consideration than the day of the descent of the Holy Spirit? and why should the celebration of the one recur weekly, whereas the commemoration of the others is not necessarily even annual, but remains at the discretion of each believer?"—(Milton's *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, p. 608.)

Milton therefore held a different opinion from Dr Wardlaw, according to whom the Lord's Day mentioned in Rev. i. 10 is "the first day of the week, beyond all controversy."—(*Discourses on the Sabbath*, p. 103.)

fact the subject of specific proof or direct argument. On this point in the controversy they know they have no case.

“ With respect to the Sunday having been observed as a prayer-day (a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction),* I consider the examination of the Six Texts to have decidedly shewn—

“ First, that there is not a single instance recorded in the Christian Scriptures of the Sunday having in the time of the Apostles been observed as a prayer-day.

“ And, secondly, that those Scriptures contain no evidence from which we can even infer a custom among the Christians of that period so to observe it.”—(Pp. 138-9.)

He observes that if such slight and scanty evidence as that given for the doctrine of a Christian Sabbath were tendered in a court of justice, to prove any grave fact relating to the ordinary affairs of life, it would not stand the least scrutiny; and thereupon he proceeds, after the manner of Bishop Sherlock in his famous *Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*, to personify the Six Texts, and put them into the witness-box of a supposed judicial tribunal. This animated way of going over the ground a second time is managed with the skill of an accomplished lawyer, who certainly succeeds to admiration in his work of “slaying the slain.”

The intrinsic insufficiency of the Six Texts to support the conclusions which have been reared upon them being thus made evident, nothing farther, of course, *needs* to be said in opposition to inferences so baseless; but to make assurance doubly sure, the Layman proceeds to evince that, moreover, they are completely at variance with facts which we learn from the New Testament itself, and which there is no possibility of explaining away.

And, first, as to the alleged observance of the first day of the week as a *Sabbath*, he shews the inconsistency of this notion with the Jerusalem decree in Acts xv.,† and anticipates the arguments (or rather assumptions) with which the Sabbatarians may endeavour to defend themselves. He then adverts to another circumstance which, says he, “is of itself, independent of all other evidence, conclusive as a proof that no other than the old Jewish Sabbath-day was known in the time of the Apostles. It is, that the Christian Scriptures make no mention of any new Sabbath or new Sabbath-day; but, on the contrary, mention the old Sabbath and the old Sabbath-day in a manner which precludes the possibility of any other Sabbath having been then in existence, or of any other Sabbath-day having been at that time observed. For it is only *the Sabbath* or *the Sabbath-day* that is there spoken of; and the definite article could never have been used on such occasions by any Christian writer, if any other than the old Jewish Sabbath and Sabbath-day had been known to him.”—(P. 179-180.) He quotes instances from Acts xiii. 14, 42, 44, and xvi. 13; the last of which (more striking, though not more decisive, than the rest) is as follows: “And on the Sabbath we (St Luke, the writer

* * Paley's ‘Philos.’ ii. 91.’

† See *ante*, pp. 172, 514.

of the Acts, and St Paul, and their companions) went out of the city (Philippi) by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made." This way of writing could never have been employed by a historian who knew that besides the Sabbath he was mentioning (which unquestionably was the Jewish), there was *another*, which as a Christian he himself observed, and which as a Christian he must believe was ordained to supersede the one he was speaking of.

It is frankly acknowledged by Mr Holden, that if the seventh-day Sabbath continued to be observed by the early Christians along with (as he supposes) the Lord's Day, this fact would lessen very materially the force of the argument for the duty of observing the latter, drawn from the custom of the primitive Church. If *they* observed both days, says he, "it cannot be inferred from their practice whether one or more of these days were appointed by the immediate disciples of Christ. If, moreover, they were so far mistaken as to keep two days holy, for which there is no authority in the sacred Scriptures, they can scarcely be credible witnesses to the apostolical doctrine and practice." He thinks, however, that the edge of the objection is blunted by sundry considerations, in front of which he places this one—that "the religious observance of the seventh day does not appear to have obtained in the earliest and purest ages of the Christian church."* To which he subjoins, that, however, "it probably was adopted in the very earliest ages of Christianity, by certain churches, in accommodation to the prejudices of the Jews."† Mr Oliver adopts the reply as conclusive; adding, most emphatically, that "since this practice *cannot* be traced from the *times* of the *Apostles*, it *cannot* for one moment be allowed to have the same weight as the practice of keeping the Lord's Day."‡ Bishop Taylor, on the other hand, affirms without qualification, that "*the primitive Church kept both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day* till the time of the Laodicean council, about 300 years after Christ's nativity, and almost in every thing made them equal, and therefore did not esteem the Lord's Day to be substituted in the place of the obliterated Sabbath, but a feast celebrated by great reason and perpetual consent, without precept or necessary Divine injunction."§ Which of these opposite representations, then, is the true one? Certainly, in regard to the *Hebrew* Christians and the *Sabbath*, that of Bishop Taylor.

I say "certainly;" for any one who looks with greater care than Messrs Holden and Oliver have done, for *Scriptural* evidence on the subject, will not be very long in finding it. Mr Holden, it is true, has not omitted to observe that Paul frequented the synagogues on

* The Christian Sabbath, pp. 336, 337.

† P. 342.

‡ Prize Essay, p. 63. The italics are Mr Oliver's. He says that to render the anti-sabbatarian argument valid, "it will be necessary to shew that the practice of keeping the *seventh* day *began* at the *same time*, and was *co-extensive* with the keeping of the *first*: but this cannot be done." (P. 62.) How could it be done, seeing that we know nothing of either the time when the keeping of the first day *began*, or the *extent* of its observance during the first two or three centuries?

§ Hist. of the Life of the Holy Jesus, Part ii., Sect. xii., Discourse x., § 24; in Taylor's Works, vol. iii., p. 29.

the Sabbath;* but he argues with reason,† that as the business of the Apostle was to preach the Gospel on all fit occasions, and as the synagogue-meetings afforded the best opportunities for doing so, we cannot *from this practice* infer that he observed the Mosaic Sabbath:‡ To which I add, that assembling in synagogues was no part of the Sabbath duty imposed by the law. But we have something more satisfactory than *inferences* for our guidance to a solution of the problem in hand—even *the authority of Paul himself*; who is found declaring in the plainest language before Festus, in answer to his accusing countrymen, that “Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar, *have I offended any thing at all.*”§ Could more decisive proof be imagined, that the Apostle observed the seventh-day Sabbath, along with every other rite of Judaism? But this is by no means the only piece of evidence we possess of the fact that in the apostolic age the converted Jews adhered to *all* their ancient customs: the dispute between the Jewish and Gentile Christians at Antioch, recorded in Acts xv., is another most weighty item; shewing, moreover, that the Hebrew converts, not content with obeying the law of Moses themselves, actually wished to impose its observances on the Gentiles too, as things necessary to salvation—but were declared by the Church at Jerusalem to be in the wrong in *this* respect, beyond the narrow compass before considered.¶ And, lastly, we know from Rom. xiv. and Col. ii. 16, 17, that disputes, *expressly about the observance of days*, arose between the same two classes of converts; whom St Paul thereupon enjoined to let each other act freely according to their respective persuasions of duty, and to abstain from mutual condemnation. “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. . . . Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ.”¶¶

If this be not as “weighty” evidence as any reasonable man can desire, of the fact that the Mosaic Sabbath was kept “in the times of the Apostles,” I know not what weighty evidence is. Let it be *impartially* weighed against that evidence for “the practice of keeping the Lord’s Day,” which Mr Oliver thinks so ponderous, and we shall see which of them will make the other kick the beam.*

* Acts ix. 20; xiii. 5, 14; xiv. 1; xvi. 13; xvii. 1, 2; xviii. 4.

† P. 236.

‡ Baxter uses the same argument; *Works*, vol. xiii., pp. 423, 495. See also Hengstenberg, p. 43; and *The Modern Sabbath Examined*, p. 51.

§ Acts xxv. 8. He repeats the same thing to the Jews at Rome, Acts xxviii. 17. See also *ante*, p. 167, note.

¶ See pp. 172, 514.

¶¶ Rom. xiv. 4, 10. See *ante*, pp. 56, 516–518.

** Dr Hamilton says of the Apostles, most confidently, that “their practice of the Christian Sabbath, [and] their non-observance of the seventh day, may be proved: this, then, is the ordinance which they have delivered unto us.”—(*Hore et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 87.) Again, with ignorant rashness almost incredible in a man of his theological status and reputation, he writes: “The Sabbath-question was never brought into dispute among the first Christians. The eating of blood, circumcision, and other injunctions or interdicts, were strenuously agitated; but this, which was a far more likely occasion and subject of debate, seems never to have disturbed the early Church. The general assent proves that it was formed under a decisive authority. We know that they did not observe the seventh-day rest. Judging from the facts before us in those primi-

From these controversies between the Jewish and Gentile Christians about the observance of the Sabbath, as well as from the similar disputes in the third and fourth centuries, we derive not only clear proof that the Sabbath was observed, and *allowed* to be observed, by Christians in the apostolic age, but the strongest indication imaginable, short of a direct historical statement, that, in the early ages of the Church, the alleged transference of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first was unknown. For, on the contrary supposition, the Apostle Paul could neither have observed the seventh day himself, nor have sanctioned with his permission its observance by the Jewish Christians at Rome; while, in regard to the protracted controversy which took place on this subject long after the destruction of Jerusalem,* it seems unaccountable, that while it was going forward, "no one thought of advancing the obvious and silencing argument, that if it were granted that Sunday was the appointed substitute of the old Sabbath, it necessarily followed that the observance of the seventh day was entirely superseded. It is natural to think, that if this doctrine had been then recognised, it would by both parties have been regarded as forming the hinge on which the whole controversy turned. The question at issue at that time, however, was plainly, not at all the religious character of the first day of the week: that its observance as a festival of the church was a laudable custom, seems to have been on all hands admitted; the notion that its observance as a holy Sabbath was obligatory in obedience to the prescriptions of the Decalogue, no one seems to have ever once broached." †

The fact, already noticed, ‡ that although the history of the Acts of the Apostles comprises a period of thirty-two years, it nowhere mentions, or alludes to, a custom of meeting on the first day of the

tive records, there is none other alternative than this: that the disciples either kept sabbath on the first day of the week, or that they kept none at all."—(P. 93.) The word "*know*" is printed in italics by the Doctor himself.

Dr Lorimer says: "It is a remarkable fact, that in so important a matter as the change from one day to another, we have no trace of division of opinion, or dissension among the Christians. Points of far less consequence created strife in the Church. The inference is, that the change was made by Christ himself, and that in a way so notorious that there was no room for diversity of opinion or practice. The Apostle Paul, while correcting many errors in churches, never found fault with the observance of the first day of the week as unauthorised, but encourages it, by calling upon all the Churches to set apart appropriate sums on that day for the maintenance and extension of the cause of Christ."—(P. 32.) But the only *allowable* "inference" is, that as we have no trace of dissension where it might so reasonably be expected to occur, the supposed change of day was not made at all, and therefore could not give occasion to disputes. The alleged "encouragement" given by Paul to "all the Churches" to observe the first day of the week, was adverted to *ante*, p. 523.

The argument of Dwight (*Serm. cvi.*), that "if the Christian Sabbath be not divinely instituted, then God has suffered his Church to disuse and annihilate his own institution, and substitute one of mere human device in its stead," hardly requires an answer. It assumes that the Fourth Commandment is a universal and perpetual law, and that God never suffers his Church to do wrong—the latter of which positions is even less tenable than the former.

* In the third and fourth centuries. See *ante*, pp. 279, 280.

† The Modern Sabbath Examined, p. 138. See also Hengstenberg, p. 53.

‡ *Ante*, p. 521. See also The Modern Sabbath Examined, pp. 46-50.

week for any purpose—or records a single instance of a meeting having been held on that day of the week for the purpose of religious instruction (the one at Troas not having been held for that purpose),—is plainly incompatible with the supposition that the observance of the day was habitual or even frequent. What a comment is this upon the habitual off-hand assertion of the “orthodox,” that we are bound by “Apostolic example” to sanctify the Christian Sabbath! * Equally unaccountable upon that supposition is it, that in none of the Epistles of the New Testament is mention made of any meeting having been held on a Sunday, or of any custom among Christians to meet upon that day; and that neither there nor in the Apocalypse (although religious duties are in all of them abundantly enforced, and the neglect of them abundantly reprovèd; and although Sabbath-observance was a practice to which the Gentile converts had never been accustomed before becoming Christians, and must have often found extremely inconvenient if imposed on them †), is there a single allusion to an obligation which, at the present time, makes a most prominent figure in clerical exhortations to the performance of religious duties. Nor, as was said before, can it be believed that St Paul, in enjoining the Corinthians to lay by them in store, on the first day of the week, contributions for the destitute Christians at Jerusalem, would have omitted to deepen the impression of his advice by reminding them of the sufferings and resurrection of Christ. ‡—That his Epistles are *positively* as well as *negatively* condemnatory of the Sabbatarian views has already been shewn; § and “how glaring,”

* The Layman devotes an entire chapter to the exposure of the Sabbatarian absurdities about the practice and example of the Apostles with reference to the religious observance of the Sunday (ch. vi., p. 204–215). The fact that no writer during the first three centuries attributes the practice of Sunday-observance either to the injunction or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself (see ch. viii., p. 302, and Kitto’s *Cyclop.*, vol. ii., p. 270), is a weighty corroboration of the inference that the meaning extracted from the Six Texts by our modern Sabbatarians is purely fanciful. Baxter, it is true, asserts that “it hath been the constant practice of all Christ’s churches in the whole world, *ever since the days of the Apostles* to this day, to assemble for public worship on the Lord’s day, *as a day set apart thereunto by the Apostles*. Yea, so universal was this judgment and practice, that there is no one church, no one writer, or one heretic (that I remember to have read of) that that can be proved ever to have dissented or gainsaid it, till of late times.”—(*Works*, vol. xiii., p. 385.) He adds, that having been ten years separated from his library, he is less furnished for the task of proving this than is requisite; “but,” he adds, “I will desire no man to receive more than the testimonies produced by Dr Peter Heylin himself, which with pitiful weakness he would pervert.” He accordingly adduces proof of the *existence of the practice* (which Heylin, from the cause mentioned *ante*, p. 282, thought to have grown into some credit towards the end of the first century); but not a syllable of what is quoted from the Fathers tends to shew that they believed the Lord’s Day to have been set apart for public worship *by the Apostles*.

Hengstenberg (pp. 97, 98) argues with much reason that even if we knew that the Sunday was observed as early as the days of the Apostles, under their eyes, and with their approval and concurrence, still this would not be equivalent to a law binding us to act like the primitive Christians. See also *ante*, pp. 129, 328.

† See Mr Russell’s observations on this subject in *The Lord’s Day Not the Sabbath*, pp. 21, 26.

‡ See *ante*, p. 524.

§ See *ante*, pp. 56–58, 516–518.

exclaims the Layman, "is the improbability that St Paul, when treating in three of his Epistles upon the subject of the religious observance of days, should, on no one of those occasions, say a single word respecting the great 'Christian festival,' if such a festival there were! How exceedingly probable is it, on the other hand, that St Paul would, if such were the fact, have seized the opportunities afforded him to extol above all festivals the day which, among the followers of the Gospel of Christ, was set apart for religious worship, in commemoration of the day of his resurrection! Antithesis was a figure of speech in which St Paul delighted and excelled; and, therefore, if the first day of the week was thus observed, it is difficult to imagine it possible he should not, in some one or other of the Epistles here quoted, have, with his wonted eloquence, set up in contrast to the ceremonial rites and unmeaning sacrifices of the Jewish and Pagan festivals the spiritual and purer worship of Christians on the Lord's day.

"And now, looking back to the texts extracted from those Epistles, how marvellous, how incredible, it appears, that St Paul should, on three different occasions, and to three different Christian communities, widely separated from each other, make known, in unmistakeable language, that for himself he esteemed all days alike,* and should, moreover, in his Epistle to the Colossians, declare that no man should be called to account for the non-observance of a Sabbath or an holy day; and yet should not in some one—I ought rather to say in all—of these Epistles, have excepted the Sunday, if at that time the Sunday was, by divine appointment, distinguished by the religious observance of it from all other days of the week!

"For these various reasons, I do with the utmost confidence affirm and maintain, that the Epistles of St Paul, himself an Apostle, present us with proof, not in this instance the less decisive because it is inferential (so strong are the inferences), that, in the time of the Apostles, the observance of Sunday, either as a Sabbath-day or as a prayer-day, had not become the practice of the Christian Church.

"With such cogent and superabundant evidence as I have here collected and stated from Christian Scripture, in refutation of the Sabbatarian tenet, whilst there is not any evidence deducible from that Scripture in support of the tenet, but such as, when touched by 'the rude hand of inquiry,' shrinks into utter insignificance; may we not with justice exclaim, What a wonderful phenomenon, with reference to our reasoning faculties, is the prevalence of Sabbatarian belief! Such dazzling, unsubstantial phenomena are, however, by no means rare in the misty regions of theology. Observe you Protestant divine, a sincere and rigid Sabbatarian: he is gazing with unfeigned astonishment on the splendid errors of Catholicism; the awful doctrine of transubstantiation has just developed itself to his view. Preposterous delusion! alike opposed to reason and to Scripture! Impious invention of presumptuous man! Such are his reflections; yet is that doctrine as implicitly believed by the multitude, and as strenu-

* That, for the *Gentiles*, he esteemed every day alike, is certain; but whether "for himself," as a Jew, he did the same, is a point on which it has been shewn there is room for difference of opinion. The question, however, is one of mere curiosity to the Gentile Christian.

ously, ably, and honestly defended by the talented, the learned, and the pious, as is the unscriptural doctrine of a CHRISTIAN SABBATH." —(Pp. 201–203.)

“The mind and will of God concerning any duty to be performed by us,” says Jonathan Edwards, “may be sufficiently revealed in his Word, without a particular precept in so many express terms enjoining it. The human understanding is the ear to which the Word of God is spoken; and if it be so spoken that that ear may plainly hear it, it is enough. God is sovereign as to the manner of speaking his mind, whether he will speak it in express terms or whether he will speak it by saying several other things which imply it, and from which we may, by comparing them together, plainly perceive it. If the mind of God be but revealed, if there be but sufficient means for the communication of his mind to our minds, that is sufficient; whether we hear so many express words with our ears, or see them in writing with our eyes; or whether we see the thing that he would signify to us, by the eye of reason and understanding.” These observations are quoted by the present Dr Andrew Thomson in his essay entitled *The Sabbath not a mere Judicial Appointment*;* and their soundness will be admitted by all reasonable Christians, to whatever denomination they may belong. But the principle here expressed is equally available to all—to the Anti-Sabbatarian no less than to the Sabbatarian: and the former, as we have seen, proceeds under its guidance as confidently to *his* conclusion, as the latter does to its opposite. “I confidently affirm,” says Mr Higgins, “that if religion was not concerned, no man of common sense would hesitate what conclusion he would come to for one moment. . . . I affirm that I have proved that the Christian Sabbath is not a divine institution, or an institution established by Jesus Christ, by as good *negative* evidence as the nature of the case would admit; and that I have proved it by the direct *POSITIVE* evidence of the apostles and of St Paul. And, in this affirmation, I am supported by the expressed opinions of the most learned divines of almost all sects and nations.”†

* *The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 84.

† *Horæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 105.—The Layman has excellently illustrated the matter as follows:—“Let me suppose the case of an intelligent Hindoo converted to Christianity by some foreign missionary, but as yet unacquainted with the Christian Scriptures, excepting such passages in them as may have been quoted to him in confirmation of the truths which he had been taught. He finds it to be the custom of his teacher to call all his converts together on the first day of the week for the purpose of devotion and instruction. He is told that the custom of thus stately assembling on that day, and for that purpose, is universal among Christians, and that it is a rite peculiar to their religion, and as ancient as the religion itself. Let me further suppose him to be curious respecting the origin of this rite, and desirous of ascertaining whether it were one of divine appointment or the invention of human wisdom, he is referred for such information to the Christian Scriptures, and also to sundry ancient, yet not scriptural, documents, which have relation to the early history of Christianity.

“Before he enters upon his investigation, he may be expected to reason thus with himself. If the rite originated in a divine command, I shall assuredly find that command registered in the sacred records of my new religion. He finds it not. He resumes his musing on the subject, and comes to the conclusion that although the command be not now extant, yet, if ever it existed, he shall find, in the Christian Scriptures and the other documents to which he has been referred, satisfactory evidence that the rite enjoined by it was observed from the

It is easy for the Sabbatarian to say that all who cannot see what *he* sees in the Bible, are “dishonest or ignorant, or unable to comprehend a very plain and simple subject:” * the compliment can as easily be returned; and with it the weighty charge, that whereas the Anti-Sabbatarian “compares together” *every* passage in the Bible through which aught about the Sabbath is “signified to the eye of reason and understanding,”—the Sabbatarian, on the contrary, while loudly proclaiming the solidity of the scriptural basis of his views, habitually directs *his* eye of reason and understanding to but *half* of the evidence; comparing together, it is true, the passages which support (or to a duly prepossessed understanding appear to support) the conclusions which he favours, but ignoring, perverting, or dismissing from view with a haste that ill agrees with the confidence of his air, every passage of unwelcome and troublesome significance. “Some,” says Dr Lorimer, “may wish for more evidence that the Sabbath was changed by divine authority from the Jewish seventh to the Christian first day of the week; but the question is, taking the whole circumstances of the case into account, is more needed, or to be reasonably expected? Is it not a principle of God’s Word, in many cases to give enough, and no more—to satisfy the devout, not overpower the uncandid?” † I answer that more evidence *is* needed, than that which has failed to satisfy any but the Puritans; which failed to satisfy the “devout” and learned truth-seekers so frequently named before; ‡ and which, for aught that appears, “over-

very first promulgation of Christianity, and was adopted in every Christian church as soon as it was planted. If such was not the fact, he will feel convinced that the observance of the rite could not have originated in a divine command, which, he will say, must, if ever given, have been at once, and universally, obeyed. Now, I ask, is there in the Christian Scriptures, or elsewhere, any such evidence of instant and universal obedience to the alleged command as would be likely to satisfy the unprejudiced Hindoo? Most assuredly there is not.

“Wherever he might reasonably expect to find such evidence he would encounter disappointment. He would seek for it in the history of the first converts to Christianity, which is given in the book of the Acts of the Apostles: it is not there. He would next turn to the writings of the apostles themselves—their Epistles to the churches which they had founded: neither is it there. He would then glance at the evidence tendered to him out of non-scriptural writings, and would at once perceive it to be too vague in its character and too remote in its date to be worthy of the slightest consideration.

“On the other hand, upon the question if the rite were of human invention, the Hindoo might be expected to reason thus. If it was of human invention, he would say, it must have originated with some individual who, with a few associates, piously disposed like himself, practised the observance of it, at first, perhaps, scarcely attracting the notice of their fellow-Christians, but its probable tendency, under due regulation, being to promote religion and good morals, it would gradually, though slowly, make its way, till in the course of time, but not till long after its first origin, it would become established as a recognised rite throughout the Christian world. If such was its origin, would the Hindoo say, I should expect to find its precise date unknown, its probable date extremely uncertain, and the first notices of its observance slight and obscure. Here I ask, whether in effect this be not the true character of the evidence adduced by the Sabbatarians respecting the rise and progress of Sunday observance as a prayer day? I think I have already shewn it to be so.”—(Pp. 299–302.)

* See *ante*, p. 484.

† The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath? p. 31.—(Is this a *candid* title?)

‡ See p. 484, and the places referred to in p. 482, note *; also pp. 322–6.

powers the uncandid" as frequently as "the devout."* If Dr Lorimer was desirous to "take the *whole circumstances* of the case into account," why is he (like the great mass of "the devout") so "uncandid" as to leave *out* of account the fourteenth chapter of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans? Would St Paul have acted thus, when addressing his readers as "wise men," who were to "judge" what he said? Assuredly not! He knew that wise men look impartially at *both* sides of a question, and that all pretences to judge without performing this imperative duty, are a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. The self-complacent allusion by the "devout" Dr Lorimer to the "uncandid" people who try to be *judges* rather than *partisans*, tempts one to exclaim, "Physician, heal thyself!" and "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye!"†

An American writer has lately sounded the praises of the Puritans thus: "The divine authority of the Sabbath neither was recognised by the ancient Fathers, nor by Luther or Calvin, or by the early reformers. It was reserved for the Puritans, to their immortal honour, first to expound and enforce the law of the Christian Sabbath, based on the authority of God's word. They better read the law of the Lord our God on this subject, and bringing it out from the enormous mass of saints' days and festivals with which the Church had overlaid it, like some priceless gem disinterred from the rubbish of many generations, presented it to the gaze and admiration of the world, radiant with heaven's own lustre. The influence of the sun

* Dr Hamilton says: "He who asks demonstration of it" (the Christian Sabbath) "shews, by the unreasonableness of his claim, a disaffection. He is unwilling to be satisfied. He betrays the contrary wish. A moral cause blinds him to those exquisite pencillings, to those unobtruded vestiges, which furnish their clearest testimony to this Institute, and which are the best grounds of all historic credence" !—(P. 143.) But in fact the anti-sabbatarians as little expect *demonstrative* evidence here, as upon any other historical question: furnish them with the "clearest testimony" of a historical kind, the kind which the nature of the case admits of (see the Introd. to Butler's *Analogy*), and they will be satisfied. They think, however, that they can shew much stronger pencillings and unobtruded vestiges of the *non-existence* of a Christian Sabbath, than Dr Hamilton has produced of its *existence*. May not "a moral cause" have "blinded" *him* to the significance of *these*? And may not Dr Andrew Thomson—who announces that he is "prepared to admit, in reference to this and many other duties, that it is quite a possible thing for a mind that is desirous of evading the evidence regarding it, to succeed in doing so" (*The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 93)—be himself the possessor of a mind in which is lurking that very desire which he thinks possible in his opponents? We are all fallible creatures; and the Sabbatarians, who admit so readily this fact in general, ought to beware of overlooking it when they think of themselves in particular.

† That "the devout" are not always satisfied with addresses to "the eye of reason and understanding," in the absence of statements in "express terms," is shewn by the inability of Dr Eadie to find in Gen. i. an intimation of the *solidity* of the blue vault of heaven (see *ante*, p. 103). Another instance occurs in the Rev. John Montgomery's pamphlet on Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, p. 18, from which it appears that he is unconvinced that polygamy was lawful among the ancient Jews. In the absence of a law expressly permitting it, the fact of its prevalence for many centuries, and among the most eminent saints, without the slightest appearance of the Divine disapprobation having been expressed, appeals in vain to the "reason and understanding" of the reverend gentleman.

in the heavens is not more clear or genial than is that of the Christian Sabbath upon the whole English race wherever found. They and they alone have a Sabbath, a Christian Sabbath, holy unto the Lord, by God's command. With all else throughout Christendom the Sabbath is a holiday, a festival, observed by common consent like other saints' days and festivals of the calendar."*

It must have been some such pharisaical flourish, that drew from Mr Higgins this spirited reproof: "If," says he, "it were observed to our little, though increasing junto of Puritans, that it is incumbent upon them to pay some attention to the great majority of the Christian world, who entertain an opinion on this subject different from them, and that they ought not to be too confident in their own judgment, but to recollect that it does not become them in fact, though perhaps not in name, to assume to themselves that infallibility which they deny to the united church of Christ with the Pope at its head; they would probably reply, that they have a right to judge for themselves, that they will not be controlled by Antichrist, or the scarlet whore of Babylon. With persons who can make this answer, the author declines all discussion; he writes not for them, but for persons who, having understandings, make use of them; and to these persons he observes, that he does not wish their opinions to be controlled by any authority; but he begs them to recollect the beautiful story of the chameleon—that others can see as well as themselves, and that when a great majority of the Christian world is against them, it is possible that they may be in error, and that therefore it is incumbent upon them to free their minds from passion or prejudice as much as possible, in the consideration of this very important subject: that on the decision respecting it depends the question, whether the Christian religion is to be a system of cheerfulness, of happiness, and of joy, or of weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth."† The somewhat hyperbolical strain in which Mr Higgins here closes his reproof, may be ascribed to the fervour of his indignation against the overbearing pharisees of his day. Allowing for this, however, I think he has justly represented the question to be between the *true* religion of cheerfulness, and the *false* one of penance and gloom.

Till the date of the edict of Constantine (A.D. 321)‡ we have no information about the observance of Sunday as a Sabbath (or day of *rest from labour*). Of the precise time when it began to be generally

* Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the Private, Domestic, Social, and Civil Life of the Primitive Christians. By Lyman Coleman. Philad. 1852. P. 532.

How the Puritan Sabbath arose, and took so firm a hold in Great Britain, was shewn *ante*, pp. 288, 302.

The pre-eminence of the Puritans in this respect is denied by a writer in the Presbyterian Review, who says: "Upon what authority then does the Christian Sabbath rest? Upon *ecclesiastical* authority, replies Dr Whately. Upon *Divine* authority, we reply; and such has been the reply of the great majority of the Christian church throughout every age, who have believed the Sabbath to be as old as the creation, and to be identified with the first principle of revealed religion,—that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."—(Vol. i., p. 499.) But the reader, I hope, is by this time satisfied that the Puritans are fully entitled to the "immortal honour" which Mr Coleman claims for them.

† *Horæ Sabbaticæ*, 2d ed., p. 60.

‡ *Ante*, p. 283.

observed as a *prayer-day*, no record is extant ;* nor can we trace either with whom this manner of celebrating the resurrection of Christ originated, or by what steps it became universal throughout the Church. “Did we know,” says the Layman, “the date of the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas, we might conclude from the vague allusion to Sunday-observance contained in it, that that observance was just then, in some form or other, coming into use ; and we may from that Epistle, considered in connexion with Pliny’s testimony relating to the Christians in Bithynia, † infer it to be, on the whole, most probable that the religious observance of the Sunday had its rise in the latter part of the first century. It is, indeed, quite possible, nor would the supposition be at all inconsistent with the argument which I have been maintaining on this point, that, even in St Paul’s time, but most certainly not with his approbation, some over-zealous individuals (over-zealous because outrunning the teaching of the Apostles) had begun to practise this observance. It is also very possible (and Heylin has a conjecture somewhat to this purport) that the practice might originate with some Jewish converts after the destruction of the temple (A.D. 70), they being thereby suddenly and for ever deprived of their stated sacrifices and festivals ; or, if we suppose that the practice had already sprung up and attracted some notice, nothing can be more probable than that upon the happening of the event, and for the reason above stated, many of the Jewish converts would become proselytes to the practice, and thereby give it an impulse, which would tend materially to its growth into general repute. These considerations, however, are offered only as conjectures.”—(P. 332, 333.)

Hengstenberg argues that as the authority of the Apostles is nowhere found to have been exerted for the establishment of the Lord’s Day, the authority of the Fourth Commandment must have been recognised as operative on the occasion. ‡ If so, we ought, in accordance with Heylin’s conjecture, to look to the Jewish converts as the most probable introducers of the custom ; and certainly nothing could be more natural than that men so deeply attached to the ancient weekly festival of their nation, should, at the termination of their political existence, substitute another weekly festival in its place. But how the *unanimity* of the recognition of this was attained

* *Ante*, p. 283.

† *Infra*, p. 539.

‡ The Lord’s Day, p. 47.—Dr Lorimer says: “I have no hesitation in admitting that it would not be easy to make out the Sabbath as a day of unbroken rest from the New Testament. It can be shewn conclusively, I think, that it was observed as a day of religious worship ; but probably nothing more could be proved. What, however, does this shew? *The necessity of falling back for argument upon the unrepealed law of the Fourth Commandment as equally binding upon [Gentile] Christians as upon the Hebrews.*”—(P. 37.) The same admission had previously been made in the *Eclectic Review*, Nov. 1830, p. 407. If the Fourth Commandment, says the reviewer, do not bind us, the *day of rest* is abrogated altogether. “According to this notion,” he adds, “the religion of Jesus Christ has abolished the most merciful provision of the Creator for the relief and recreation of the sons of toil and the domestic animals.” With this view Dr Wardlaw’s virtually coincides.—(*Discourses*, p. 153.) But the Gentiles, who never had the law of Moses, are at least no worse than before the coming of Christ : and the Eclectic Reviewer knows little of the Christian religion, if he is ignorant that its tendency is to render us just and merciful, not only to the sons of toil and the domestic animals, but to *all men and all animals* ; thereby coming in aid of that law of nature which has everywhere and in every

among Christians both Jewish and Gentile, Hengstenberg makes no attempt to explain. According to Dr Hetherington, again, "there is sufficient proof that the ideal standard of religious observance [of the Lord's Day] which the early Christians longed to realize, was the transference of Old Testament principles from the *seventh* day to the *first*; in other words, the identification of the Fourth Commandment with the Lord's Day, which is the Christian Sabbath."* But in none of the facts adduced by him in support of this assertion is any such proof to be found. He quotes indeed Eusebius as saying that "all things whatever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's Day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has a precedence, and is first in rank, and more honourable than the Jewish Sabbath." But as Eusebius lived in the reign of Constantine, it is unwarrantable and misleading to represent him either as one of "the early Christians," or as giving a statement of *their* opinions when he expresses *his own*. The phrase, "early Christians," is, I submit, one which cannot in such discussions as this be warrantably applied to any of a later period than the second century. What the subsequent Christians fancied, is no evidence of the opinions of the really primitive Christians; and even if the latter had agreed with Eusebius, there would have been no obligation upon us to adopt their views, except when based on satisfactory grounds. One important conclusion may, however, be derived from the passage; and it is this: Eusebius did not think, as the Sabbatarians do, that *God* had transferred the duties of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day.

According to Neander, the origin of the religious observance of Sunday must be deduced, not from the Jewish-Christian churches, but from the peculiar circumstances of the Gentile Christians; and he accounts for the practice thus: "Where the circumstances of the churches did not allow of daily meetings for devotion and agapæ [love feasts]—although in the nature of Christianity no necessity could exist for such a distinction—although on the Christian standing-point all days were to be considered as equally holy, in an equal manner devoted to the Lord—yet on account of peculiar outward relations, such a distinction of a particular day was adopted for religious communion. They did not choose the Sabbath which the Jewish Christians celebrated, in order to avoid the risk of mingling Judaism and Christianity, and because another event was more closely associated with Christian sentiments. The sufferings and resurrection of Christ appeared as the central point of Christian knowledge and practice; since his resurrection was viewed as the foundation of all Christian joy and hope, it was natural that the day which was connected with the remembrance of this event should be specially devoted to Christian communion."† But how *all* the churches were brought to an agreement remains to be accounted for, if the supposed unanimity

age led to the observance of festive holidays by mankind. "All work and no play," is a maxim which has never enjoyed much favour in the world. See *ante*, p. 225-6.

* The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects, p. 262. Here again, we have reason to complain that in a matter relating to the Old Testament, the Jewish and Gentile converts are blended into one mass of "early Christians," as if both had the same feelings and longings with reference to the Mosaic law.

† Hist. of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church, p. 159.

did really exist before the time of Constantine—a point, perhaps, too readily held to be ascertained. If it could be proved that in the second century, and in those heathen countries where converts to Christianity were most numerous, a custom existed of observing the Sunday as a holiday, in honour of the great luminary from which its name is derived, and which was held in such reverence by the nations of the East,*—*then* a sufficient reason would be disclosed for the universality of the practice, among Christians in those countries, of holding religious assemblies upon the Sunday; since it is natural for people desirous (as the early Christians, for obvious reasons, must have been) to be often in each other's company, to avail themselves of the opportunities which any weekly day of at least partial leisure affords.† The fact, however, of the observance, in the Roman Empire, of a heathen holiday on the first day of the week, remains to be established. Perhaps the epistle of Pliny the Younger to Trajan, about the Christians in Bithynia (written A.D. 107), may be held to indicate, on the contrary, that *there and then*, the Sunday was not observed as a festival, even by the Christians themselves. For, his report of them is, that according to the statement given by themselves when brought before him as governor, “they were wont to meet together on a stated day *before it was light*, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as a god, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them, when called upon to return it. *When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal*, which they ate in common, without any disorder.”‡ From this it would appear that the meetings for worship were of brief duration, and took place before the working portion of the day began; and that when they broke up, the persons who attended them proceeded to occupy themselves with the duties of their callings till the evening—which, in Oriental countries, is the time when it has been customary from time immemorial to meet for eating the principal meal. Whether the “stated day” was the *first*, or the *seventh*, or *any* day of the *week*, or a day in the Greek *decade* or the *month*, we have no means of knowing with certainty; but the most probable, and, at all events, the most general opinion is, that Sunday was the day of which these Bithynian Christians spoke. If it was, the epistle seems

* See *ante*, p. 514.—It would seem from a passage in Tertullian, quoted by Mr Oliver, p. 18, that the ancient Persians observed the first day of the week as a religious festival. “If we, like them,” says he, “celebrate Sunday as a day of rejoicing, it is for a reason very different from that of the worship of the sun.” In the North British Review, vol. xviii p. 409, it is assumed that the heathen among whom the apostles made converts, kept the Sunday as a festival; but no proof is given.

† The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews advises his correspondents not to abandon their practice of holding meetings for mutual exhortation (x. 25). From another part of the Epistle it appears that these meetings were daily ones: “Exhort one another daily while it is called to-day, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin” (iii. 13).

‡ Plin. Epist., lib. x., ep. xcvi; in Lardner's Credibility, part ii., ch. ix.; vol. iv., p. 14. Pliny's words, of which the translation is above printed in italics, are these: “Quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum.” See Lardner's comment on this, p. 24.

to furnish yet another argument against the notion that the early Christians kept Sunday as a Sabbath.

Having considered the Sabbath-doctrine of the Catechism as far as Q. 59,* and stated the reasons which necessitate the conclusions, 1. That the Fourth Commandment was imposed only on the Jews, and hence, if still in force, obliges none but them; and, 2. That were it binding on the Gentile Christians, their duty would be to observe *that* day of the week which the Jews, including our Lord and his Apostles, have at all times kept holy,—I might here conclude the discussion, without proceeding to inquire into the correctness of the answers supplied by the Catechism to the questions, “How is the Sabbath to be sanctified?” and “What is forbidden in the Fourth Commandment?” For, neither is it any concern of ours in what manner the Jews ought to keep the Sabbath—nor, if the law about the seventh day of the week were binding upon us, would an inquiry into the prescribed duties of the seventh-day Sabbath throw any light upon the duties of a first-day Sabbath, for the observance of which no divine authority, either express or implied, can anywhere be found. Nevertheless it will not be uninteresting to consider for a little what it was that the Fourth Commandment required of those to whom it was really given. To all of us, this inquiry must be a subject of rational curiosity; while, to such as retain unshaken their conviction that the commandment prescribes a religious duty to *them*, it must be a subject of interest the most profound.

The precept, as recorded in Dent. v. (which, for reasons formerly given,† must now be regarded as the more authentic of the two copies we possess), commences in these words: “Keep the sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee:” in complete correspondence with which is the phraseology in Exod. xx. 8, “Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy.” The express intimation in the one copy, that the observance of the day had already been “commanded” to the Israelites,—and the allusion to that fact, which the word “remember” in the other is usually believed to contain,—agree with what we read in Exod. xvi., where it is recorded that the Lord, in order that he “might prove them whether they would walk in his law, or no,” commanded them to gather on each of five days a certain rate of the manna which he would rain from heaven, and on the sixth day to gather and prepare twice as much as on any other. It is not added that any command was at the same time given about the *seventh* day; but, that one *was* given, seems to follow from the reason assigned for the command which is recorded, as well as from the speeches of Moses on the sixth and seventh days, which shew that, at least before then, *he* had received an injunction about the seventh. Be this, however, as it may, a double quantity of the manna was gathered on the sixth, “and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is a rest of a holy sabbath‡

* See *ante*, p. 487.

† *Ante*, pp. 72–106.

‡ In our version of the Bible, this is erroneously translated “the rest of the holy Sabbath;” probably in consequence of the notion of a primeval Sabbath being in the heads of the translators. Much plausible argument has been

unto the Lord: bako that which ye will bake to-day, and see the that ye will see the; and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a sabbath* unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is a sabbath,† in it there shall be none. And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath,‡ therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day.”

Dr Wardlaw, in his elaborate argument against Paley and the crowd of other eminent theologians who maintain that on this occasion the Sabbath was *first* appointed to be kept, says that in ver. 5 “God makes the intimation that a double quantity of the manna should fall,§ and gives the order that a double quantity should be gathered and prepared, *without assigning for these things any reason whatever*; which, on the supposition of no sabbatical observance of the seventh day having previously existed, and no distinction between that day and other days, *is utterly unaccountable*; whereas, on the contrary supposition, that of its previous celebration, all is natural, and precisely as we should have expected it to be.”|| Now, if the fact really were that no reason is *recorded* to have been assigned, yet one *might* have been given; and if none had been *assigned* to the Israelites, we should still by no means have been obliged to suppose that none *existed* in the mind of the Legislator. But if Dr Wardlaw had copied the narrative from ver. 4, instead of only from ver. 16, as he does, both he and his readers would have become aware that a reason *is* recorded to have been assigned—namely the one already quoted: “That I may prove them,

reared on this mistake, in treatises on the Sabbath; and Mr Higgins, whose little work is the only one where I have seen any mention made of it and of the other adverted to below, says “he has met with several clergymen, not learned in the Hebrew language, who have maintained, that from the use of the emphatic article in the places in question, a previous establishment and an existence of the Sabbath must be necessarily inferred. But the fact is, that the contrary inference must be drawn from the Hebrew text; and no Hebrew scholar will doubt a moment on the correctness of what is said respecting the Hebrew definite article. It is not one of the points of this language about which there has been any dispute.”—(*Horæ Sabbaticæ*, 2d ed., p. 35. Compare p. 80.) He remarks also that the words in Exod. xx. 10, are literally, “but the seventh day a sabbath,” and might as properly be completed with “shall be,” as with the “is” which our translators have inserted.—(P. 38.)

* Correctly translated.

† Mistranslated “the Sabbath” in the current version.

‡ This is rightly translated: the Israelites were *now* acquainted with the Sabbath, which therefore might with propriety be thus spoken of.

§ It is a mistake to say that such intimation is made in ver. 5, which relates only to the quantity to be *gathered*. Not till ver. 29 do we learn that “the bread of two days” was *given* on the sixth day.

|| Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 17.

whether they will walk in my law, or no." And if he had happened to observe, and to mention, that in our translation the phrase "the sabbath" is thrice substituted for "a sabbath," he would have made himself and them more capable of answering with intelligence the question which he puts to "any man of ordinary understanding and candid simplicity,—Whether he can imagine this to be the manner in which a religious observance, entirely new, quite unknown before, would have been first legally instituted?"*

The mode of Sabbath-observance prescribed in these circumstances was simply that of resting on the seventh day; and if the Fourth Commandment had contained nothing more than the words, "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee," neither the Israelites nor we should have been at a loss to understand *in what manner* it was to be sanctified. But on this point the commandment itself is perfectly explicit; proceeding immediately, as it does, to specify the observance required: "*In the Sabbath thou shalt not do any work,*" thou, nor thy children, nor thy slaves, nor thy cattle, nor the Gentile that is a proselyte to Judaism. This, *and this alone*, is the mode of Sabbath-observance prescribed to the Israelites by the Fourth Commandment, and this alone is what it prescribes to us, if Sabbath-observance be *our* duty as it is or was *theirs*.†

* Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 15.—In Milton's opinion, the injunction respecting the celebration of the Sabbath, given on this occasion, "seems rather to have been intended as a preparatory notice, the groundwork, as it were, of a law for the Israelites, to be delivered shortly afterwards in a clearer manner; they having been previously ignorant of the mode of observing the Sabbath. Compare ver. 5 with ver. 22–30."—(*Christian Doctrine*, B. i., ch. x., p. 229.)

† This interpretation of the Fourth Commandment seems to me so plain that no *unprejudiced* interpreter could fail to make it, and it was therefore adopted *ante*, pp. 221, 226, 420. It is that of Heylin (Part I., p. 121); Spencer (*De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus*, referred to by Hengstenberg, pp. 13, 67); Le Clerc (on Exod. xx. 8); and Vitringa (*De Synagoga Vetere*, lib. i., P. ii., cap. ii., p. 292; of which treatise an abridged translation, characterized by Archbishop Whately as excellent, has been published by Mr Bernard). Vitringa was a Dutch divine of great learning, and, as Hengstenberg testifies, "both pious and acute." In another of his works Vitringa says: "The lawgiver commences with the summary of the commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy,' and then explains, in the latter part, what keeping holy implies. This continuation contains directions to cease from work, and to extend this rest to others. And wherever this command of God is repeated, we find only the injunction to abstain entirely from work; which proves in our opinion that the keeping holy of the seventh day consisted merely, as the words of the commandment read, in entire abstinence from work."—(*Obs. Sacr.*, B. i., p. 292–3; quoted by Hengstenberg, p. 14.) To the same effect Beausobre and L'Enfant observe: "It appears from several places of the New Testament, that religious exercises, as reading the law, praying, and blessing, were reckoned necessary [useful ?] on the Sabbath; but they are not prescribed by the law; whereas *rest* was enjoined with the utmost strictness imaginable. Hence in the Scripture-language (Exod. xxxi. 14; xxxv. 2; xx. 8) *to profane the Sabbath* is the same as to work upon it, as to *sanctify* it signifies to rest."—(*Introd. to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures*, in Watson's *Coll. of Theol. Tracts*, vol. iii., p. 231.) To the references given in this passage I add Jer. xvii. 24, quoted *ante*, p. 488, note (g), and Matt. xii. 5. Mr Holden, with laughable moderation, admits that "the phraseology of the statutes on the subject is not absolutely inconsistent with this opinion" (p. 119); while Whately, though conceding that rest "seems to have been" (why not say that it *was*?) "the primary circumstance in the Jewish Sabbath," observes that public worship, and reli-

On what grounds, then, it may well be asked, are we required to believe that it prescribes abstinence from "recreations which are lawful religious studies and exercises, seem to have been the *secondary* circumstance. Yet he allows that the Fourth Commandment "does not even contain any injunction respecting public worship, or religious study;" adding, "But the day was naturally made a day of worship *because* it was a day of rest: the Lord's Day ought to be made a day of rest *because* it is a day of worship."—(*Thoughts on the Sabbath*, p. 16.) Jortin says: "It must be acknowledged that the commandment concerning the Sabbath seems to require nothing more than a strict and solemn rest from labour;" and he justly charges Josephus with misrepresentation in saying (*Contra Apion.*, ii. 17) that Moses commanded the Israelites to meet once a week for the hearing and study of the law.—(Jortin's *Works*, vol. ix. p. 107.) It is surprising that Hengstenberg should lay stress upon this assertion of Josephus, on a point where we have the law of Moses to judge of, as well as he had.—(*The Lord's Day*, pp. 15, 93.) There appears, no doubt, in *Levit.* xxiii. 2, a declaration that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, *an holy convocation*;" but, as Jortin says, "though it should be granted that by a holy convocation may be meant an assembly held for the performance of religious acts, yet here is no command to read the law, or to hear it read." To me it appears probable that as the phrase "an holy (*i. e.* separate, or clean) convocation" is a mere *allusion*, unintelligible by itself, and which nothing in the Fourth Commandment, or elsewhere throughout the law of Moses, corresponds to or explains, it is one of the additions which were made to the Pentateuch in later times (see *ante*, pp. 94, 182).—As to synagogue-meetings, there is no proof of their introduction till the occasion recorded in *Neh.* viii., after the return of the Jews from Babylon. (See Heylin, Part I., pp. 122 *et seq.*, 158 *et seq.*; Prideaux's *Connection of the Old and New Testament*, Part i., B. vi.; Beausobre and L'Enfant, in Watson's *Coll. of Theol. Tracts*, vol. iii., p. 158; Dr Brett in the same volume, pp. 47, 48; Michaelis's *Com. on the Laws of Moses*, vol. iii., pp. 150, 156; *The First Principle of Church Government*, by A. J. Scott, M.A., pp. 23–28, 40 (London, 1845); Dr Edward Robinson's *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*, art. Σάββατον; Kitto's *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.*, art. SYNAGOGUE; and Dean Milman, quoted *ante*, p. 436.) Philo, who is quoted by Hengstenberg (*op. cit.* p. 93; see also p. 13), says only that "it is a custom received from our forefathers, and still continued, to consecrate this day to science—the study of the nature of things." This, according to Hengstenberg, is language "more conformed to the taste and style of the Gentiles" than the words of Josephus are; but in truth it is more conformed to the law of Moses likewise. The same learned German argues, from divers passages in the Pentateuch and Prophets, that the public worship of God by the people, and also the study of the law, *must have been intended* to be a part of Sabbath-duty. But although he shews himself well aware of the difference between the mode of *sanctifying* the Sabbath (*i. e.*, of *distinguishing* it from other days), and the mode of *occupying* the time so sanctified, separated, or marked off, he is not sufficiently careful to avoid confounding these two ideas in the course of his argument. As to the *sanctification* of the day, is it credible that the manner of effecting this could be *imperfectly* indicated in the law appointing the sanctification?—or, that if something was meant to be essential for that purpose, *beyond* what the commandment enjoins, neglect of the thing there *specified* could have been the only form of *profanation* of the Sabbath which is ever hinted at in Scripture? Hengstenberg thinks that "the *peculiar sacrifice* offered on the Sabbath" (see *Numb.* xxviii. 9, 10; and *infra*, p. 549), "is at once a proof that the rest was not the only mark of the Sabbath."—(P. 14.) But in fact, it is a proof merely that a double sacrifice *was to be offered upon the sanctified day*; not that the double sacrifice was a part of the means of *marking* or *distinguishing* that day from the others. Again, he supposes that it must have been "the intention of the law-giver that the spare time, caused by the leisure of the seventh day, should be employed in the study of the law." Very possibly! though not, I think, so *certainly* as he infers (see *Deut.* xxxi. 9–13; *2 Kings* xxii. and xxiii.; *2 Chron.* xvii. 7–9): still, the employment of the spare time (or part of it) was very different

on other days," and "the spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy;" and that it forbids, as "profanations" of the Sabbath, "idleness" (which must mean neglect to perform religious exercises, and works of necessity or mercy, from morning to night), and "unnecessary *thoughts or words* about worldly employments or recreations"?

The answer of course will be, that all these modes of sanctification and profanation are implied,—1. In the command to "keep *holy* the sabbath-day;" 2. In the description of it as "the sabbath of the Lord thy God;" 3. In the statement that "God *blessed* the sabbath-day and *hallowed* it," because, after creating the universe in six days, "he rested the seventh day" from his labours; and, 4. In the passages quoted in the Catechism, notes (*l*), (*o*), and (*q*), *ante*, p. 488.

The third of these reasons being now defunct, the others alone require to be considered.

As to the Hebrew word translated "keep holy," "hallow," and "sanctify," every scholar will admit that in the Fourth Commandment it has no such meaning as the Sabbatarians imagine. Its primary signification is simply "to set apart;" while that of the adjective translated "holy," is "set apart," "separated from the mass," "unused for ordinary purposes;" the purposes for which the thing or person is set apart, being always implied to be more honourable or agreeable than those which would otherwise have continued to be served. Of the adjective, the secondary meaning is "*clean*" (which, however, is by some thought to be the *primary* sense, and "set apart" the secondary); and all agree that "*pure* in mind" is a figurative signification, of later origin than the others. Throughout the Pentateuch, the usual meanings are "set apart," and "*clean*." Thus, Exod. xix. 6, "Ye shall be to me an holy nation," means, "Ye shall be to me a nation set apart from all others;" or, as ver. 5 has it, "Ye shall be a *peculiar treasure* unto me above all people:" so also Exod. xxxi. 13, "I am the Lord that *sanctify* you." In Lev. xxvii. 30, the tithe of the land is said to be "*holy* unto the Lord;" set apart or appropriated to Him. And the epithet "holy," when joined, as it frequently is in Scripture, to God's name JEHOVAH , seems to be so applied because the word was not to be

from the *sanctification* by which it was created. According to Hengstenberg's way of reasoning, we must infer from Neh. viii. 10–12 (*ante*, p. 434), that feasting and making great mirth was the mode of *sanctifying* the day there mentioned as "holy unto the Lord;" not the mere way of fitly occupying the day which was already holy. He refers also to the "holy convocation" above noticed, and urges out of the Hebrew Scriptures other considerations which might easily be met, were it needful to do so in a country where it is a received doctrine that the Ten Commandments are the *only* portions of the Jewish law which retain their force.—Holden writes with perfect candour on this question, and concludes that "on the whole, the phrase 'an holy convocation' is of very doubtful interpretation: yet," says he, "it is the only one which *seems* to sanction the practice of sabbatical public worship; and as it cannot be supposed that the Deity, if he had intended to enjoin such a practice among the Israelites, would have done it in ambiguous terms, it may safely be concluded that they were left at liberty by the Mosaic law as to the mode by which they were *individually* to sanctify the Sabbath" (*The Christian Sabbath*, p. 132); by which last expression Holden must surely mean, "to spend the time, appointed to be sanctified by rest from labour." The italics are his own.

spoken except on most solemn occasions; in other words, it was to be *set apart* from ordinary use.* In Exod. xix. 12, Moses is ordered to “*set bounds unto the people round about [Sinai], saying, Take heed to yourselves that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it; whosoever toucheth the mount, shall be surely put to death.*” That is to say, he was to fix limits within which the ground should be regarded as *holy—set apart—secured from intrusion*. The correctness of this interpretation is evident from ver. 23, where the setting of the bounds by Moses is expressly referred to as a “sanctification” of the mount: “The people,” says he to the Lord, “cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, *and sanctify it.*” As the last three words do not occur in the command, ver. 12, they must either refer to the warning to the people not to break through, or merely repeat the idea expressed by the words which immediately precede them.

In the injunction to keep the camp *holy*, that “the Lord, who walketh in the midst of it, may see no unclean thing in thee” (Deut. xxiii. 14), the only possible meaning of the word is *clean*; as is the case also in Exod. xix. 10, “Go unto the people and *sanctify* them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes.” That to “*sanctify* the sabbath-day” means simply to set it apart from other days, so that, as the Israelites were not to intrude upon Mount Sinai, so the labours of the six days should not intrude upon the seventh, is so fully admitted by the *learned* advocates of the Christian Sabbath, that the fact may be considered indisputable. Thus Horsley, speaking of the Fourth Commandment, says plainly, “*Set it apart* is the true import of the word ‘hallowed it;’”† and again, with reference to Gen. ii. 3, “‘He hallowed it,—that is, God distinguished this particular day, and set it apart from the rest.’”‡ In like manner Dr Wardlaw says, “The primary import of the word *holy* is, that the day is *set apart.*”§ And Dr Chalmers, commenting upon Rom. i. 1, where Paul describes himself as “an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God,” explains “separated unto” as meaning “set apart to a particular work,” and then proceeds as follows:—“You know that holiness, in its original meaning, just signifies separation from the mass. It is thus that the vessels of the temple are holy,—it is thus that the terms common and unclean, are held, in the language of the ceremonial law, to be synonymous. And it is thus that the devoting or setting apart of an apostle to his office, is expressed by the consecration of him to it; and even, in one part of the New Testament, by the sanctifying of him to it. This explains a passage that might be otherwise difficult, John xvii. 17–19, ‘Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.’ To sanctify here is not applied to the personal but the official character. It is not to moralize the heart, but merely to set apart to an employment; and thus bears

* See *ante*, p. 490.

† Sermon xxii.

‡ Sermon xxiii.

§ Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 185. Dr Wardlaw puts more meaning than this primary one into it in the Fourth Commandment; but he must allow that it *may* mean only this, and that the additional meaning may be quite fanciful.

application to the Apostle Christ, as to the apostles whom He was addressing." *

The analogy between the physically-enclosed Mount Sinai, upon which the Israelites were forbidden to intrude, and the legally-enclosed Sabbath-day, upon which the *labourer* was forbidden to intrude, is well shewn in the phraseology of Isaiah lviii. 13, "If thou shalt *turn away thy foot from the Sabbath*, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," &c. On this Dr Wardlaw observes: "In order to a simple and satisfactory explanation of this somewhat singular form of speech, we ought, I should suppose, to conceive of a person as, during the preceding days of the week, following a particular course,—going forward in the prosecution of his worldly engagements,—and, when the Sabbath arrives, as stopping in his course,—desisting from his ordinary occupations,—not intruding on its hallowed hours with the footstep of earthly and secular businesses,—but waiting till it be over,—devoting it to its own proper employments and purposes,—‘resting the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.’" †

We thus see with what large abatement must be received the assertion of Dr Jennings in his *Jewish Antiquities*, ‡ that "the word 'sanctify,' applied either to persons or things, usually imports, not only the separation of them from common use, but the dedication of them to the more immediate service of God;" and that "to sanctify the Sabbath therefore, according to the true import of the word, is not only to refrain from common business, *but to spend the day in the peculiar service of God, or in religious exercises and acts of devotion.*"

Did the Israelites ever understand it to be their duty to spend the Sabbath in religious exercises and acts of devotion? Did the Pharisees? Did Jesus Christ or his apostles? Is it anywhere in Scripture charged against a Jew that he neglected to perform religious exercises and acts of devotion *on the Sabbath*? Is Sabbath-profanation ever represented in Scripture as any thing but the doing of work? To these questions the whole tenor of the Bible emphatically answers, *No!*

* Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. i., p. 46.—It is Coleridge, I think, who exclaims—

"How sweet to him who, all the week,
Through city crowds must push his way,
To stroll alone through fields and woods,
And *hallow* thus the Sabbath-day!"

Here the word "hallow" is as correctly as it is beautifully employed. Some even of those who think it their duty to spend the whole Sunday in religious exercises may applaud this use of the word: for although—

"Where mighty congregations throng amain,
And pulpit-thunders shake the astonished fane,
And through far roofs long-volumed organs peal,
There are, who then alone consent to feel.
Others, shy souls, whom silken crowds perplex,
Polemics tire, and actor-preachers vex,
Love more, like hermit near his cross of stone,
To pace, at eve, the silent turf alone,
And softly breathe, or inly muse, a prayer,
And find, not less, the general Father there."

Rhymed Plea for Tolerance, p. 112.

† Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 198.

‡ Edinburgh, 1808. P. 327.

“It is indeed particularly observable,” says Dr Barrow, “that in this [the fourth] command there is not an express order concerning the natural or moral service of God (by prayer, or hearing God’s Law) to be publicly performed on this day.”* Or privately either, he might have added with equal truth; for the phrase “keep holy,” it has been shewn, will by no means support the vast theological structure erected on it by the Puritans, whom for this reason I formerly charged with *ultrajudaism*.† “There is here,” says the Sabbath Alliance, “no room for equivocation. *Holy must just mean holy*; that is, sacred to God. IF IT DOES NOT MEAN THIS, IT MEANS NOTHING AT ALL. And if men will not understand words in their plain and obvious sense, let them at least be honest, and say so. Let them at once acknowledge that they wish it not to be so, and that therefore they hold it not to be so.”‡ The Alliance, in short, unable to imagine the possibility of any one interpreting a Hebrew word differently from themselves, or from the translators whom they slavishly follow, are driven to the necessity of believing that whoever *says* that it means something else, is saying what he knows to be false, and endeavouring by self-deceit to smother his sense of sin. But allowing, as I can well afford to do, that the word means “*holy*,” and that “*holy*” means “*sacred to God*”—still the question remains, What does “sacred to God” signify—*how* were the Jews to keep the day sacred to God? The answer of the Sabbatarians is in the ultrajudaical responses to Questions 60 and 61 of the Catechism;§ while *mine* is wholly contained in the Mosaic injunction, “In it thou shalt not do any work.” Assuming, with the Alliance, that “the Sabbath is not ours, but God’s, and therefore we are not at liberty to spend it as we please, but as He directs,”|| can any one find in the precept a farther direction than this *prohibition* of work—any direction about *active* duties? Can the Alliance produce from the Decalogue any justification of their averment, that “miserably do those pervert and degrade the Sabbath, and with awful presumption sin against God, who would convert it into a day of amusement or healthful recreation”?¶ Or can Dr Wardlaw, who says that “this command prescribes the proportions of time which are to be devoted to secular *and to spiritual concerns*, to the labours of the present world, *and to the service of God, and preparation for the world to come*,”** refer to the words which demand other “service”

* Exposition of the Decalogue, in Barrow’s Works, vol. ii., p. 574–5, ed. 1847.

† See *ante*, pp. 62, 355.

‡ Tract No. II., p. 1.

§ See *ante*, p. 487–8.—Or take the following dictum of Dr Bruce: “The most prominent and characteristic duty of the Sabbath, is the duty of attendance on the public worship of God in the sanctuary.”—(*The Duty and Privilege of Keeping the Sabbath*, p. 57.) This is just as if one should say, “The principal character in the tragedy of Hamlet is Coriolanus.” What right has Dr Bruce to degrade thus the only duty which the Fourth Commandment prescribes, and to thrust over its head another “duty” which is totally different, and has no title to be spoken of at all in connection with that precept, far less to be called the most prominent and characteristic duty of the Sabbath? Has he forgotten Deut. iv. 2? “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.”

|| Tract No. IV., p. 4.

¶ *Ibid.*

** Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 82. See also pp. 45, 78 *et seq.*, 89, 91–95,

than abstinence from labour ; or can he shew us a single allusion in the Law of Moses to that world to come, for which he says the commandment prescribes time to prepare ? And since, in the case of "cattle," the observance of the Sabbath has in it nothing "spiritual," whence does he infer that in the case of menservants and maidservants, for whom, precisely as for cattle, the commandment makes provision, "without doubt *the principal meaning* of the words 'that they may rest as well as thou,' is, that they should enjoy the full benefit of the spiritual rest of the Sabbath as well as their masters?"*

Professor Maurice observes : "The word '*holy*,' which people in our day repeat as if they were quite sure that they knew what it means, and could assume that every one else knew what it means, must, it seems to me, be interpreted by the Scripture itself, and not by any notions or practices of ours."†

138, 155, 160, 179, 195, 198 *et seq.*, 291 ; Baxter, vol. xiii., p. 422 ; The Quarterly Review, vol. xxxviii., p. 523 ; Holden on the Sabbath, p. 85, 86, 396–406, 414, 416 ; Hengstenberg, pp. 18, 35 ; Lorimer, p. 67 ; the Eclectic Review, June 1830, p. 500 ; and the Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects, pp. 61, 75, 88, 104, 115, 136, 142, 147, 160, 174, 260, 289, 397, 423.

* Wardlaw, p. 234. See *ante*, pp. 225–6, 420.

† Sermons on the Sabbath-day, &c., by Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. 1853. P. 8.—The promising sentence above quoted introduces a briefly-stated, and, as it seems (perhaps by reason of the brevity), somewhat fanciful theory of a connection of the holiness of the Sabbath with the holiness of the Israelitish nation. Had the limits of his sermon permitted him, surely so acute and well-informed a thinker as Mr Maurice could have given us a more satisfactory exposition of the meaning of "*holy*" than this. Moreover, I beg him to reconsider whether it is really the case that, in the Fourth Commandment, "work is enjoined just as much as rest is enjoined." Unquestionably God *does* enjoin work, and severely punishes idleness, in the course of his regular providence (see *ante*, p. 451, and Dr Combe's *Physiology applied to Health*) ; but in common with the generality of theologians, and, it is believed, the Jews themselves, I fail to discover any such injunction in the commandment—the entire scope of which appears to be contained in the opening words, "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it." The idea thus expressed pervades so thoroughly the rest of the commandment, and is so exclusively pointed at by the reason annexed, that the clause, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work," should, I think, be held to signify merely, "In six days shall all thy work be done, so that no part of it may encroach upon the Sabbath." The only other writer by whom I have observed the notion of Professor Maurice to be advocated, is the author of the clever but somewhat eccentric article on the Sabbath, in the *North British Review*, vol. xviii., Feb. 1853, p. 420.

This reviewer, it may be mentioned by the by, attempts in vain a reconciliation of Genesis and Geology (p. 401) ; resuscitating the hypothesis that the heavenly bodies were not *created* on the fourth day, but then *became visible*, owing to the clearing away of thick vapours which had previously enveloped the earth. To the fertile brain of Whiston, I suppose, we are indebted for the main part of this theory (See his "Discourse concerning the Nature, Style, and Extent of the Mosaic History of the Creation," p. 13 *et seq.*, prefixed to his *New Theory of the Earth*, Lond. 1696) ; and of no small service has it ever since been to the reconcilers of the Hebrew cosmogony with science. Thus, Bishop Newton, in his Dissertation on the "History of the Creation," coolly says, "On the first day God created *the heavenly bodies* and the earth," . . . but "it was not till the fourth day that the sun appeared in full lustre. The sun, moon, and stars are said to be then made, because they were then made visible and conspicuous upon earth."—(*Works*, ed. 1782, vol. ii., p. 60, 62.) He, however, admits that in the narrative of the creation and fall of man,

“The word *holy*,” says a modern writer on the Sabbath, “has now become so associated in our minds with puritanical ideas of self-mortification, and with modern religious forms of worship, that we are naturally misled by it from the meaning of the original. Many pious persons suppose that the command to keep the Sabbath-day *holy*, was equivalent to an injunction to attend a parish church, hear two or more sermons in the course of the Sunday, and during the rest of the day to keep in-doors and read the Bible. The Jews, however, did not do this, for the Bible was not written, and sermons in its exposition (which would have wanted texts) could not well be preached. Nor does it appear, from any passage in the books of Moses, that religious admonitions or discourses of any kind formed a part of the Tabernacle service. Nor is even prayer mentioned as an important part of public worship. The religious worship of the Jews at the time of Moses consisted wholly of the ceremonials of offerings and sacrifices; which were not confined to Sabbaths, but were continuous throughout the week, and throughout each day of the week. The public service of the Tabernacle was the daily and an evening sacrifice of ‘a lamb of the first year,’ without blemish, as a burnt-offering. On Sabbaths the service was the same, with this difference only, that, instead of one lamb, two lambs were then offered. The Tabernacle, however (as subsequently the Temple), was always open for the reception of gifts to the altar, the times for presenting which depended upon crops, and seasons, and the convenience of individuals. The ceremonial for these must have been short, from the multitudes who attended, and it was probably confined, in each case, to a short invocation and blessing. The books of Moses prescribe with great minuteness the nature of the offerings to be made, as adapted to the circumstances of both poor and rich; but there is not a word of re-

“the language is extremely figurative, being taken from the ancient pictures and hieroglyphics wherein these transactions were first recorded. . . . What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents, it is not an easy matter to determine. ‘Eating the forbidden fruit’ is nothing more than a continuation of the same hieroglyphic characters wherein the history of the fall was recorded before the use of letters.”—(Pp. 65, 71.) Had the Bishop written a century later, he would perhaps have discovered that the language of the cosmogony likewise had been taken from his “ancient pictures and hieroglyphics.”

See also the *Ancient Universal History*, B. I., ch. i., vol. i., p. 122-7; Archbishop King’s Sermon on the Fall of Man, annexed to Law’s translation of his *Essay on the Origin of Evil*, p. 516; Bishop Sherlock on Prophecy, Disc. iii., and Dissert. on the Sense of the Ancients before Christ on the Circumstances and Consequences of the Fall,—and Appendix thereto, being a Further Inquiry into the Mosaic Account of the Fall (*Works*, ed. 1830, vol. iv., pp. 49, 155-214); and Lardner on the Mosaic Account of the Creation and Fall of Man (*Works*, ed. 1815, vol. v., pp. 446-558). To the references given, *ante* p. 90, I add Dr Robertson’s Disquisition concerning Ancient India, Appendix (*Works*, ed. 1818, vol. xii., p. 282); and Law’s Theory of Religion, pp. 75, 264, 327.

How ridiculous appears now the following morsel of scriptural science, given out by the pious and respectable Bishop Horne in 1784. “The globe of the earth, *as the Scriptures inform us*, is a shell, or hollow sphere, enclosing within it a body of waters, styled ‘the great deep,’ or abyss. The earth, at the creation, was covered on all sides with water, which, at the command of God, retired to this abyss beneath, from whence, at the same command, it came forth in the days of Noah; and, having performed its task, was again dismissed as before.”—(*Letters on Infidelity*, Letter XII. on the Flood; Horne’s *Works*, vol. vi., p. 468.)

ference in the Pentateuch to offerings or sacrifices, or attendance upon them, as *peculiar Sabbath duties*.

“As before observed, the word *holy* signifies *separate*. The Hebrew is קדוש *Kadosh*, ‘to set apart.’ Parkhurst renders it, ‘to separate, or set apart from its common and ordinary to some higher use or purpose;’ and describes it as corresponding with the word *Badil*, which signifies ‘divide,’ and first occurs in Genesis i. 4 (‘and God *divided* the light from the darkness’). The vessels of the sanctuary were to be ‘holy unto the Lord;’ that is, they were to be kept strictly separate for the service of the sanctuary. Lest they should be broken or misappropriated, they were on no occasion to be used by any but the priests;—the origin of the custom which prevents modern Brahmins from either eating or drinking from vessels that have been touched by profane hands. The fourth command of the Decalogue may therefore be rendered, ‘Remember the seventh day to keep it separate:’ and these terms convey its full meaning. The command is not, ‘Remember the seventh day to keep it with *solemnity*;’ nor ‘Remember the seventh day to devote it exclusively to sacrificial or other religious rites:’ the injunction is simply to keep it *separate* from other days, and the explanation of the distinction to be observed is given with the text. Other days were to be working days, but the seventh day was to be a rest day or holiday.”*

In fact, this word *holiday*, as employed by Presbyterians, represents exactly what was meant by *holy* when applied to days, until the Puritans came in and perverted it. Among our forefathers, as among the Jews, † a holy day was a day of festive enjoyment; and even by Baxter, the word “feast” is given as the exact synonyme of “an holy day.” ‡ The expression “keep holy,” in short, is one of “those parrot-like phrases which, to the disgrace of human reason, so often bind men’s minds with a secret and sovereign charm;” § and well has Southey said, “Beware how you allow words to pass for more than they are worth, and bear in mind what alteration is sometimes produced in their current value by the course of time.” || Even had our forefathers translated

* *Sabbaths: An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions, &c.*, pp. 28, 29.

† *Ante*, pp. 433–9; Beausobre and L’Enfant, in Watson’s Coll. of Theol. Tracts, vol. iii., p. 233; Michaelis, *Com.*, vol. iii., p. 187 *et seq.*; Holden, pp. 116, 117; and Hengstenberg, p. 32. See also the Psalms *passim*, particularly the Hundredth; the texts cited by Holden, *infra*, p. 555; and, above all, Hosea ii. 11, “I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast-days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.” In Hosea ix. 5, “the solemn day,” and “the feast of the Lord,” seem to mean one and the same occasion.

Even Dr Lorimer says that “there is strong reason to believe that there was no remarkable rigidity about the Hebrew observance of the Sabbath, and that to suppose the reverse springs from not a few looking at the old scriptural law through the light of the perverse superstitions of the Jews in the days of Christ.” —(*The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath?* p. 64.)

‡ Works, vol. xix., p. 191.

§ Edinburgh Review, vol. xlv., p. 511.

|| See also Baxter, quoted *ante*, p. 227. — Bishop Hoadly says: “One of those great effects which length of time is seen to bring along with it, is the alteration of the meaning annexed to certain sounds. The signification of a word, well known and understood by those who first made use of it, is very insensibly varied by passing through many months, and by being

the Fourth Commandment "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it *with solemnity*," the meaning would not have been that which the Westminster divines and the whole body of the Puritans have thrust upon the word "sanctify" therein: for *solemnity*, which at first signified *any anniversary occasion*,* next came to mean *any stated periodical occasion*; and by our ancestors was currently used for the *formality* or *ceremony*, whether religious or otherwise, which attended any feast, meeting, or entertainment whatever. Thus we read of "a *solemn* supper" in *Macbeth*, and of the *solemn* festivities of

taken and given by multitudes, in common discourse, till it often comes to stand for a complication of notions, as distant from the original intention of it, nay, as contradictory to it, as darkness is to light. The ignorance and weakness of some, and the passions and bad designs of others, are the great instruments of this evil; which, even when it seems to affect only indifferent matters, ought in reason to be opposed, as it tends in its nature to confound men's notions in weightier points; but, when it hath once invaded the most sacred and important subjects, ought in duty to be resisted with a more open and undisguised zeal, as what toucheth the very vitals of all that is good, and is just going to take from men's eyes the boundaries of right and wrong."—(*Sermon on the Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ*, preached March 31, 1717; *Works*, vol. ii., p. 416. See also an article on Biblical interpretation by the late Dr M'Crie, in the *Presbyterian Review*, vol. vi., pp. 397–8.) Thus the word "*heart*," which with us means *the affections*, was used by the Hebrews for *the understanding*; and important errors are committed by readers of Scripture who are ignorant of this fact. Again, any mark of respect is called "worship" in our translation of the Bible (*e. g.*, in Luke xiv. 10), whereas the meaning is now restricted to acts of devotion to the Deity, &c. In the same verse, "Sit down in the lowest room," means in the lowest *place* at table. It was a mistake to suppose, as the old painters did, that "a coat" and "a cloak" in the New Testament were such as covered Dutchmen in the sixteenth century; that a "pillar" of Pharaoh's palace or Solomon's temple was a Corinthian column in a Palladian structure; and that the "mill" which two women were to be grinding at, was like the hand-mills of later times. As Rubens and Kemble stripped modern costumes from ancient figures, so have biblical scholars who have arisen since the Assembly of Divines interpreted the Scriptures at Westminster, substituted much ancient truth for much modern misapprehension. The word "*clergy*," which now means only ecclesiastical persons, meant formerly all men of learning, and in the apostolic times (See I Pet. v. 3) signified the Christian people. Nor has the meaning of "*church*" undergone a smaller transmutation. "It may never," says a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, "have occurred to some of our readers, that the Greek word which we translate 'Church,' Ἐκκλησία, was the peculiar term used to denote the general assembly of the people in the old democracies; that it essentially expresses a 'popularly constituted meeting,' and that such, in great measure, was the original constitution of the Christian society. We need not say with what different associations our English version of it is now connected; we need not ask what *popular* elements are left in [the Church of England,] a body in which the people have no voice at all, either by themselves or their representatives; where the chief officers, the Bishops, are appointed by the Crown, and are accountable to no one but the Archbishops and the Crown for the manner in which they discharge their trust."—(Vol. xliv., p. 507.

* Lat. *sollennis*, "annual;" *sollenne*, "a solemnity, a feast yearly kept, an anniversary;" *sollenniter*, "ordinarily, solemnly, in usual form." Lawyers still speak of the solemnities of deeds, *i. e.* the fixed forms in which deeds must be executed. The French words *étiquette* and *routine* give precisely the old signification of *solemnity*. To drink a toast is a solemnity; to give it with "three times three" is more solemn still. So, abstinence from work is the solemnity by which the Jewish Sabbath was distinguished or separated from other days.

Theseus in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*.* In Birrel's *Diary*, under date the 2d of May 1598, there is a combination of epithets, which, to a modern ear, is ludicrous, but in those days had no such character: in recording a banquet given by the Town of Edinburgh to the Duke of Holstein when on a visit to James VI., he says, "The King's Majesty and the Queen being both there, there was *great solemnity and merriness* at the said banquet" †—that is to say, great *formality or ceremony*, and merriness. Even Locke, writing so lately as 1687, characterises as a "solemnity" the ceremonious entry of a newly married Prince of Nassau into Leewaerden, amid the firing of muskets by the burghers. "The cavalcade and solemnity," says he, "were suitable to the greatness of the government." ‡—To which may be added, as the practical lesson to be deduced from all these examples, the following remarks of this great philosopher in a letter to one of his friends. "Commentators," says he, "not seldom make it their business to shew in what sense a word has been used by other authors: whereas the proper business of a commentator is barely to shew in what sense it was used by the author in that place; which, in the Scripture, we have reason to conclude was most commonly in the *ordinary vulgar sense of that word or phrase known in that time*; because the books were writ, as you justly observe, and adapted to *the people*. If the critics had observed this, we should have had in their works less ostentation and more truth; and a great deal of the darkness and doubtfulness now spread upon the Scriptures, had been avoided. I have had a late proof of this in myself, who have lately found in some large passages of Scripture, a sense quite different from what I understood it in before, and from what I find in commentators; and yet it appears so clear to me, that when I see you next I shall dare to appeal to you in it. But I read the word of God without prepossession or bias, and come to it with a resolution to take my sense from it, and not with a design to bring it to the sense of my system. *How much that hath made men wind and twist and pull the text in all the several sects of Christians, I need not tell you.* I desire to take my religion from the Scriptures, and then whether it suits or suits not

* Macbeth, Act iii., Sc. i.; and A Midsummer Night's Dream, Act i., Sc. i., Act iv., Sc. i., and Act. v., Sc. i. In the last of these the couplet occurs—

"A fortnight hold we this solemnity,
In nightly revels, and new jollity."

In the Taming of the Shrew, Act iii., Sc. ii., a wedding is called "a solemn festival." In Titus Andronicus, Act. ii., Sc. i., Aaron says—

"My lords, a solemn hunting is in hand;
There will the lovely Roman ladies troop."

And in Romeo and Juliet, Act. i., Sc. v., the ball in Capulet's house is spoken of as a "solemnity."—The Jewish festivals are frequently called "solemn feasts" in our translation of the Old Testament. See particularly Hosea ii. 11, quoted p. 550; and Isa. xxx. 29, where "a holy solemnity" means a stated occasion of song and gladness.

But, as many solemnities are grave, the word *solemn* naturally came, in the last place, to be used in the sense of grave; as by Shakspeare himself, in King John, Act iv., Sc. ii.—

"Why do you bend such solemn brows on me?"

† Fragments of Scottish History, p. 46. Edin. 1798.

‡ Lord King's Life of Locke, ed. 1830, vol. i., p. 303.

any other denomination, I am not much concerned; for I think at the last day it will not be inquired whether I were of the Church of England, or Church of Geneva, but whether I sought and embraced the truth in the love of it.”*

The writer on the Sabbath in the *Eclectic Review* for June 1830, p. 494, says, “In the Fourth Commandment, we know nothing that can be called ceremonial, except it be the prohibition to do any work on that day;” which is equivalent to saying, that nothing in it can be called ceremonial except it be *every thing that it enjoins!* The reviewer, however, like most other Sabbatarians, understands the commandment to be “a law ordaining the outward and public acknowledgment and worship of the Only True God, the Creator of the world. That this,” says he, “is the primary design and essential character of the institution of the Sabbath, is evident from the very reason that is given for its sanctification as a standing memorial of the work of creation.”—(P. 491.) But as the reason here alluded to is no longer serviceable, we must now content ourselves with the reasons which remain, to wit the following:—

1. “That thy manservant and thy maidservant MAY REST as well as thou: and remember that thou (Israel) wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: THEREFORE the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.”†

2. “Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass MAY REST, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, MAY BE REFRESHED.”‡

3. “Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: FOR IT IS A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU, THROUGHOUT YOUR GENERATIONS; that ye may know that I am the Lord, that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath THEREFORE; for it is holy unto you.”§

From these three passages we learn, 1. That the *beneficial purpose* of the festival was to give rest and refreshment to the Israelites, and their slaves, proselytes, and cattle—the cessation of work being *prescribed*, and the other means of refreshment being left to be chosen by each man according to his peculiar necessities; || 2. That its *commemorative purpose* was to keep the Israelites in mind of their miraculous deliverance from Egyptian bondage; and, 3. That its *political* (which in the theocracy was also its *religious*) *purpose*, ¶ was to remind the

* Letter to Samuel Bold, 16th May 1699; in Locke’s Works, ed. 1823, vol. x., p. 319.

† Fourth Commandment in Deut. v., 14, 15.

‡ Exod. xxiii. 12.

§ Exod. xxxi. 13, 14; see also verses 16, 17.

|| See *ante*, pp. 226, 420 *et seq.*—“It is change of occupation that is true rest,” observes the writer on the Sabbath in the *North British Review*, vol. xviii., p. 414. “What is wanted in a physiologically conceived Sabbath,” says he, “is the going to sleep of the week-day propensities, sentiments, and faculties; and the awaking rather of such as are too latent from busy day to day: and hence a natural right of each individual to the choice of his Sabbath occupations and enjoyments, always within proper social or sacred limits.” In short, the leisure of this day ought to be employed in keeping the balance of the whole human functions as even as possible, so that fair play may be given to them all.

¶ See Wardlaw’s Discourses on the Sabbath, p. 158.

Israelites of the covenant between Jehovah and them—an end for which, in its own nature, it was highly suitable; to serve as a test of their allegiance to Him as their supreme Ruler; and, by putting a marked distinction between them and the nations which surrounded them, to lessen their liability to lapse into treasonable idolatry. If the Fourth Commandment were a universal and permanent law, only the first of these purposes would be applicable to us; and recreations being, as we have seen, a most important means of refreshment,* the precept, instead of forbidding them, as the Catechism informs us it does, actually enjoins their use, if not to the bodily eye in so many written words, at least to that “eye of reason and understanding” which the Sabbatarians acknowledge to be the only one whereby may be discerned the Scriptural authority for a change of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first. That the Author of the Fourth Commandment had in view the mental as well as bodily utility of those means of refreshment which it specifies and implies, is in a high degree probable. Repose and recreation increase the cheerfulness of man; and this, again, is conducive to kindness and the other virtues:† while the leisure of a weekly Sabbath affords to the devout a season for contemplation and prayer—to the thinker, and the lover of knowledge, a time for study—to the philanthropist a time for good works—to the man of taste opportunity for the indulgence of his bent—to the townsman the means of invigorating and refreshing himself with rural scenes and sounds—to the rustic an opportunity of exchanging solitude for society—to the man of business time to consider his ways, and settle the principles of his daily conduct—to husbands, wives, and children, a time for domestic enjoyment and mutual improvement—and to all, the means of gratifying the social affections, and of cultivating the social properties and virtues. That these are legitimate purposes of the Christian Sabbath, its most rational advocates admit. “With respect to recreations [on the Sabbath],” says Mr Holden, “no express permission is found in the law of Moses, but that they were, at least to a certain extent, allowable, may be inferred from several considerations. As a total abstinence from all amusement would render it a day of gloom and sadness, productive of melancholy rather than of religious comfort, no such enactment, it may be presumed, would be promulgated by a benevolent Deity. It did, indeed, assume an aspect of this forbidding appearance, in consequence of the minute and scrupulous observances of the Pharisees, so strongly reprobated by our Saviour;‡ but the law of God does not prohibit those relaxations, without which the Sabbath would be more toilsome to the body, more depressing to the spirits, than the six days’ labour. The design of the institution was to afford an hebdomadal respite from toil, not only to the Israelites, but to servants and strangers, that they might ‘be refreshed,’ and something to amuse and recreate is indispensable for this purpose.§ In some cases

* *Ante*, pp. 225–6, 229–242, 267–279, 433, 503.

† *Ante*, pp. 72, 73, 239, 275–6, 369–70, 448–9.

‡ This, I think, is a mistake. The scruples of the Pharisees seem to have had reference only to *work*.

§ “Exod. xxiii. 12.”

the seventh day was appointed by statute to be kept a feast unto the Lord;* and the Sabbath is numbered among the Jewish feasts or festivals, in all of which they were commanded to rejoice.† To the same purpose is the text of Isaiah: ‘Ye shall have a song as in the night when a holy solemnity is kept; and gladness of heart as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the Mighty One of Israel.’‡ Zechariah declares, that different fasts ‘shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts.’§ From all these circumstances, it is but just to conclude, that, according to the Mosaic law, the Sabbath was to be not only a day of rest, but also of innocent enjoyment.

“But the Jews, it is said on the other hand, were forbid from ‘doing their own ways, or finding their own pleasure, or speaking their own words;’|| which, it is thought, is to be understood of recreations and diversions, and of talking about worldly matters. Three things, it is perfectly clear, are here condemned by the prophet. Of these the first, ‘doing their own ways,’ means the refraining from¶ the usual business or way of life; the second, ‘finding their own pleasure,’ upon which the objection chiefly depends, denotes the pursuing one’s own will, pleasure, or inclination, in opposition, as the context shews, to the commands of God; and the third, ‘speaking their own words,’ means the speaking vain, unprofitable, or injurious words. The prophet, therefore, only condemns the pursuit of worldly affairs, and the indulgence of such inclinations and pleasures as are contrary to those holy purposes for which the Sabbath was designed. He forbids such ways as are opposite to the true way, such pleasures as are contrary to those which are spiritual, and such language as is impure and unholy; but his phraseology cannot fairly be construed in the sense of prohibiting what contributes to harmless entertainment even on the the Sabbath-day. The law of Moses, then, with all its severity, is so far indulgent to the weakness of human nature, as to allow whatever recreations are innocent and compatible with the sanctity of a day which the Almighty has commanded to be kept holy.”**

Again he says:—“Many writers and preachers condemn, without restriction, all secular pleasures on this sacred day; but that amusements are, to a certain extent, permitted, is implied in the Sabbatical command, for the injunction to remit the accustomed toils of life not only is, but must have been intended to be, a source of delight; and it is in perfect harmony with this design, to allot some portion of the day to proper recreation and refreshment. Under Judaism it is declared to be the object of the institution that beasts of burthen, servants, and labourers, might *be refreshed*;†† and it cannot be supposed to have a less beneficent intention under Christianity. Contemplating the ease and lightness of the Christian yoke, the spirit of tenderness and love which breathes throughout the Gospel, the benevolence of its ordinances, the benignity of its precepts, the freedom and cheerfulness

* “Exod. xiii. 6; Numb. xxix. 12; Deut. xvi. 13–15; 2 Chron. xxx. 21.”

† “Compare Levit. xxiii. 2, 4, 37, with Deut. xvi. 11, 14; Lam. ii. 7.”

‡ “Isa. xxx. 29.”

§ “Zech. viii. 19. Compare Amos viii. 10.”

|| “Isaiah lviii. 13.”

¶ A *lapsus* for “carrying on.”

** The Christian Sabbath, pp. 115–118.

†† “Exod. xxiii. 12.”

of the services required, together with the total absence of all rigour and austerity, it cannot be imagined that a God so merciful and gracious would forbid innocent recreation on the day set apart for his praise and worship. He has so constituted the human powers, that reasonable relaxation is indispensable to their legitimate use; the mind cannot remain upon the stretch for an entire day; and the spiritual exercises of the Sabbath, like every other which demand a steady application, require convenient intermissions. Whatever may be pretended by those who, under the impulse of fanaticism or hypocrisy, overstep the sobriety of truth, it is impossible to be wholly occupied for so long a space as one day, in the public and private duties of religion: some relaxation, then, there must be; and the Divine Being will never be offended with that which he has rendered necessary by the constitution of human nature.”*

These views are closely coincident with those before expressed in Note L (pp. 420–450), which was printed before I had seen Mr Holden’s book; and I am pleased to find also that he interprets as I have done† the words in Isaiah lviii. 13, which the Westminster Divines refer to as a proof of the unlawfulness of “unnecessary *thoughts, words, or works, about our worldly employments or recreations.*”‡ The allowance of recreations on the Sabbath by the law of Moses, Mr Holden in the former of these passages speaks of as an instance of “indulgence to the weakness of human nature;” but in the latter he more justly represents it as something that is thoroughly adapted to the *normal or healthy constitution of man*. He must therefore, like

* The Christian Sabbath, pp. 379, 380. See also p. 394.

The opinions of Horsley, Vicesimus Knox, Bishop Porteus, and Bishop Aylmer, on this subject were mentioned *ante* pp. 120, 121, 336.

“In joy and thanksgiving,” says Jones of Nayland, that good and true minister of the Church of England, ‘the tongue is not content with speaking; it must evoke and utter a song, while the feet are also disposed to dance to the measures of music, as was the custom in sacred celebrities of old among the people of God, before the World and its vanities had engrossed to themselves all the expressions of mirth and festivity. They have now left nothing of that kind to religion, which must sit by in gloomy solemnity, and see the World with the Flesh and the Devil assume to themselves the sole power of distributing social happiness.’”—(*The Doctor*, by R. Southey, ch. 190.)

“The rector of a parish once complained to Fenelon of the practice of the villagers in dancing on Sunday evenings. ‘My good friend,’ replied the prelate, ‘you and I should not dance; but allowance must be made to the poor people who have only one day in the week to forget their misfortunes.’”—(*Ib.*, ch. 189.)

“The sabbatical institution,” says a Scottish clergyman, “is not a gloomy fast—it is a feast of cheerfulness and joy. Even among the Jews it was essentially joyful.” Will it be believed that these are the words of that very Dr Lorimer, who, as we saw before (p. 453), ascribes, in the very same treatise, the ruin of the Stewarts to the Divine displeasure, excited by a Declaration which two of them issued, that such of their subjects as chose to convert the Lord’s Day into a gloomy fast, should not be permitted to force their new-fangled and unscriptural practice upon those who preferred still to make it, as before, a feast of cheerfulness and joy? Yet there the words stand, in his 58th page.

† *Ante*, p. 437.

‡ *Ante*, p. 488.—Hengstenberg also (p. 92) interprets the passage in the “orthodox” manner, with a sneer at Gesenius, which recoils on himself; but even were this the *rational* manner, would the passage add any meaning to the Fourth Commandment in regard to the *sanctification* of the day?

myself, regard recreation as actually "a Sabbath-duty," incumbent upon all who were, or are, subject to the Fourth Commandment.

Dr King, in an excellent essay on "the Adaptation of the Sabbath to the temporal Wellbeing of Men, and more especially of the Working-classes,"* observes most justly:—"The pursuit of happiness is inseparable from our nature. If denied the more pure and ennobling enjoyments, man will lay hold on such gratifications as he can find, and will yield himself to the domination of mischievous indulgences. When the pure and salutary delights of the Sabbath have been withdrawn, an equivalent will be sought in such enjoyments as drinking, and lewdness, and nocturnal revelry afford."† Than the sphere of Dr King's own clerical labours—the pre-eminently drunken Glasgow—no city in the world could supply more convincing evidence of the truth of what he says: yet *even he* opposes Sunday trains! And why? Because they are inconsistent with "the hallowed character of the day,

* The Christian Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects, p. 110. If there be any reader who doubts the utility of the Sabbath (for I have never met such a person), he is referred also to Michaelis, Com., vol. iii., p. 193, art. on the Political Effects, Objects, and Uses of the Mosaic Festivals; Dwight, Serm. cix.; Paley on the Use of Sabbatical Institutions, Mor. Phil., B. v., ch. vi.; Mrs Barbauld on the Propriety of Public or Social Worship, in her Works, vol. ii., p. 415; Holden on the Christian Sabbath, ch. i., on the Political Advantages of the Sabbatical Institution; Wardlaw, pp. 234-5, 252, 254; Higgins, p. 54; and Dr James Hamilton's Essay on the Adaptation of the Sabbath to Man's Intellectual and Moral Nature, p. 125 of the first-mentioned volume.

As to the power of the State to appoint and enforce the observance of a weekly Sabbath for the sake of its political uses, and in so far as these are concerned, see *ante*, p. 342-5; the Eclectic Review for June 1830, p. 507, and for October 1830, p. 328; Wardlaw, pp. 157, 251, 268-280; Macfarlan, p. 230; Hamilton, pp. 158, 161; the Presbyterian Review, vol. x., p. 334; and The Modern Sabbath Examined, p. 279.

† The following is from Sir Humphry Davy's *Salmonia*, pp. 134-5:—

"Once in the north of Ireland, when a very young man, I ventured after the time of divine service, to put together my rods, as I had been used to do in the Catholic districts of Ireland, and fish for white trout in the river at Rathmelton, in pure innocence of heart, unconscious of wrong, when I found a crowd collect round me—at first I thought from mere curiosity, but I soon discovered I was mistaken; anger was their motive and vengeance their object. *A man soon came up exceedingly drunk, and began to abuse me by various indecent terms, such as a Sabbath-breaking papist, &c.* It was in vain I assured him I was no papist, and no intentional Sabbath-breaker; *he seized my rod and carried it off with imprecations*; and it was only with great difficulty, and by rousing by my eloquence some women who were present, and who thought I was an ill-used stranger, that I recovered my property. Another time I was walking on Arthur's Seat, with some of the most distinguished professors of Edinburgh attached to the geological opinions of the late Dr Hutton, a discussion took place upon the phenomena presented by the rocks under our feet, and to exemplify a principle, Professor Playfair broke some stones, in which I assisted the venerable and amiable philosopher. We had hardly examined the fragments, when a man from a crowd who had been assisting at a field-preaching, came up to us and warned us off, saying, 'Ye think ye are only stane-breakers; but I ken ye are Sabbath-breakers, and ye deserve to be staned with your ain stanes!'"

In how much more Christian a manner the Lord's Day is kept in the South and West of Ireland than it appears from the above anecdote to be in the Presbyterian North, may be learnt from Dr John Forbes's Memorandums made in Ireland in 1852, vol. i., pp. 67, 194-8. This enlightened physician is no less favourable to Sunday recreation than myself.

and set at nought its Divine appointment and indestructible obligations;" and because "when working men are conveyed by railway trains, it is to the injury of other working men, who are thus deprived of a day of rest." But the Sabbatarians themselves admit the truth of Christ's doctrine that it is lawful to do good, to save life, and to restore health on the Sabbath-days;* and, for my part, were I a Sabbatarian engine-driver on a railway, holding my present opinion that Sunday trains are a most valuable means of preserving and restoring health to multitudes, I should consider it no "injury" at all to be required, agreeably to previous compact with my employers, to minister for a few hours every fifth or sixth Sunday to the recreation, happiness, and improvement of my fellow-men. On the contrary, I should consider myself engaged in a very useful and honourable work, well deserving to be called "a work of necessity and mercy." And if, in performing that work, I should unexpectedly find it hurtful to myself, I should think it fair to ask an equivalent time for repose on Saturday or Monday,† and, in the event of refusal, should abandon the service of task-masters at once inhumane and blind to the fact that in promoting the wellbeing of their servants they would be advancing the prosperity of their undertaking.

"There is no doubt," says the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan, "that whatever is necessary to the *recovery* OR PRESERVATION of health, OR EVEN TO OUR COMFORT, is lawful on the Sabbath-day. . . . That, also, is necessary to the comfort, and even to the health of some, which is not so to others; and hence the impropriety of judging concerning others, from what is necessary to ourselves. . . . It may, on the same account, be necessary to some, to employ to a considerable extent the services both of man and of the inferior animals on the Lord's Day; but it would be well for such to bear in mind, that the comfort they thus enjoy, is at the expense of fellow-creatures, to whom God hath also reserved the rest of the Sabbath; and the very reflection will scarcely fail, in any humane mind, to mark the limits beyond which it ought not to be carried."‡

If it be true, as I believe it is, that "what is adapted to humanity, as such, will abide through all periods of human history,"§ the weekly holiday, or some yet more extensive provision for the recreation and enjoyment of labouring men and beasts, is among the most stable of human institutions. Against this, it is no argument that the madmen of the first French Revolution abolished the observance of Sunday, and that, in France, workmen may still be seen labouring during a portion of the day. If repose sufficient for the week be not enjoyed during *some part or parts* of the week, Nature will, in the long run, vindicate the authority of her law, and force men back into the ancient paths. The busier a nation is, the more need has it of the weekly rest; and hence, as Hengstenberg has well remarked, "it is not without good reason that in England the Sunday is held with almost a convulsive grasp: with this restless, busy people it is but the impulse to spiritual" (and bodily?) "self-preservation which

* See Matt. xii. 10-13; Mark iii. 1-5; Luke vi. 6-10. † *Ante*, p. 270.

‡ Treatise on the Christian Sabbath, p. 107. Mr Macfarlan has the rare merit of recommending the study, on Sundays, of God's *natural* laws, p. 124-130. See on this subject, Encyc. Brit., vol. xvii., p. 574-5.

§ The First Principle of Church Government, by A. J. Scott, M.A., p. 50.

dictates this strict observance" (p. 105). Even in regard to spiritual concerns, he admits with Bengel that while "for those who are deeply engrossed in the business of the world, a fixed day is not only useful but necessary, they who keep a constant Sabbath enjoy the greater liberty;" and he observes how natural it is that in the Roman Catholic Church, which has its services every day, the Sunday should stand out with far less prominence amidst the other days than in "Evangelical" churches.

Bishop Horsley, unable to find in the phrase "hallowed it," Gen. ii. 3, an injunction to engage in devotional exercises on the (primeval) Sabbath, has recourse to the clause which says that "God *blessed* the seventh day," and expounds it by adding,—“that is, he appropriated this day to religious exercises on the part of man, and he engaged, on his own part, to accept the homage which should on this day be offered to him. He promised to be propitious to the prayers, public and private, which should be offered to him on this day in the true spirit of piety, humility, and faith.”* Admirable is the ingenuity which could extract so much meaning from the announcement that God *made the seventh day a happy one* (for such is the meaning of *blessed* it)—a day set apart for the repose, refreshment, and enjoyment of labouring men and beasts; and which, with respect to the manner of spending it, is nowhere said in Scripture to have been instituted for any other purpose than this.† But no sooner has the Bishop thus loaded with significance the simple phrase in question, than he begins to suspect himself of drawing too largely on the credulity of his readers, and proceeds to qualify his exposition by saying—“This is, *I think*, the import of the phrase that God ‘blessed the day.’” So that the duty of public worship depends on the correctness of an interpretation which Horsley, the least diffident of divines, dares to say only that he *thinks* the words convey this meaning! As, however, they occur, not in the more authentic copy of the Commandment, but in that referring to a narrative of the creation which has been proved to be non-historical, the interpretation of Horsley, even if indisputable in itself, would in no degree strengthen the Sabbatarian cause. Add to this, that in the New Testament there is not even an allusion to the “blessing and sanctifying” of the seventh day at the creation of all things.

The next point to be noticed is the argument from the words, “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Of these it is enough to say, that they prove nothing as to the mode of *employing* the Sabbath: they merely assert the *Divine origin* of the institution, and neither claim for Jehovah a *special property* in the day‡ (since *all* the days of the Israelites were as much His property as the seventh *could* be), nor imply more than that it was their political and religious duty to observe the Sabbath *in the manner He was pleased to prescribe*.

Lastly, let us see what *special* evidence is offered in the Catechism, of the duty of abstaining from recreations on the Sabbath, and spend-

* Sermon xxiii.

† See *ante*, pp. 225–6, 229–242, 267–279, 433, 553.

‡ See the Shorter Catechism, Q. 62; *ante*, p. 489.

ing the whole time (except as aforesaid) in the public and private exercises of God's worship.

Passing over Neh. xiii.—which, although referred to at the place where recreations are said by the Catechism to be forbidden, mentions nothing but *work**—we come to notes (*l*), (*o*), and (*q*); in which the duty of employing the whole day in religious exercises is deduced,—1. From the custom of Jesus to go into the synagogues on the Sabbath-day, and there read and expound the law of Moses to the people; 2. From the proceedings of Paul and the disciples at Troas; 3. From the fact that somebody has prefixed to the 92d Psalm the title “A psalm or song for the Sabbath-day;” 4. From Isaiah lxvi. 23, in which it is foretold that, from one new-moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord in his holy mountain, Jerusalem (see ver. 20); 5. From the fact that Eutyechus was killed by falling down asleep at midnight from the third floor of a house in Troas, where Paul was preaching at so late an hour; and, 6. From Jer. xvii. 24–26, and Isa. lviii. 13, as quoted in note (*q*), p. 488.

How far, then, do these passages give countenance to the doctrine which they are cited to support?

1. What is mentioned of Jesus shews that he wisely took advantage of fit opportunities to address his countrymen, and that in doing so he moreover complied with a useful custom which was established among them; † but it neither tells us how the rest of the day was spent by him, nor imposes upon anybody the duty of attending synagogues. There is no evidence that he ever engaged in public prayer in synagogues or anywhere else. From certain passages in the New Testament, we learn that he *did not* spend the whole day as the Catechism says he ought to have done: he walked with his disciples through the corn-fields, and acted according to a Jewish custom in attending a feast to which one of the chief Pharisees invited him on a Sabbath-day. ‡

2. The occurrences at Troas, on the occasion of Paul's visit, have already been shewn to be of no avail for the purpose of the Sabbatarians. §

3. That a Jewish song should be appropriated to be sung on the Jewish Sabbath, is surely no reason why Gentile Christians should spend the whole of the Lord's Day in the public and private exercises of God's worship.

4. The passage in Isaiah lxvi. 23 does not require the very Jews themselves to spend the Sabbath-day in worship; and we have seen that they never did so. How then can it have such a meaning for us? If it proved *anything* about Sabbath-duties incumbent on us, it would prove that we ought to observe new-moons as well as Sabbaths, || and that our Sabbath-day should be the seventh day of the week, as were the Sabbaths mentioned by Isaiah.

5. To say or insinuate that the fatal accident which befel Eutyechus was a divine judgment for his “idleness” in sleeping while Paul

* See *ante*, p. 487, note (*k*).

† See *ante*, pp. 229–30, 329, 529.

‡ See Luke vi. 1, and xiv. 1–9; and *ante*, p. 439.

§ See *ante*, p. 521.

|| See *ante*, p. 508.

preached, is to set at defiance both common sense and the words of the history: for not only is it expressly recorded, without the slightest appearance of reproach to the unfortunate young man, that his sleep was the consequence of Paul's "long preaching," which by that time had "continued till midnight;" but nothing could be more natural and innocent than to fall asleep in such circumstances—and if, as is probable, Eutychus was at length exhausted, and unable to attend to the speaker, it was positively his *duty* to refresh himself with sleep. If *any* lesson is intended to be conveyed by the historian, it must be one very different from that which the Westminster Divines have deduced, and which is quite consistent with the notions entertained by them.* The restoration of Eutychus to life by Paul, is altogether at variance with their interpretation of the event: had it been a punishment for sin, the Apostle would no more have acted thus, than Peter would have resuscitated Ananias and Sapphira when *they* fell down and gave up the ghost.

Lastly: From Jer. xvii. 24, 25, we learn this, and nothing more, about the Sabbath—that "to hallow" it, was "to do no work therein." And Isa. lviii. 13 means only (as Mr Holden agrees with me in thinking†) that the Sabbath should be *willingly* hallowed in the manner just mentioned, which is that prescribed by the Fourth Commandment, and be spent conformably to God's law in general; honour being thus given to the Divine Author of the Commandment, whose will, and not the *contrary* inclinations of his subjects, should be the rule of their conduct. That the words, "doing thy pleasure," and "finding thine own pleasure," mean "doing any thing pleasant to thee," is inconsistent alike with the whole tenor of the Jewish Scriptures, and with the practice of the Jews founded thereon: yet this passage of Isaiah is, I believe, the sole fragment of Scripture in which the sour and sombre Sabbath-observance of the Puritans finds the *semblance* of a warrant—the only authority which Jonathan Edwards could have produced for writing down this among his seventy good resolutions: "Resolved, Never to utter anything that is sportive, or matter of laughter, on the Lord's Day." Is it credible that nothing sportive was uttered at the table of that chief Pharisee with whom Jesus feasted on the Sabbath-day? Would the feast have been worthy of its name, if sportive utterances and laughter were excluded?‡

The following enactments are said to have been contained in the first draft of the laws of the Colony of Massachusetts, drawn by John Cotton, a Puritan minister who had emigrated from Boston in Lincolnshire to New England:—

* See their inquiry into "the cause that God was so provoked," on the occasion of the Parliamentary General's "defeat in the west," *ante*, p. 137.

† See *ante*, pp. 437, 555.

‡ "A feast is made for laughter, and wine maketh merry."—(*Eccles.* x. 19.)

The Rev. Peter M'Owen of Liverpool says that "the Sabbath is desecrated when it [or a part of it, I presume] is spent in convivial feasting" (*The Sabbath considered in its Various Aspects*, p. 165); but the more genial John Angell James of Birmingham allows that "as the Sabbath is a feast-day, and not a fast-day," "there can be no objection to the feast of fat things, provided it be prepared the day before, and none are employed or cumbered about cooking or much serving" (*Ib.* p. 460). Dr Lorimer, as we saw (*ante*, p. 440), allows cooking as well as feasting—a laxity for which his premises supply no warrant.

“Whoever shall profane the Lord’s Day by doing unnecessary work, by unnecessary travelling, or by sports and recreations, he or they who so transgress shall forfeit forty shillings, or be publicly whipped; but if it shall appear to have been done presumptuously, such person or persons shall be put to death, or otherwise severely punished at the discretion of the court.

“No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

“No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath-day.

“No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting day.

“If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife her husband, on the Lord’s Day, the party in fault shall be punished at the discretion of the magistrates.”*

* I find these articles in a tract entitled *The Whole Doctrine of the Sabbath, &c.*, by J. W., p. 31 (Edin. 1851); but no reference is given.—In Bancroft’s *History of the United States*, near the end of chapter x., an able sketch of the old Puritans will be found. The following is another, from the brilliant pen of Macaulay:—“While a section of the Anglican clergy quitted, in one direction, the position which they had originally occupied, a section of the Puritan body departed, in a direction diametrically opposite, from the principles and practices of their fathers. The persecution which the separatists had undergone had been severe enough to irritate, but not severe enough to destroy. They had not been tamed into submission, but baited into savageness and stubbornness. After the fashion of oppressed sects, they mistook their own vindictive feelings for emotions of piety, encouraged in themselves by reading and meditation a disposition to brood over their wrongs, and, when they had worked themselves up into hating their enemies, imagined that they were only hating the enemies of Heaven. In the New Testament there was little indeed which, even when perverted by the most disingenuous exposition, could seem to countenance the indulgence of malevolent passions. But the Old Testament contained the history of a race selected by God to be witnesses of his unity and ministers of his vengeance, and specially commanded by him to do many things which, if done without his special command, would have been atrocious crimes. In such a history it was not difficult for fierce and gloomy spirits to find much that might be distorted to suit their wishes. The extreme Puritans therefore began to feel for the Old Testament a preference, which, perhaps, they did not distinctly avow even to themselves; but which shewed itself in all their sentiments and habits. They paid to the Hebrew language a respect which they refused to that tongue in which the discourses of Jesus and the epistles of Paul have come down to us. They baptized their children by the names, not of Christian saints, but of Hebrew patriarchs and warriors. In defiance of the express and reiterated declarations of Luther and Calvin, they turned the weekly festival by which the Church had, from the primitive times, commemorated the resurrection of her Lord, into a Jewish Sabbath. They sought for principles of jurisprudence in the Mosaic law, and for precedents to guide their ordinary conduct in the books of Judges and Kings. Their thoughts and discourse ran much on acts which were assuredly not recorded as examples for our imitation. The prophet who hewed in pieces a captive king, the rebel general who gave the blood of a queen to the dogs, the matron who, in defiance of plighted faith, and of the laws of eastern hospitality, drove the nail into the brain of the fugitive ally who had just fed at her board, and who was sleeping under the shadow of her tent, were proposed as models to Christians suffering under the tyranny of princes and prelates. Morals and manners were subjected to a code resembling that of the synagogue, when the synagogue was in its worst state. The dress, the deportment, the language, the studies, the amusements of the rigid sect were regulated on principles resembling those of the Pharisees, who, proud of their washed hands and broad phylacteries, taunted the

For these and the modified austerities of later times, there is as little warrant in the practice of the early Christians as in the law and practice of the Jews. The uniform testimony of the Fathers is, that the Lord's Day was and ought to be kept as a festival with gladness, and that mortification and fasting upon it was heretical.* They did not make it that "heavy day" which Wilberforce confesses it now is even to well-disposed people,† and which the *Manichees* were the first in the world to render it.

Seeing, then, that nothing to be found in *Scripture* imposes upon us the duty of observing a Sabbath, of esteeming one day above another, or of abstaining from recreations upon the first or any other day of the week, let us dare to use the freedom that belongs to us, and, instead of letting ourselves continue "tethered to the stump of old superstitions," boldly shake off the yoke which our pious but mistaken forefathers have laid upon our necks—and henceforth range at large, confiding steadfastly in that Divine light of reason and conscience, which, as knowledge increases and extends, will more and more enable us to make our weekly holiday one that "the heart will own, and the understanding ratify."

Redeemer as a sabbathbreaker and a winebibber. It was a sin to hang garlands on a Maypole, to drink a friend's health, to fly a hawk, to hunt a stag, to play at chess, to wear love-locks, to put starch into a ruff, to touch the virginals, to read the Fairy Queen. Rules such as these, rules which would have appeared insupportable to the free and joyous spirit of Luther, and contemptible to the serene and philosophical intellect of Zwingli, threw over all life a more than monastic gloom. The learning and eloquence by which the great reformers had been eminently distinguished, and to which they had been, in no small measure, indebted for their success, were regarded by the new school of Protestants with suspicion, if not with aversion. Some precisians had scruples about teaching the Latin grammar because the names of Mars, Bacchus, and Apollo occurred in it. The fine arts were all but proscribed. The solemn peal of the organ was superstitious. The light music of Ben Jonson's masques was dissolute. Half the fine paintings in England were idolatrous, and the other half indecent. The extreme Puritan was at once known from other men by his gait, his garb, his lank hair, the sour solemnity of his face, the upturned white of his eyes, the nasal twang with which he spoke, and, above all, by his peculiar dialect. He employed, on every occasion, the imagery and style of Scripture. Hebraisms violently introduced into the English language, and metaphors borrowed from the boldest lyric poetry of a remote age and country, and applied to the common concerns of English life, were the most striking peculiarities of this cant, which moved, not without cause, the derision both of prelatists and libertines."—(*Hist. of England*, ch. i.; vol. i., p. 79-81, 5th ed. See also ch. ii., p. 160-3.)

* See the quotations from the Fathers in Heylin, Part II., p. 81; Baxter, vol. xiii., pp. 405, 477; Holden, pp. 317, 318; Higgins, pp. 47, 48, 89; Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, vol. ii., p. 229 (Oxford, 1843); Cook's Gen. and Hist. View of Christianity, vol. ii., pp. 292, 296; The Sabbath, or an Examination of the Six Texts, &c., p. 234; and Neander's Church History, vol. i., p. 409.

† See *ante*, p. 452. The puritanical observance of the Sabbath is opposed by Holden, pp. 347, 389; Wardlaw, pp. 209, 228; Hamilton, p. 179; Michaelis, Com., vol. iii., p. 161; Hengstenberg, pp. 33, 34, 102; Dr (now Sir John) Forbes, Memorandums made in Ireland in 1852, vol. i., p. 194; ii., 278; and the author of a vigorous little treatise on The Philosophy of Evil (Philad. 1845), p. 73, section on "The Mischief of our gloomy Sunday." Baxter, though he maintains the duty of spending the Lord's Day in religious exercises, protests warmly against the practice of making it a season of penitence instead of joy and thanksgiving.—(*Works*, vol. ix., p. 282-3.)

INDEX

OF

TEXTS RELATING TO THE SABBATH.

<p>GEN. i.—74-91, 101, 103, 105, 325, 391, 394, 492, 514, 535, 548, 550. ii.—89-93, 102, 487, 545, 548, 559. xvii. 8, 171 xxiii. 94 xxxvi. 31, 94 EXOD. xii. 14, 168 17, 168 19, 49, 188 48, 188 xiii. 6, 555 xv. 20, 435 xvi. 487, 540 xix. 182, 544, 545 xx. 1, 2, 182, 486, 491, 502 8-11,—74, 95-99, 187, 188, 196, 433, 487, 489, 492, 495, 513, 537, 540, 542, 545, 547, 548, 550, 559. xxiii. 12,—181, 226, 433, 553, 554, 555. xxx. 12-17,—167, 170, 171, 493, 542, 544, 553. xxxiv. 27, 28, 96, 182, 491 xxxv. 2, 542 LEV. xvii. 8, 188 xix. 30, 181, 495 xxiii. 2, 3, 168, 543, 544, 555 37, 555 xxiv. 22, 188 xxvi. 2, 181 xxvii. 30, 544 NUMB. xv. 15, &c. 188 xxviii. 9, 10, 543 xxix. 12, 555 DEUT. iv. 8, 165 v. 1, &c. 182 12-15,—95-99, 487, 490, 492, 513, 540, 542, 553. vi. 5-12, 169 x. 2-4, 96, 182, 486 xiv. 26, 434 xvi. 13-15, 555 xxiii. 14, 499, 546</p>	<p>DEUT. xxvii. 7, 434 xxix. 11, 188 14, 15, 188 xxxi. 188, 543 JOSH. viii. 33, 35, 188 2 SAM. vi. 16, 434 2 KINGS xxii. and xxiii. 543 2 CHRON. xvii. 7-9, 543 xxx. 21, 555 NEH. viii. 543 10-12, 434, 544 xiii. 15-21, 188, 487, 560 PSAL. xix. 1, 103 6, 62 xxiv. 2, 62 c. 550 civ. 3, 62 cxii. 488, 460 cxviii. 24, 290, 507 cxxxvi. 6, 62 cxlvii. 19-20, 165 cxlviii. 4, 62 cl. 3, 435 ECCLES. i. 4, 62 x. 19, 561 ISA. i. 13, 122, 435 viii. 13, 122 xxx. 29, 552, 555 lvi. 6-8, 508 lviii. 13,—437, 488, 546, 555, 556, 560, 561. lxvi. 23, 488, 560 JER. xvii. 24-26, 488, 542, 560, 561 xxx. 13, 435 31, 34, 508 LAM. i. 7, 512 ii. 7, 555 EZEK. xx. 12-20, 168 xxiii. 38, 488 DAN. vii. 25, 290 xii. 3, 103 HOSEA ii. 11, 550, 552 ix. 5, 550 AMOS viii. 5, 437 10, 555 ZECH. viii. 19, 555 MATT. v. 16, 343</p>
---	--

MATT. v. 17-19,	175, 495, 497	ACTS xvii. 1,	329, 529
vii. 21-27,	343	xvii. 2,	329, 523, 529
xii. 1-8,	160, 542	17,	329
10-13,	558	22-25,	344
xv. 3-6,	505	xviii. 4,	329, 523, 529
xxi. 28-31,	343	xx. 7-11,—59,	487, 488, 521,
xxiii. 2, 3,	329, 504	560, 561.	
xxiv. 20,	505	xxi. 20,	172
MARK ii. 23-28,	160, 490, 508	24-27,	167, 172, 326
iii. 1-5,	558	xxii. 17,	329
LUKE iv. 16,	488, 560	xxiv. 18,	329
vi. 1-5,	160, 560	xxv. 8,	529
6-10,	558	xxvii. 35, 36,	521
xiv. 1, &c.,	436, 439, 560	xxviii. 17,	529
xvi. 17,	497	ROM. i. 1,	546
xxiv. 36,	520	ii. 14, 15,	486
JOHN v. 10-12,	504	xiv. 5-6,—56, 57, 58, 59, 60,	172,
17,	493	291, 326, 330, 516,	
ix. 6, 14,	504	517, 518, 527.	
xiii. 35,	171, 343	10,	173, 529
xv. 21,	343	17-8,	343
xvi. 2,	329	1 COR. ix. 20, 21,	167
xvii. 17-19,	545	x. 31,	343
xx. 19,	519	xiii. 1-3,	171
xxi. 3, 4,	520	xvi. 1, 2,	487, 522, 523, 531
ACTS i. 2, 3,	520	2 COR. xi. 3,	91
ii. 1,	521	GAL. iv. 10, 11,—58,	287, 291, 326,
46,	329, 521	516.	
iii. 1,	329	COL. ii. 16, 17,—58, 59, 291, 326, 330,	
iv. 10, 11,	508	516, 529.	
ix. 20,	329, 529	iii. 12, 14,	171
xiii. 5,	329, 529	1 TIM. ii. 14,	91, 92
14,	329, 527	TITUS ii. 14,	172
31,	520	HEB. iii. 13,	539
42. 44,	527	iv. 9, 10,	506
xiv. 1,	329, 529	viii. 13,	167
xv.,	172, 514, 515, 516, 527	x. 25,	539
xvi. 1-4,	167, 173	2 JOHN 6,	343
13,	523, 527, 529	REV. i. 10,	514, 524, 525, 526

INDEX

OF

NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

- ABBOT, Archbishop, 143, 148.
- Abercrombie, Dr John, referred to, 132.
- Aberdeen, Sabbath desecration in, 309, 312, 313; earthquake at, 313; laws of Town-Council for Sabbath-observance, 317; state of morals there about the year 1650, 444.
- Accidents on railways, 270, 454.
- Acts of Parliament about the Sabbath: English, 296, 331, 332, 333, 334; Scotch, 307, 339; acts against religious liberty, 46, 462-9; against immorality and impiety, 445-6.
- Adam, Mr, case of, 125.
- Addison, Joseph, on witchcraft, 66; on religion, 236, 237; on Puritanism, 237; on the drama, 427; on Sunday in the country, 428; referred to, 424, 428.
- Adshead, Joseph, referred to, 468.
- Adultery, 174, 220, 228, 442, 497, 499.
- Aglionby, Mr, on Sunday-trains, 405.
- Agnew, Sir Andrew, 12, 150, 160; Sabbatarian opinions of, 170, 196; Dr Chalmers's letter to, 180; on Sabbath-observance as a natural duty, 205-9; his appeal to Scripture, 290; history of his agitation for Sabbath-observance, 342 *et seq.*; death of, 370; character of, 357, 370; his Memoirs quoted, 348 *et seq.*; extracts from the Report of his Committee on Sabbath-observance, 298, 306 *et seq.*; 334, 342 *et seq.*; references thereto, 334, 339.
- , Gen. Sir Andrew, his adventure at Blair Athole, 359.
- , Rev. David C. A., on the meaning of "the stranger within thy gates," 187.
- Agricultural labour on Sunday, 308, 310, 339, 369.
- Aikin, John, M.D., on theological studies by the laity, 117; eulogy of, *ib.*; on the study of natural history, 424; on controversy, 475; referred to, 157, 424, 426, 468; his General Biography quoted, 146.
- , Lucy, referred to, 468.
- Alcoholic liquors, 416. See *Drunkenness*.
- Alexander, Dr W. L., on Jewish proselytes, 188.
- Allegory, a favourite vehicle of instruction in the East, 89. Is the Hebrew primeval history allegorical? 95, 492, 549.
- Althorp, Lord, on Sabbath-observance, 355.
- "Ambassadors" of God, 378.
- Ambiguity of words, errors from, 227, 544-552.
- America. See *United States*.
- American Indians, intemperance of, 416.
- Amusements on Sunday, 120, 121, 369, 421, 554. See *Recreations*.
- Anabaptists, their hostility to church-holidays, 292; burning of, 464, 466.
- Anglo-Papacy, 381. See *Church of England*.
- Animals, Sabbath rest of, 269, 277, 402, 537.
- Animal food, 416.
- Anne, Queen, High Church clergy in her reign, 247.
- Antioch, disputes about the law of Moses at, 172, 514, 529.
- Apocalypse, 524.
- Apollo, seventh day of the month sacred to, 512.
- Apollonius referred to, 29.
- Apologue. See *Allegory*.
- Apostles, their doctrine and practice of the Sabbath, 514 *et seq.*, 531; observed the Mosaic Sabbath, 221, 329, 527-9; attended the synagogues and temple service, 329; not recorded to have kept holy the first day of the week, 329; did they transfer the Sabbath to that day? 335; never allude to such transference, 285; how far their precepts and example are a rule to us, 129, 328.
- Apostolical succession, 381.
- Apparitions, 68.
- Appetite for food, 416.
- Applause, love of, 375.
- Aquinas on the Sabbath, 285.
- Arabian week, 514.
- Archery on Sundays, 300.
- Argyle, Duke of, referred to, 426, 468.

- Arian, burning of one, 466.
 Arianism, 36, 37, 48, 243.
 Aristotle, former servile deference to authority of, 109; referred to, 429.
 Arminianism, 140.
 Armstrong, Rev. G., referred to, 468.
 Arnold, Dr Thomas, on the Sabbath, 119, 221, 281, 284, 484, 501; on Sunday-trains, 363; referred to, 119, 158.
 Arrogance, implied in the word "toleration," 473; of priests, 376. See *Pride*.
 Articles of faith, authority of, 109; subscription to, 115, 252, 259, 386, 396; extract from Rogers's Preface to the 39 Articles, 302.
 Arvine, Mr, quoted, 277.
 Asiatic Researches quoted, 93.
 Assembling on the Lord's Day, 518, 519, 539.
 Assembly of Divines at Westminster. See *Westminster*.
 ———, General. See *Church of Scotland*.
 Assyrian week, 514.
 Astronomy and Scripture, 62, 77, 85, 263, 327, 391, 493, 548; ancient astronomy, 103, 513.
 Athanasian Creed, 48, 256, 338, 391.
 Atheism, 75, 76; unfair accusations of, 247, 381; does not necessarily produce immorality, 200; is no good ground for punishment or civil disabilities, 250, 377; natural religion preferable to, 480.
 Athens, great plague at, 444.
 Atonement, doctrine of the, 36.
 Atterbury, Bishop, referred to, 429.
 Augsburg Confession, on the Lord's Day, 287, 515.
 Augustine, St, on original sin, 38; on the use of reason in religion, 53; on the Sabbath, 284, 288; referred to, 78, 233.
 Authority, love of, 373 *et seq.*; in matters of faith, 107 *et seq.*; of churches, 138, 379; of reason and conscience, 202 *et seq.*; of learned laymen in religion, 389; that of the clergy lessened by subscription of articles, 397; servility to, 51, 107-113, 373, 383, 398, 399.
 Aylmer, Bishop, played at bowls on Sunday, 295.
 Ayr, punishment of Sabbath-breakers at, 318.
 BABBAGE, Charles, referred to, 76.
 Bacon, Lord, on doubt and certainty, 53; on superstition, 54, 142; on
 Atheism, 200; on conversation, 428; on gardens, 432; referred to, 425.
 Bailey, Samuel, on the duty of disseminating opinions, 471; on the good effects of free discussion, 474, 476; referred to, 29, 132, 266, 375, 456, 468, 471.
 Baillie, Robert, on the Westminster Assembly, 134, 136, 139, 140; his abhorrence of toleration, 151; on the state of religion in Scotland in his time, 444.
 Bailly, Mons., referred to, 104, 514.
 Baker, Benj., quoted, 346.
 Bakers, Sunday-work of, 313, 334, 342.
 Balfour, James, jun., quoted, 370, 402.
 ———, Dr J. II., quoted, 99.
 Balguy, Dr Thomas, referred to, 29, 471.
 Bancroft, George, his claim for Roger Williams, 469; referred to, 470, 562.
 Baptism, profession of faith by parents at, 136; conventional hypocrisy with respect to, 214.
 Baptist Churches, General Assembly of, *v.* Taylor, 479.
 Barbauld, Mrs, 118; her defence of public worship against Gilbert Wakefield, 230, 557; her suggestions for its improvement, 230.
 Barber's boy at Dundee, case of, 353.
 Barclay, Robert, referred to, 29, 121, 484, 468, 470.
 Barlow, Bishop, referred to, 29.
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 525, 537.
 Baron, Richard, 44, 257.
 Barrow, Dr Isaac, on universal redemption, 54; on the difficulty of finding truth, 106; on the universality of festivals, 225; on the Fourth Commandment, 217, 547; referred to, 484, 489, 517.
 Bathing, 433.
 Baxter, Richard, Doddridge's character of, 35; on misrepresentation, 27; on changes of opinion, 34; his belief that all sincere lovers of God will be saved, 49; his superstition, 67; on religious melancholy, 71; on the two copies of the Fourth Commandment, 98; on the Sabbath, 121, 327-330, 484, 529, 531, 550; against over-confident judgment, 128; on the errors of the orthodox, 128; on the Westminster Assembly, 134, 138; on the Sunday-sports, 143; on the Mosaic law as binding only on the Jews, 165, 179; on usury, 180; on imaginary sins, 213; on the positive character of the Fourth Commandment, 217; on am-

- ligious words, 227 : on the variety of men's minds, 244 ; on charity towards differing persons, 330 ; on bawlers for "the cause of God and of truth," 365 ; on spiritual pride, 378, 382 ; his recommendation of humility to the clergy, 382 ; on creeds and confessions as a device of the devil, 398 ; on the Great Fire of London, 456 ; on clerical influence over the ignorant, 457 ; referred to, 456, 470, 489, 563.
- Bayle, Peter, an objection of his to Christianity, 38.
- Bear-baiting on Sundays, 293, 295, 297.
- Beattie, Dr, on truth, 31 ; on the influence of science in dispelling superstition, 69 ; on conscience, 263 ; on rural pleasures, 431 ; referred to, 480.
- Beausobre and L'Enfant on the Decalogue, 186 ; on the Sabbath, 542, 543, 550.
- Becon, chaplain of Cranmer, 290.
- Begg, Rev. Dr, 481.
- Belief, should be the rule of practice, 3, 27, 161, 173 ; generally overmastered by the natural feelings, 467 ; uniformity of, impossible, 242 *et seq.* ; standards of, 108, 112, 113, 115, 130, 132, 138, 162, 258, 379, 385, 398.
- Bell, H. G., referred to, 432.
- Bellarmine on the Pope's supremacy, 211.
- Belsham, Thomas, his conversion to Unitarianism, 47 ; on the Sabbath, 57 ; referred to, 48.
- Benevolence, increased by happiness, 72, 73, 239, 275-6, 369-70, 448-9, 554 ; sentiment of, 201.
- Bengel quoted, 559.
- Benjamin's sack, the cup in, 224.
- Bentham, Jeremy, his satirical remark on the inexpediency of setting about proving the truth of propositions, 59 ; his greatest-happiness principle, 201 ; referred to, 132.
- Bentley, Richard, referred to, 45, 117.
- Bereans, 61.
- Berkeley, Bishop, referred to, 424.
- Bernard's translation of Vitranga, 542.
- Betty, Joseph, on the rebellious and impious Kirk, 381.
- Beza on the Lord's Day, 286, 484 ; Dudith's letter to, 468.
- Bible, how far a standard of religious truth, 33, 37, 108, 127, 138, 379, 383, 384, 468 ; corruptions of, 44, 182 ; inspiration of, 79, 84, 96, 99, 163, 191, 391 ; not practically the only rule of faith among Protestants, 115 ; translations of, 156, 510 ; its division into chapters and verses, 162 ; errors of Protestants respecting it, 163 ; relation of science to, 62, 77, 189, 208, 263, 327, 391, 394 ; must undergo the test of the law of nature, 204 ; is not our *only* rule, 210, 230, 455 ; study of, 257 ; diversity of interpretations of, 242 ; interpretation of, 80 *et seq.*, 104, 138, 155 *et seq.*, 328, 365, 387, 391, 533, 551, 552 ; mistranslations in our version of, 510, 540, 541. See *Old Testament* and *New Testament*.
- Bibliolatry, 161.
- Binning, Hugh, on the low state of morals in his time, 444.
- Biographia Britannica quoted, 135, 148.
- Birds, noise of, in the country, 431.
- Birrel's Diary quoted, 553.
- Bithynia, Christians in, 537, 539.
- Black, Peter Young, on Sabbath-observance, 212.
- Blackadder, James, 403, 481.
- Blackburn, Peter, 19.
- Blackburne, Archdeacon, on Church-authority, 109 ; on the right of private judgment, 114 ; his observation that Jesus addressed the *Jews*, 166 ; referred to, 258, 468, 471.
- Blackness Castle, blowing up of, 443.
- Blackwood's Magazine quoted, 74 ; referred to, 468.
- Blair, Rev. Adam, quoted, 285.
- , Robert (Lord President), on the Scottish Sabbath Acts, 338.
- Blair Athole, a military adventure at, 359.
- Blasphemy, laws against, 477.
- "Blessing" the Sabbath-day, meaning of, 489, 559.
- Blood, abstinence from, 172, 515.
- Book of Sports. See *Sports*.
- Books, idolatry of, 385 ; pleasure afforded by, 425.
- Boswell, James, 444 ; quoted, 428, 449.
- Botanic Gardens, 216, 433.
- Botany, study of, 424.
- Bound, Dr, his work on the Sabbath, 217, 302, 304, 305.
- Bowling on Sunday, 295, 310.
- Boyle, Hon. Robert, on natural priesthood, 117 ; referred to, 157.
- Lectures, quoted, 32 ; referred to, 29, 40, 132, 468.
- Bradborne, Theophilus, 297.
- Brain, effect of its condition on the mind, 207, 274 ; its need of rest and recreation, 423, 439.

- Brazil, sobriety in, 215.
 Bread, breaking of, 521.
 Brett, Dr, referred to, 183, 543.
 Brewster, Sir David, on the alliance of religion with knowledge, 425.
 Bridges, James, 114, 124, 360.
 Briggs *v.* Hartley, case of, 478.
 Brigham, Dr, referred to, 73.
 British and Foreign Medical Review quoted, 275.
 British Museum, 356.
 Brook, Benj., quoted, 155; referred to, 293, 468.
 Brooks, J. T., referred to, 277.
 Brougham, Lord, referred to, 425.
 Brown, John, D.D., on undue assumption of authority by expositors of Scripture, 113; on the sense in which ministers are messengers of God, 380; referred to, 126, 157, 471, 477.
 —, Dr Thomas, on servility to the authority of Aristotle, 109; on love of power, 374; referred to, 132.
 Browne, Sir Thomas, on difference of opinion, 52; on apparitions, 68.
 Brownists, persecution of the, 464, 465; not the first who understood religious liberty, 469.
 Bruce, Dr John, on the prosperity of Sabbath-observers, 450; his notion of the method of God's government, 452; on the Sabbath, 508, 547; referred to, 513.
 Bucer on the Lord's Day, 286, 484.
 Buck's Dictionary quoted on Sabbath-desecration, 439.
 Buckland, Dr, referred to, 76, 78.
 Buffon, Count de, recantation by, 104.
 Building on Sunday, 336.
 Bunsen, Christian C. J., on Sabbatarianism, 517.
 Bunyan, John, 71, 161.
 Burder, referred to, 523.
 Burghley, Lord, 293.
 Burke, Edmund, on the impolicy of forbidding recreation, 216, 448; on the laws against the Irish Catholics, 377.
 Burnet, Bishop, on the Sabbath, 218; on the Decalogue, 501; confounds Jewish and Gentile Christians, 501; referred to, 107, 379.
 Burney, Dr, referred to, 429.
 Burning of witches, 64, 135, 443; of heretics, 464-6, 469.
 Burns, Robert, quoted, 154; referred to, 54, 411.
 Burrows, Dr, on religious insanity, 419.
 Burton, J. H., referred to, 132, 377.
- Butler, Bishop, on moral and positive duties, 169, 227; on the moral law written on our hearts, 197; on the divine origin of *all* light and knowledge, 198; includes prudence among the virtues, 200; on the law of nature, 203; on natural religion as a test of revelation, 204; on the province of the clergy, 239; referred to, 253, 456, 480.
 —, Samuel, quoted on religious belief, 32; on the war of opinions, 366; on timeserving orthodoxy, 387; referred to, 134.
 Buxton, Sir F., on Sunday-trains, 406.
- CALDWELL, Dr Charles, referred to, 73.
 Caledonian Railway, Address to Shareholders of, quoted, 217.
 Calendar, its reform in England, 392; ancient calendars, 513, 514.
 Callimachus, 512.
 Calvin on the Sabbath, 58, 122, 285, 288, 484; his preference for the Old Testament, 173; defended the taking of interest for money, 180, 499; on the Decalogue, 493; on the meaning of "breaking bread," 521; his Life referred to, 468.
 Calvinism, 38, 48, 53, 54, 70, 140, 163, 230 *et seq.*, 338, 344, 420, 430; its tendency to breed insanity, 418.
 Cambridge, introduction of Newton's philosophy at, 110.
 Cameron, Sir Ewen, his Memoirs quoted, 314.
 Campbell, Dr George, of Aberdeen, on the standard of orthodoxy, 33; on the divine authority of conscience, 204; on toleration, 255; on the conformity of the Apostles to Jewish customs, 329; referred to, 158, 256, 377, 471.
 Campian, Father, torturing of, 465.
 Candlish, Dr Robert S., on the Hebrew cosmogony, 78; his character of Sir A. Agnew, 370; speech of, at formation of the Sabbath Alliance, 482; referred to, 504.
 Cant, religious, 213, 214, 234.
 Capes, J. M., referred to, 417.
 Capital punishment of murder, 189; of children, under the Mosaic law, 196, 499, 505.
 Captors, in Scotland, 299, 310, 311, 312, 317.
 Carlyle, Thomas, referred to, 135, 456; on the opposition of the clergy to education in science, 394.
 Carpenter, Dr W. B., on Alcoholic Liquors, 416 referred to, 157.

- Carter, Mrs, referred to, 424.
- Cartwright, Major, letter from Jefferson to, 477.
- Catechism. Westminster, 57, 132, 140, 180, 432, 485; of the Unitarian Churches of Poland, 162; of the Church of England, 118, 282, 491; Cranmer's, 119, 289; Luther's, 503.
- Catholic Church, 366. See *Roman Catholic*.
- Celts more sober than Saxons, 415; week of the old Celts, 511.
- Ceremonial laws. See *Positive laws*.
- Ceremonies, religious, why so much in favour, 447.
- Chalmers, Thomas, D.D., ignores the bearing of Rom. xiv. on the Lord's Day, 57; on creeds and systems of theology, 113, 162; on Paul's saying that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin," 161; on the treatment of the Roman Catholics by Protestants, 178; on the Sabbath, 180, 340, 358; on the Tables of stone, 182; on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 192; on zeal, 366; was an evangelical preacher, 340; was averse to be examined as a witness on Sabbath-observance, 348; his rebuke of servility to the clergy, 383; on the meaning of "sanctify," 545; referred to, 75, 76, 78, 360, 377, 424, 425, 430.
- , Rev. Peter, speech of, 402.
- Chambers, Dr Humphrey, 133.
- , Robert, his *Cyclopædia of English Literature* referred to, 35, 48, 53, 157, 266, 429, 456; his *Biographical Dictionary* quoted, 444.
- Chambers's *Journal* referred to, 276.
- Chandler, Dr Samuel, on the duty of obeying God's positive laws, 220; on religious freedom, 398; referred to, 266.
- Channing, Dr W. E., on preachers, 393; on amusement in relation to religion, 423; referred to, 38, 132, 233, 377, 479.
- Chapone, Mrs, on the Ten Commandments, 166.
- Chapters, division of the Bible into, 162.
- Charity, Christian, 28, 38, 50, 51, 249, 330; is the badge of Christians, 171; ill-directed, 205.
- Charles I., his revival of the Book of Sports, 143, 147-8, 369; Sabbath-legislation in his reign, 296, 333; historical forgeries at that time, 321; his displeasure at the suppression of Church holidays, 332; his letter on the subject, 333; a Sabbatarian explanation of the cause of his downfall, 453.
- Charles II., Bishop Taylor's sermon on his Restoration, 127; state of religion and morals in his reign, 334, 448; Sabbath-legislation, 333, 334, 339.
- Cheerful religion, 237, 417, 448; Sabbath-observance, 554 *et seq.*
- Chester Training College, 422.
- Cheyne, Dr John, referred to, 66; on religious insanity, 71.
- Children, duties of, 223; Mosaic law as to rebellious children, 196, 499, 505.
- Chillingworth, William, held Arian opinions, 39; changes of his religious views, 50; on the relation of the Mosaic law to Christians, 197; on the sufficiency of each Gospel, 197; his letter to Lewger on sinless error, 266; on the Sabbath, 119, 484; referred to, 107, 266, 499, 520.
- Cholera, the, no judgment, 456.
- Christ, law of, undervalued by the Sabbath Alliance, 197. See *Jesus*.
- Christian charity. See *Charity*.
- Christianity, character of, 58, 418, 555; corruptions of, 670, 230 *et seq.*; ought not to be mixed with Judaism, 85; wholly contained in the New Testament, 197; a republication of the law of nature, 204; evidence of, to the unlearned, 397; maxim that it is "part and parcel of the law of England," 477; Was the Sabbath adopted by Christ into it? 504.
- Christians, distinctive mark of, 171; how far concerned with the Old Testament, 189, 190, 499; of the Jewish race, 279; importance of distinguishing between these and Gentile Christians, 501, 538.
- Christmas, observance of, 306, 332, 334.
- Chrysostom on music, 429; on the Sabbath, 507.
- Church, change in the meaning of the word, 551; the Visible, 179; "true" churches, 114-116; all churches equally dogmatic, 398.
- Church Establishments, whether compatible with religious freedom, 154.
- Church of Christ, every little sect assumes the title of, 366, 472.
- Church of England, Hoadly on the, 53; Articles of, 53, 252, 494; Sabbath-doctrine of, 119, 214, 282, 289 *et seq.*; supineness as to new translation of the Bible, 157; change of spirit since commencement of the

- 17th century, 157; suppression of festivals by the Puritans, 332; state in the 18th and 19th centuries, 337; proposed revival of standards, 338; doctrine as to the rule of faith, 379; authority in matters of faith, 379-381; liable to err, but never erring, 381; temptation to timeserving in, 386; doctrine as to Mosaic law, 494; Catechism, 118, 282, 491; Communion Service, 491. See *Articles, Authority, Clergy*.
- Church of Scotland, 53; first Confession of, 292; present standards, 132, 379; want of freedom of thought and teaching in, 258; state of learning in, formerly and now, 135, 360, 301, 337, 396; Sunday services formerly shorter, 299; Acts against the Papists, 315; efforts for stricter observance of the Sabbath, 338-341; authority in matters of faith, 379; Sabbath-doctrine, 325, 485; said by an English High Churchman to have rebelliously and impiously rejected Episcopacy, 126, 381. See *Calvinism, Clergy, Catechism, Confession*.
- Church-attendance, laws for compelling, 149, 295, 309, 312, 317, 344; promoted in Britain by the French Revolution, 337. See *Worship*.
- Church-authority, 108, 120, 138, 333, 379, 536.
- Cicero on the law of nature, 264, 265; on self-knowledge, 374; referred to, 480.
- Clarendon, Lord, on the Synod of Dort, 48; on the character of John Hales, 49; on the drama, 427; referred to, 134.
- Clarke, Dr Adam, referred to, 90.
- , Dr Joseph, 417.
- , Dr Samuel, on the Trinity, 42, 45; his manner of studying the Bible, 42; on the continual operation of God, 76; how he introduced the Newtonian philosophy at Cambridge, 110; on the Sabbath, 226; a disbeliever in eternal torments, 233.
- Cleanliness, Mosaic law for, 196, 499; promoted by Sabbath-observance, 277; a meaning of "holiness," 545.
- Clemens Alexandrinus on the seventh day among Gentiles, 511.
- Clemens Romanus, Epistle of, 525.
- Clergy, have no authority in matters of faith, 116; sometimes exalt themselves into legislators, 189; generally hostile to the study of nature, 210; discourage the free study of the Bible, 257; labour on the Sabbath-day, 269, 270; Bishop Butler on their province, 239; their dogmatism, 373; in what sense "God's messengers," 380; original meaning of, "clergy," 381, 551; usurpations of, 381; become ridiculous when they dogmatize out of the pulpit, 382; Baxter's recommendation of humility to the, 382, 551; greater temptation to timeserving in England than in Scotland, 386; expectation of preferment, 387; are prejudiced witnesses of religious truth, 387 *et seq.*, 398; effect of corporate spirit and parties on, 388; slavery of some to Pharisaical busybodies and ignorant women, 389, 392; tempted to do what is *expected* of them, whether approved of or not, 389, 390; disingenuousness of, 391; why the study of natural science is frowned on by, 391, 394, 396; fettered by confessions, 386, 387, 390, 396; necessity of liberating them, 396; their authority lessened by creeds, 397; attractiveness of eloquence in, 427; their influence on the ignorant, 457; English and Scotch, in the 18th and 19th centuries, 337; improving in America, 393; the Glasgow clergy, 360; change of meaning of the word, 551.
- , Scottish, 300, 301, 314, 337, 396, 443; their learning, 135, 301; hints to them as to the study of natural religion, 211, 558.
- Climate, its effect on sobriety, 415.
- Clyde, sudden fall of its water, 68.
- Cobbett, William, on tithes, 175.
- Cobden, Richard, quoted, 423.
- Cold fosters intemperance, 416.
- Coldness of devotional feeling, 71.
- Colebrook, Sir George, referred to, 468.
- Coleman, Mr, a member of the Westminster Assembly, 134.
- , Lyman, on the Puritan Sabbath, 535-6.
- Coleridge, S. T., on Baxter's autobiography, 35; on Socinianism, 48; on Selden, 135; on Bunyan's bibliolatry, 161; on the Sabbath, 302, 546; referred to, 281.
- Collier, Jeremy, on the Book of Sports, 146; on Puritan Sabbatarianism, 305.
- , J. Payne, on Sunday plays in England, 293, 298.
- Collins, Anthony, referred to, 480.
- , Dr, quoted, 417.
- Coltness Collections, quoted, 311.
- Combe, Dr Andrew, on the impor-

- tance of physiology as a means of improving the moral and intellectual qualities of man, 207; on Sunday tasks, 276; on spirituous liquors, 416; on religious insanity, 418; referred to, 73, 276, 416, 417, 422, 423, 548.
- Combe, George, on the change in the spirit of the Scottish clergy, 337; on intemperance, 411; on the laws of Massachusetts, 499; referred to, 73, 210, 239, 309, 386, 396, 456.
- Commentators, servility of, 112; hints to, 158, 552. See *Bible*.
- Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, 291.
- Commons, Committee of House of, on Sabbatarian petitions, 457; on Sabbath-observance, see *Agnew, Sir A.*
- Communion service of Church of England, garbling of a phrase in, 491.
- Confessions of Faith, 108, 113, 115, 130, 132, 138, 162, 258, 379, 385, 469; Dunlop's defence of, 379; bad effects of, 386, 396; said by Baxter to be a device of the devil, 398; Knox's, 123, 256, 292; of Westminster, 57, 132, 138, 140, 155, 160, 164, 256, 279, 325, 353, 494; of Augsburg, 287, 515.
- Conscience, 198; authority of, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 224, 227, 263; erroneous, 28, 351; troubled, sometimes occasioned by disease, 71; rights of, 406, 411. See *Liberty*.
- Consent, general, as a test of truth, 113.
- Constantine's edict for the observance of Sunday, 280, 281, 283, 536.
- Controversies, religious, 50, 366; beneficial effects of controversy, 474 *et seq.*
- Conversation, Lord Bacon on, 428; cheerful, 449.
- Conversion, attempts at, equally the right of all sects, 476.
- Convocation, holy, 543, 544.
- Conybeare, Bishop, on the extent of the obligation of God's laws, 164; on the abrogation of the Jewish law, 166, 167; on that law, in relation to the Gentiles, 184; his answer to Tindal, 184, 189; on religion and superstition, 204; on the law of nature, 223.
- Cook, Dr Geo., on Sir Isaac Newton's religious faith, 44; on the Lord's Day, 284; on Sunday amusements, 300; on the Book of Sports, 318; on Sabbath-observance after the Restoration, 334; on the Reformers, 467; on religious liberty in Scot-
- land, 472; referred to, 281, 288, 379, 563.
- Cook, Dr John, on differences of opinion, 248; referred to, 158.
- Cooking on Sunday, 177, 312, 333, 440, 561.
- Copernican system of astronomy, 62, 77, 85, 104, 327, 391.
- Corinth, Paul's application to the disciples there for alms, 522, 531.
- Corporate spirit of the clergy, 388.
- Corruption of human nature, doctrine of, 38, 231, 453.
- Cosmogony, Hebrew, 77, 99, 391, 394, 492, 511, 548.
- Cotton, John, 561.
- Councils, ecclesiastical, 133, 137, 399.
- Country sounds, 430.
- Covenant between God and the Israelites, the Sabbath a sign of, 167 *et seq.*, 218, 357, 491.
- Covenanters, Scotch, 381; their preference for the Old Testament, 173; their intolerance, 151, 152, 315; their dislike of music, 430; their Sabbath, 440; state of religion and morality during their ascendancy, *ib.*
- Cowper, William, his religious opinions, 70; on the continual display of God's creative action, 75; religious influence of his writings, 337; on servility to great names, 385; on rural sounds, 430.
- Cox, Robert, 20, 483, 484.
- Craig, Sir James Gibson, 21 *n.*, 484.
- Cranmer, Archbishop, on the Sabbath, 119, 282, 289, 291, 484.
- Creation, Hebrew narrative of the, 72 *et seq.*, 391, 394, 492, 511, 548; the Sabbath generally regarded as a memorial of the, 93, 369, 536, 553; this belief no longer tenable, 93, 513, 553; creation of new species, 74; God is continually creating, 75, 493.
- Credner, Dr, referred to, 157, 166.
- Credulity, 67-69.
- Creeds. See *Belief, Confessions*.
- Crichton, Dr, of Liverpool, 368.
- Criminals, allegation that Sabbath-breaking is their first step to crime, 35, 345.
- Cromwell, Oliver, his letter to the General Assembly of the Kirk, 135; his account of the morals of the Scotch, 442; punished his soldiers for plundering, 443; toleration under, 470.
- Crosskey, H. W., on changes of theological opinion, 260.
- Cruden, Alex., quoted, 171.

- Crystal Palace at Sydenham, 216 ; 228 *et seq.*, 240, 371, 390, 450 ; petition of the working classes of London in favour of its being open on Sundays, 371.
- Cullen, Dr, odium incurred by him for his medical improvements, 112.
- Cumming, Rev. Dr, on music, 429 ; on natural sounds, 430.
- DAILY NEWS, the, quoted on Sunday-trains, 22.
- Dancing, 308, 369, 370, 434, 436, 438, 443, 556.
- Daubeny, Archdeacon, on the cause of differences of religious opinion, 41, 254 ; on the doctrine of election, 54 ; on the subjection of the ignorant to words and names, 457.
- D'Aubigné, Dr Merle, on the characteristic of Protestantism, 256.
- David danced before the Lord, 434.
- Davidson, Dr, quoted, 95.
- Davy, Sir Humphry, on Sabbath-observance in Ireland and Scotland, 557.
- Dawn, the, quoted, 423.
- Day, meaning of the word in Genesis i., 79, 81 ; origin of the names of the days of the week, 513.
- Decalogue, duties of, according to Knox's Confession, 123 ; confusion often made between it and the moral law, 163 ; binding only on the Jews, 165, 166, 181 *et seq.*, 491, 494, 502 ; Dr Chalmers on the, 181 ; regarded by Philo and others as a summary of the whole Mosaic law, 186, 493 ; may be *perpetually*, yet not *universally*, binding, 186 ; alleged vital importance of, 212, 224, 481, 494 ; not wholly moral, 281, 489, 493 ; custom of using it as a summary of moral duty, 284 ; the Westminster Catechism and Confession on, 486, 489, 494 ; Milton on, 493 ; two copies of, 95, 492 ; a third copy according to Mr Newman, 492 ; arbitrary separation of it from the rest of the Jewish law, 496, 500 ; Bishop Burnet on, 501 ; Luther on, 502 ; preface to, 486, 491, 502.
- Deceit, proneness to, 66.
- Deism, promoted by the impieties of Calvinism, 233 ; better than atheism, 480. See *Natural Religion*.
- Deists, an argument of theirs, 184 ; Do they treat their servants worse than others do ? 350 ; a good effect of their writings, 480.
- Deluge, Noah's, 189, 549.
- Demoniacal possession, 64, 67, 444.
- Denham, Rev. J. F., referred to, 67.
- Denison, Edmund B., referred to, 194.
- Denmark, insanity prevalent among the Calvinists in, 418.
- Derbyshire, prodigies in, 67, 68.
- Derwent, river, sudden fall of its waters, 67, 68.
- Descartes, deference formerly paid to his authority, 110.
- Despotism, spiritual. See *Authority, Intolerance, Pride*.
- Deuterote, 95.
- Devil, the, 64-68, 72, 91 ; said by Baxter to be the author of creeds and confessions, 398.
- Devotion, feeling of, 201. See *Worship*.
- De Wette referred to, 94, 96, 500.
- Dick, William, speech of, 402.
- Dion Cassius referred to, 511.
- Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, 526.
- Dipsomania, 414.
- Discussion, benefit of, 474 *et seq.*
- Disease, its influence on the mind, 71, 72. See *Health*.
- Disney's Life of Jobb, 47.
- D'Israeli, Isaac, on King James's Demonology, 64 ; on Sunday plays, 144 ; on the Book of Sports, 145 ; referred to, 456, 468.
- Dissent beneficial to religion, 252.
- Dissenters, quality of their preaching, 238 ; Mr Gathercole's character of the, 247 ; their influence last century on the Church of England, 337 ; Paley on their treatment, 377 ; persecutions of, 464 *et seq.*
- Divorce, Jewish law of, 176, 177.
- Doddridge, Dr Philip, on Baxter, 35 ; influence of, 337 ; referred to, 166.
- Dogmatism bred by ignorance, 51, 52, 112, 245, 326, 366, 373, 383, 475 ; its influence on the ignorant, 457.
- Doig, Dr David, on the manner of teaching of the Eastern sages, 90.
- Dort, Synod of, 48, 53.
- Doubt, utility of, 52.
- Dramatic spectacles, 55, 122, 144, 285, 293, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 306, 370, 427.
- Drinkwater, Mr, quoted, 103, 104.
- Driving on Sunday, 352, 558.
- Drummond, Dr James, referred to, 132. ———, II., his speech on Sunday-trains, 406, 407.
- Drunkenness in relation to Sabbath-observance, 10, 215, 401 ; punishment of, under the Mosaic law, 196, 499 ; causes and cure of, 216, 411, 557 ; leads to crime, 346 ; Solomon on, 451.

- Dudith, a consistent Protestant, 468; his letter to Beza, *ib.*
- Duelling, 176.
- Duff, Rev. Dr., on the failure of the argument from miracles with the Hindoos, 185.
- Dunbar, battle of, 443.
- Dundee, case of barber's boy at, 353; Sunday steamer at, 353.
- Dunlop, Dr William, on the Trinity, 48; his defence of Confessions of Faith, 379; referred to, 124.
- Dury, John, fond of sports, 300.
- Duty, foundations of, 198 *et seq.*; bad effects of factitious standards of, 213; moral and positive duties, 169, 218, 227, 516.
- Dwight, Dr Timothy, on the Decalogue, 185; on the Sabbath, 516, 530; referred to, 507, 508, 513, 557.
- , S. E., referred to, 192.
- Dyer, Thomas H., on the preference of the Puritans for the Old Testament, 173; his Life of Calvin referred to, 468.
- Dymond, Jonathan, on the Sabbath, 121, 396.
- Dyspepsia, 274, 276.
- EADIE, Dr John, on the Sabbath, 57; on the profound scientific knowledge of Moses, 101; on the firmament, 103, 535; referred to, 513.
- Earth's revolution on its axis formerly an irreligious doctrine, 60. [*ib.*]
- Earthquake at Aberdeen, 313; in Chili.
- Easter, observance of, 306, 332, 333.
- Ebionites, 279-280.
- Ecclesia, original meaning of, 551.
- Ecclesiastical history, Le Clerc on, 461.
- Eclectic Review on the Sabbath, 517, 537, 548, 553, 557.
- Edinburgh, acts and proclamations about Sabbath-observance in, 149, 339; punishment of Sabbath-desecration, 309 *et seq.*; despotic conduct of the clergy in the reign of James VI., 316; market-day in, 316; preaching of General Lambert, &c., in, 443; Sabbath-observance 200 years ago, 275, 440; state of morals then, 442; public opinion as to Sunday-trains, 403; drunkenness in, 215, 402.
- Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway, 1, 17, 221, 360, 361, 402, 410, 457, 459, 483.
- Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway, 362, 400.
- Edinburgh Christian Instructor referred to, 469.
- Edinburgh Review quoted, 35, 135, 214, 242, 301, 340, 341, 381, 389, 550, 551; referred to, 29, 68, 97, 178, 252, 258, 276, 377, 468, 471, 472, 478.
- Education diminishes poverty, 240, intellectual bondage, 395, and intemperance, 414, 417; importance of diffusing knowledge of human nature, 273, 415; scientific, generally frowned on by the clergy, 391; national religious education, 153, 233; importance of national, 395; religious education in Scotland, 337, 338; manual labour academies, 422; law of Massachusetts about religious school-books, 471; education there, 499; importance of secular education in a religious point of view, 205 *et seq.*
- Edward VI., statute of, as to the Lord's Day, 282, 291; burning of heretics in his reign, 465.
- Edwards, Jonathan, on revelation to human reason, 533; his puritanical Sabbatarianism, 561.
- Egypt, the Sabbath a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from, 217, 486, 490, 491, 492, 502, 553.
- Egyptians taught by symbols, 90, 93; their week, 514.
- Election, doctrine of, 53, 54, 230, 232.
- Elizabeth, Queen, her law for church-attendance, 344; consequence of persecutions under, 469; Sabbath-observance under, 293, 294; burning of papists and heretics, 464, 465.
- Ellice, E., on Sunday-trains, 405.
- Elliot, Dr Gilbert, on clerical usurpation, 381.
- , Mr., his speech in Parliament on Sabbath-desecration, 336.
- Eloquence, pleasure derived from, 127.
- Elrington, Dr, referred to, 48, 468.
- Emmanuel, King, his persecution of the Jews, 376.
- Encyclopædia Britannica quoted, 90, 96, 110, 376; referred to, 76, 90, 157, 180, 258, 468, 513, 558.
- Enfield, Dr, on public worship, 232.
- England, Sabbath-observance in, 293, 294, 295, 296, 336, 371; rise and progress of Sabbatarianism in, 301 *et seq.*; reaction against Puritanism in, 448; maxim that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of, 477; Church of, see *Church of England*.
- Enthusiasm, religious, 246, 389, 418.
- Epilepsy, 66.
- Episcopacy, alleged divine right of,

- 126, 127; "rebellious and impious rejection" of it by the Presbyterians, 381.
- Episcopalians are but a tolerated sect in Scotland, 479.
- Erasmus on Judaising Christians, 173.
- Error no match for truth, 56, 178, 394, 476, 480; injurious effects of, 231; religious, not demonstrable, 242; inevitable, not damnable, 264.
- Essenes, 95.
- Eternal, use of that word in Scripture, 171; doctrine of eternal torments, 230 *et seq.*, 447.
- Ethical philosophy, principles of, 198 *et seq.*; limits of ethics and politics, 348.
- Eusebius on popular instruction among the Jews, 95; on the Lord's Day, 538; Melito's letter to Onesimus quoted from, 500.
- Eutyclus, death of, 488, 560, 561.
- Evangelical Alliance, 367, 482.
- Evangelical Christians, appeal to, 397; arrogant exclusive assumption of that title, 473.
- Evangelical preaching, 41; promoted by the French Revolution, 338, 340.
- Evans's Sketch of Christian Denominations referred to, 176.
- Everlasting. See *Eternal*.
- Evidence, internal and external, of revelation, 191; evidence of Christianity to the unlearned, 397; theological, 397, 533-535.
- Evil and good in actions, 190, 191.
- Examiner, the, quoted, 24.
- Example of the Apostles. See *Apostles*.
- Excitement, need of, 286, 424.
- Exegesis, improved mode of, 159. See *Bible*. [141, 448.
- Extremes, flying from one to another, Ezra said to have revised the Hebrew Scriptures, 95.
- FABLE.** See *Allegory*.
- Factories, holidays in, 270.
- Faith. See *Belief*.
- Falkirk Tryst, interference of the Sabbatarians with, 316.
- Fall of man, Scriptural narrative of the, 89, 189, 548-549.
- Fallacies, pious, 10, 341, 346, 347.
- Fallibility of human judgment, 52, 106, 535.
- Falsehood no match for truth, 56, 178, 394, 476, 480; immorality of its use in controversy, 475.
- Fame, love of, 375.
- Fanaticism, 67, 246, 389, 418; is sometimes insanity, 474.
- Farmer, Rev. Hugh, on demoniacs, 66; on Christ's temptation, *ib.*
- Farmers, intemperance of, in the last generation, 413.
- Farre, Dr John R., on the physiological uses of the Sabbath, 268, 277.
- Fasting not favoured by Moses, 533; mention of, in Rom. xiv., 517; fasts appointed by the General Assembly in Scotland, 441, 442.
- Fathers, the Christian, 91; ascribed the Sabbath to Moses, 226, 280; represent the Lord's Day as joyful, 563.
- Fear, inhumanising effect of, 443; dread of free inquiry, 51.
- Feasting on the Sabbath, 137, 433, 436, 439.
- Feasts. See *Festivals*.
- Females sometimes disposed to deceit by hysteria, 66.
- Fenelon on Sunday recreations, 556.
- Ferguson, Dr Adam, his opinion of the drama, 428.
- Fergusson, James, of Kilwinning, intolérant views of, 470.
- Festivals are established in all nations, 225, 345; of the English Church, 332, 333; Jewish, 433, 516, 550, 552.
- Festus, his answer to the Jews, 224; Paul before, 529.
- Field, John, on the Sabbath, 293.
- , Rev. William, his *Life of Dr Parr* quoted, 473; referred to, 48, 234, 423.
- Fife, Synod of, 318.
- Fifth Commandment, 491.
- Fighting on the Sabbath, not forbidden to the Jews, 439.
- Figurative language. See *Allegory*.
- Fines for Sabbath-breaking in Scotland, 307, 312, 315.
- Firmament, 103-105, 535.
- Fish, sale of, on Sunday, 334.
- Fishing on Sunday, 310, 313, 339.
- Fleetwood, Recorder of London, 293.
- Fleury, Cardinal, 388.
- Flood, Noah's, 189, 549.
- Food, in relation to drunkenness, 412, 414, 416.
- Forbearance, mutual, 51, 73, 254. See *Toleration*.
- Forbes, Sir John, M.D., referred to, 557, 563.
- Foreign Quarterly Review referred to, 64.
- Forgeries, historical, 321; of signatures to Sabbatarian petitions and memorials, 458, 461.
- Fornication, 348, 442; meaning of the

- word in the decree of Jerusalem, 515.
- Foster, Dr James, his answer to Tindal, 189; on the old Testament, 189; on differences of opinion, 245; on the Fourth Commandment, 221; referred to, 158, 166.
- , John, a disbeliever in eternal punishment, 234.
- Fourth Commandment, 4, 11, 84, 510, 537, 540, 553; not binding on the Gentiles, 167, 217, 227, 228, 354, 357; regarded by Philo, &c., as an abridgment of the ceremonial law of Moses, 186, 493; alleged vital importance of, 196, 481; use of it by the Church of England, 214, 282; imposes the duty of observing the *seventh* day of the week, 11, 220, 221; disputes about, 323; spirit of the, 225, 226; does not forbid recreation, 229, 433, 543 *et seq.*; how it gained authority among modern Christians, 284, 288 *et seq.*; Dr Cook on the, 335; Horsley on, 335; the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on, 341; Sir A. Agnew's Committee on, 342; Dr Lorimer's complaint of relaxed views about, 390; purposes of, 420, 553; forbids only *work*, 437, 439, 487, 488, 542 *et seq.*; two copies of, 95, 492, 513; whether moral, 217, 489, 490, 495; vital importance of its moral character to Sabbatarianism, 516; what it prescribes, 487, 542; quoted, 95, 486. See *Sabbath*.
- France, Sabbath-observance in, 277, 368, 558; sobriety in, 215, 415; persecutions in, 466; influence of the French Revolution on the religious state of Britain, 335, 337, 338, 340.
- Francis I., his letters-patent against Ramus, 109.
- Franklin, Benjamin, his electrical discoveries, 70; referred to, 150, 175, 480.
- Frauds, pious, 45, 58, 214, 231, 234, 341, 391, 475.
- Free discussion, 250, 251; expediency of, 397, 474, 480.
- Free inquiry, 61, 62, 93, 116, 257, 385; dread of, 51; use of, 52; Milton on, 56; right and duty of, 114.
- Free Church of Scotland, its opposition to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 194; manifesto on the Sabbath, 247; its ministers claim the authority of the Holy Ghost, 247; a fanatical book republished by, 276; sites for its places of worship, 407.
- Frégier. II. A., on drunkenness in France, 415.
- French. See *France*.
- Friday, 513.
- Friendship, Lord Bacon on, 428.
- Fruit, sale of, on Sundays, 366.
- Fryth, John, his opinion about the Lord's Day, 287, 484.
- Fulgentius on original sin, 233.
- Fuller, Thomas, on King James's investigation of witchcraft, 65; on the Book of Sports, 144, 145, 146; on the introduction of the Puritan Sabbath, 304, 305; on recreation, 420, 422; on burnings for heresy, 446; character of, 146; referred to, 322.
- Furneaux, Dr Philip, referred to, 29.
- Future state not taught by Moses, 268, 548.
- GALATIANS, Paul's reproof of them for observing days, 58, 516.
- Galen, former defence to, 111.
- Galileo's recantation, 104, 391; repeal of the edicts against him, 104.
- Gall, Dr, referred to, 39.
- Galleries of art, 433.
- Gardens, Lord Bacon on, 432.
- Gathercole, Rev. Mr, his accusation of the Dissenters, 247.
- Gaubius, Dr, referred to, 276.
- Gaussen, Professor L., his extravagant assertion of the minute scientific accuracy of the Bible, 99; on its plenary inspiration, 100, 191.
- Geddes, Dr Alex., on the Hebrew cosmogony, 90; on the two copies of the Fourth Commandment, 98.
- General Assembly. See *Church of Scotland*.
- Geneva, Sabbath-observance in, 123.
- Gentiles not subject to law of Moses, 164 *et seq.*, 177, 222, 224, 324, 491-504, or, in particular, to the Fourth Commandment, 354, 357; did not observe the Sabbath in early ages of the Christian Church, 173, 511; doctrine of the Apostles to them about the Sabbath, 514; influence of the Jewish dispensation on the ancient Gentiles, 183.
- Gentilis, John Valentine, burning of, by Protestants, 466.
- Geology inconsistent with the Hebrew cosmogony, 76, 99, 101, 106, 263, 391, 394, 493, 548.
- George III., Sabbath-acts in reign of, 334; state of religion then, 336-9.

- Gerard, Dr Alex., on human nature, 39; referred to, 157.
- Germantown Manual Labour Academy, 422.
- Germany, effects of Judaical Christianity in, 174; Sabbath-observance in, 55; Sabbath-controversies, 503; German theology, 97, 160.
- Gesenius referred to, 96, 556.
- Gibbon, Edward, Bishop Watson's letters to, 61, 377.
- Giles, Rev. Dr, referred to, 94, 96.
- Gilfillan, Rev. Geo., on the approaching New Reformation, 261.
- Gillespie, Geo., on the Westminster Assembly, 141; opposed toleration, 151; on the authority of the Jewish law, 179; on the progressiveness of religious knowledge, 258.
- Gilly, Dr W. S., on the Sunday sports of the Vaudois, 286.
- Glasgow, drunkenness in, 215, 402, 557; immorality in, 216, 557; clergy of, 360; Rom. xiv. ignored by certain of them, 56, 57, 517; law of the kirk-session that the Sabbath should be observed from sunset to sunset, 308; this law altered, 309; efforts of the Presbytery for Sabbath-observance, 309; the gates closed on Sunday, 311; Sunday-omnibuses, 355; unpromising commencement of the agitation against Sunday-trains, 359; its progress and success, 360-1; servility to the clergy in, 386.
- Glasgow, Paisley, and Ayr Railway bill, 358.
- Glory of God, 342, 343, 348.
- God, erroneous and pernicious notions of his character, &c., 51, 54, 230 *et seq.*, 417, 424, 436, 446, 491; will not be served with a lie, 100; man said to be made in his image, 189; will of, considered as man's rule of conduct, 199, 200, 229; the human conscience his representative, 200, 204; source of willing obedience to his laws, 205, 206, 209, 274; glory of, 342, 343, 348; alleged doings of his "wonderworking hand" on behalf of Sabbatarianism, 358, 362, 364, 453; in what sense the clergy are his "ambassadors" and "messengers," 378, 380; continual working of, 75, 493; utterance of the name Jehovah unlawful among the Jews, 490, 544; the phrase "a jealous God," 491; his method of governing the world, 70, 73-76, 450-6; his laws bind only those on whom they have been im-
- posed, 164; the opponents of Sir Andrew Agnew are "God's enemies," 370, 461; "God's judgments" against Sabbath-breakers, &c., 57, 137, 293, 313, 357, 364, 378, 450, 560.
- Godwin, Wm., referred to, 387.
- Goldsmith, Oliver, on credulity, 69; on the pride of ignorant nations, 375; on freedom, 394.
- Gomarus on the Sabbath, 512.
- Good and evil qualities of actions, 190, Good Friday, 334. [191.
- Goodsir, Joseph Taylor, on the discrepancy between the Bible and dogmatic standards, 162; referred to, 115.
- Goodwin, Dr Thomas, his gloomy Puritanism, 237; on "breaking bread," 521.
- Gordon, Thomas, on persecution, 245; on the difference of men's minds, *ib.*; notice of, 246; referred to, 456, 471.
- Gospel, sufficiency of the, 499; each Gospel a sufficient rule of Christian duty, 197.
- Gouge, Dr, 155.
- Government, civil, natural foundations of, 198-9, 373; method of God's, 70, 73-76, 450-6.
- Grafton, Duke of, 338.
- Graham, Col., speech of, 400.
- , Rev. Wm., on truth, 262.
- Grandpierre, Dr, quoted, 368.
- Graves, Dr Richard, on the universal obligation of the Decalogue, 181; on its importance, 224; on the Mosaic laws for punishing rebellious children, 196, 499; garbling of a passage in Scripture by, 182, 491; referred to, 499.
- Gravesend, Sunday excursions to, 342.
- Gravitation, a teeming principle in natural philosophy, 471.
- Grecks, did they ever account the seventh day sacred? 511, 512.
- Green, Matthew, on religious freedom, 62, 395.
- Greg, W. R., on the low arts to which theologians are sometimes driven, 78; referred to, 94, 256.
- Gregory, James and David, 111.
- , Dr John, on the mutual influence of the mind and body, 73; on the blind deference formerly paid to the authority of Hippocrates, &c., 111; on the duty of preserving health, 275; on the drama, 427; referred to, 38, 429.
- Grey, Sir George, his speech on Sunday-trains, 405, 408.

- Griesbach referred to, 45, 157, 522.
- Griffith, Rev. John, his advocacy of Sunday-trains, 449.
- Grotius, against force in religion, 480; his notion as to the sacredness of the seventh day among the early Gentiles, and that the week is a monument of the Creation, 512.
- Grove, Henry, referred to, 276.
- Guthrie, Dr Thomas, on the sobriety of the Parisians, 215.
- HALDANE, Robert, on the Lord's Day, 330, 516.
- Hale, Sir Matthew, condemned old women as witches, 28; is the author of the maxim that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England, 477.
- Hales, John, of Eton, renounced Calvinism, 48; writings and character of, *ib.*, 49; on "necessary" articles of faith, 49; on usury, 180, 499; referred to, 470.
- Hall, Robert, on the works of John Howe, 374. [469.
- Hallam, Henry, referred to, 461, 467, "Hallow," meaning of the word, 544 *et seq.*, 561.
- Hamilton, Dr Richard Winter, on the Sabbath, 60, 506, 529, 535; his attack on Paley, 60; his assertion that the Fourth Commandment was binding on the Gentiles, 188; referred to, 563.
- , Sir William, on the low state of learning among the Scottish clergy, 301; referred to, 468.
- , Dr James, referred to, 557.
- Hampton Court Conference, 295; gardens on Sunday, 433.
- Hanserd Knollys Society, 468, 469.
- Happiness favourable to virtue, 72, 238, 369, 370, 448, 449, 554; its promotion the aim of ethics and politics, 348; Bentham's greatest-happiness principle, 201.
- Harcourt, Rev. W. Vernon, on the discordance between Scripture and science, 85.
- Hardwicke, Lord, a decision of, 478.
- Hare, Bishop, on the difficulties and discouragements which attend the study of the Scriptures, 257; referred to, 117, 380.
- Harmer, Thomas, referred to, 157.
- Harrington, Sir James, his answer to Charles I., 333.
- Hartley, W. J., legacy by, 478.
- Harvey, Dr, of Dublin, 417.
- Hävernicks, referred to, 96.
- Hawkesworth, Dr, referred to, 276.
- Health, its influence on temper, cheerfulness, and religious feeling, 71, 72, 274, 275; duty of preserving it, 210, 237, 267, 558. See *Physiology*.
- Heart, meant the understanding among the Jews, 551.
- Heat of the body, 416.
- Heathen worship, 515. See *Gentiles*.
- Heber, Bishop, on the general blindness to the wickedness of persecution in the abstract, 150; on the punishment of idolatry, 179; referred to, 29.
- Hebrew Scriptures. See *Bible, Old Testament, Pentateuch*.
- cosmogony. See *Cosmogony*.
- language, 96.
- literature, revival of, 173.
- poetry not to be literally interpreted, 437, 563.
- Hebrews, Epistle to the, 158, 506.
- Heidegger, J. H., asserts the stability of the earth as a scriptural doctrine, 63.
- Helps, Mr, on Sunday in Germany, 216; on playing at orthodoxy, 236; on the new Reformation, 262; referred to, 417.
- Henderson, Alex., 133, 137, 139.
- , Eagle, his advocacy of Sunday-trains, 402.
- Hengstenberg, Dr E. W., on the continued obligation of the Mosaic law, 496; on the Sabbath, 502, 503, 505, 508, 512, 516, 543, 558; Bunsen's opinion of his treatise thereon, 517; referred to, 489, 493, 529, 530, 531, 537, 542, 543, 544, 548, 556, 563.
- Henley, Anthony, his visit to Dr Goodwin, 237.
- Henry, Dr P., his Life of John Calvin quoted, 174.
- Henry IV. of France, his death thought a judgment of God, 456; a tolerant saying of his, 474.
- Henry VIII., burning of Papists and heretics by, 464.
- Heresy, 34, 151, 366, 378, 399, 400, 469; burning for, 464-466, 469; arrogance of accusations of, 473.
- Heriot, F. L. M., 362, 401.
- Hermas, referred to, 525.
- Herschel, Sir John, on the creation of new species, 74; on laws of nature, *ib.*; on the pleasure of reading, 425; referred to, 417, 425.
- Hesiod on the seventh day, 512.
- Hess's Life of Zwingle, referred to, 468.
- Hesse-Cassel, Sabbath-observance in, 121, 369.

- Heterodoxy. See *Heresy*.
- Hetherington, Dr W. M., on the Westminster Assembly, 134, 137, 141; on the magistrate's duty as to religion, 152, 343; on the Sabbath-doctrine of the Reformers, 290; his assertion that the Presbyterians never were intolerant, 315; on the Book of Sports, 142, 144, 146, 147, 148, 321; on the Sabbath-observance of the early Christians, 538.
- Heylin, Peter, on the Sabbath, 281, 282, 285, 286, 291, 293, 295-7, 302; referred to, 119, 217, 288, 507, 511, 512, 521, 531, 537, 542, 543, 563.
- Hickes, Dr George, his abuse of the Church of Scotland, 126; called Tilotson an atheist, 247.
- Hieroglyphics, 549.
- Higgins, Godfrey, on the Second Commandment, 490; on the Sabbath, 506, 533, 536, 541; referred to, 514, 563; Hughes's Letter to, 512.
- Highlands, memorials against Sunday-trains from the, 457.
- Hill, Frederic, referred to, 417.
- Hindoos uninfluenced by the argument from miracles, 185; supposed inquiry into the Sabbath by one, 533.
- Hinds, Bishop, referred to, 157.
- Hippocrates, blind deference to, 111.
- Hirscher, Dr J. B. Von, on external acts of religion, 447.
- History, party misrepresentations in, 146, 461; forgeries, 321.
- Hitchcock, Dr Edward, on the religion of geology, 77.
- Hoadly, Bishop, on Dr Samuel Clarke's manner of studying the Scriptures, 42; religious opinions of, 43, 44; his Dedication to Pope Clement XI. quoted, 53; on error in religion, 139; on the law of nature, 203; on pride, 380; on change of the meaning of words, 550; referred to, 109, 247, 377, 380, 468, 470.
- Hobbes on dogmatism, 375.
- Holden, Rev. Geo., on the Christian Sabbath, 491, 506, 528, 542, 544; on the Decalogue, 505; on Sunday-recreation, 554; referred to, 489, 501, 504, 508, 513, 520, 521, 548, 550, 563.
- Holiday, meaning of, 550.
- Holidays of Roman Church, 284; of Church of England, 302, 304, 332; in Scotland, 306; expediency of giving holidays to workmen, 270.
- Holland, Sabbath-observance in, 55, 301; controversies there, 56, 62, 503.
- Holy, meaning of the word, 434, 487, 544 *et seq.*, 561; holy convocation, 543, 544.
- Home, Henry. See *Kames*.
- , John, on an adventure at Blair-Athole, 359; his life quoted, 427.
- Homer on the seventh day, 512.
- Honesty, in relation to Sabbatarianism, 512; in controversy, 475. See *Frauds, pious*.
- Hooker, Richard, on the abolition of the Jewish law, 166; on the disputes between the Jews and Gentiles about the Mosaic law, 172; on the law of nature, 202, 264; on government, 373; on music, 429.
- Hooper, Bishop, on the Lord's Day, 288.
- Horace on the force of nature, 423.
- Horne, Bishop, on music, 429; on the Flood, 549.
- Horse, Sabbath-rest necessary to the, 269, 277, 402, 537.
- Horsley, Bishop, on Sir Isaac Newton's religious opinions, 44; on the Hebrew cosmogony, 79; on the high accomplishments of the apostles, 100; on positive and moral duties, 227, 228; on the Sabbath, 58, 120, 335, 482, 515, 545, 559; on the Mosaic law, 504; on fornication, 515.
- Howe, John, on the persecuting spirit, 254; on the passions, 374; Robert Hall on his works, 374; referred to, 470.
- Hübertz, Dr J. R., on the insanity of Calvinists, 418.
- Huet, Peter Daniel, no sectarian, 52.
- Hughes, T. S., on the Sabbath, 512.
- Huguenots were themselves persecutors, 466.
- Hull, Dr Robert, on Calvinism, 235.
- Human nature, alleged corruption of, 38, 453; study of, 73; importance of knowledge of, 206, 207, 414, 415; variety of men's minds, 244 *et seq.*; impulses and affections of, 373 *et seq.*
- Hume, David, Dr Campbell's letters to, 377.
- , Joseph, 433; his advocacy of Sunday-trains, 409.
- Humility recommended to the clergy, 382. See *Pride*.
- Huntingdon, Lady, influence of, 337.
- Hurd, Bishop, referred to, 90.
- Hurlbut, E. P., referred to, 343, 471.
- Hygiene, instruction in, 415. See *Health, Physiology*.
- Hypocrisy, conventional, 213, 214, 231, 234; temptation to, 396.
- Hysteria, 66, 72.

- IBBOT, Dr Benj., on religious opinions, 32; on the soundness of human reason, 40; referred to, 29, 40, 131, 468, 470.
 Ideler referred to, 512.
 Idiots, moral, 201.
 Idleness, natural fruits of, 72, 451, 548; "idleness" on the Sabbath said to be forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, 437, 544, 560.
 Idol-offerings, abstinence from, prescribed to Gentiles, 172, 515.
 Idolatry, punishment of, 179; and of seducers to, 224; often called fornication in the Old Testament, 515; Protestant idolatry, 385.
 Ierson, Henry, referred to, 260.
 Ignatius, Epistles of, 283, 525, 526.
 Ignorance, dogmatism of, 51, 52, 245, 366, 375; bad effects of, 240; not damnable when inevitable, 265; clerical influence over the ignorant, 457.
 Immorality on Sundays, 10, 216, 452, 557.
 Independence, spirit of, 61, 62, 375, 477; want of, 51, 107-113, 373, 383, 398, 399.
 Independent Whig, 246; quoted, 63.
 Independents not the first who understood religious liberty, 469; advocated toleration, 470.
 Indian week, 511.
 Indigestion, 274, 276.
 Industry, 72, 451.
 Infallible guides to truth, 107, 125, 131, 473; are unnecessary, 235.
 Infallibility denied by the Westminster Assembly, 138; Protestant, 376, 378, 381, 384, 398, 536; assumption of, 375, 475.
 Infants, alleged damnation of still-born, 233.
 Infidels. See *Deists*.
 Informers, common, 347.
 Inglis, Dr John, on Jewish law and example, in relation to Gentile Christians, 222.
 Inns, 331, 332, 333, 334.
 Inquisition, Protestant, 335.
 Insanity of supposed demoriacs, 66; religious, 71, 418, 474; fostered by gloomy views of God's character, 235, 417, 418; insane craving for spirituous liquor, 411, 414.
 Inspiration, doctrine of, 79, 84, 96, 99, 163, 191, 391.
 Intellect, its part in moral judgments, 200, 201.
 Intemperance. See *Drunkeness*.
 Interest. See *Usury*.
- Interludes formerly acted on Sundays, 293, 294, 295, 297.
 Internal evidence of revelation, 191.
 Interpolations in the Pentateuch, 44, 182.
 Interpretation of the Bible. See *Bible*.
 Intolerance of Protestants, 46, 178, 244, 378, 462; of the Presbyterians, 315, 339, 472; Sir H. Moncreiff's abhorrence of, 340.
 Ireland, treatment of the Catholics in, 178, 377, 461, 466; Church-article on the Sabbath, passed there in 1615, 296; Sunday in, 557; "Catching up" of Irish boys for the colonies, 467.
 Irenæus ascribed the Sabbath to Moses, 226.
 Israelites, power of their kings, 195; Sabbatarians call themselves "the true Israel," 170, 281. See *Jews*.
- JAMES, Rev. John Angell, on Sunday dinners, 561.
 James VI. of Scotland and I. of England, on witchcraft, 64-66; his Declaration for sports on Sundays, 142, 144, 146, 318, 369; his opinion of the utility of recreation for the people, 145; his carriages said to have been arrested by the Lord Mayor of London on a Sunday, 319, 330; Sabbath-observance in his reign, 295, 300; Act for Sabbath-observance, 307; burning of Papists, 464; burning of Legate by, 466; discussions on religious liberty in his reign, 469; his saying on the death of Henry IV. of France, 456; banquet to, 552.
 Jebb, Dr, on intolerants, 377.
 Jefferson, President, on the maxim that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England, 477; referred to, 480.
 Jeffrey, Lord, decisions by, 353, 479; on the character of Sir James Mackintosh, 375.
 Jehovah, utterance of the name unlawful among the Jews, 490; why it is called holy, 544.
 Jennings, Dr, on the Sabbath, 546.
 Jenyns, Soame, on inspiration, 191; on the internal evidences of Christianity, *ib.*
 Jerusalem, decree of, 172, 515, 527, 529; sieges of, 439; Christ's prophecy of the destruction of, 505; conjecture as to the origin of observance of the Lord's Day immediately after its destruction, 537.
 Jesuits, a trick of the, 211.

- Jesus generally thought to have abolished the Mosaic law, 184; spoke only to the Jews, 166, 328, 504, 509; obeyed the Mosaic law, 328; never enforced Sabbath-observance, 328; his declarations respecting it, 175, 497, 500; walked in the fields on the Sabbath, 229, 311, 341, 440, 488, 560; attended meetings in synagogues, 329, 488, 560; feasted with a Pharisee on the Sabbath, 439, 560; his resurrection, in relation to the Sabbath, 327, 330, 335, 487, 519, 524, 525, 526, 531, 532, 538; his after-appearances to the disciples, 519; did not enjoin the observance of the first day of the week, 326; why the people heard him gladly, 239; his saying that his Father continued to work, 493; healed on the Sabbath-day, 504; did he adopt the Sabbath into the new dispensation? 504 *et seq.* See *Christianity*.
- Jews, their festivals, 433, 516; theocracy, 179, 222, 450, 452, 454, 498, 553; kings, 195; polygamy, 192, 220, 535; why called a holy nation, 544; how they spent the Sabbath, 435, 436; persecution of, in modern times, 376; political disabilities, 462, 478; Are sacrifices still possible by them? 496. See *Judaism, Decalogue, Law of Moses, Sabbath, &c.*
- Jewish Christians observed the Mosaic Sabbath, 173, 279, 528; differently circumstanced from the Gentile converts, 501 *et seq.*; conjectured to have begun the observance of the Lord's Day, 537.
- Jobson *v.* Lambert, case of, 353-5.
- John, St, whether the author of the Apocalypse, 524.
- Johnson, Samuel, on the exception which some who proclaim human fallibility make of themselves, 154; on amusements, 428; on the necessity for stated times of worship, 278; his tour to the Hebrides, 449; referred to, 35, 374.
- Johnston, J. F. W., on religious liberty in America, 472.
- Jones, Sir William, on the figurative style of Moses, 92; probably a Unitarian, 93.
- , Rev. William, of Nayland, on cheerful religion, 556.
- Jordan, Rev. John, quoted, 367, 482, 512, 513, 514.
- Jorgenson, Mr, on neglect of the Sabbath in France, 277.
- Jortin, Dr John, on the duty of judging candidly and charitably of others and of human nature, 38; on ecclesiastical councils, 137; on the Jewish Christians, 167; on natural religion, 211; on revelation, 211; on positive and moral laws, 218; on unity in religion, 245; on the High Church clergy of Queen Anne's time, 248; on subscription of articles, 252; said to have been a Unitarian, 252; on ignorant fanaticism, 341; on persecution of the Jews, 376; on prejudice, 338; on the controversy at Antioch, 516; on the Sabbath, 543; referred to, 166, 285, 471.
- Josephus, referred to, 89; on the Sabbath, 511, 543.
- Judaism, effects of, on the Gentiles, 183; proselytes to, 187; of the Puritans, 146, 173; of Sabbatarians, 286, 297, 303, 335, 502. See *Jews, Law of Moses*.
- Judging our neighbours, 455, 518.
- Judgment, private, right and duty of, 3, 5, 384, 385.
- "Judgments of God" against sinners, 67, 137, 293, 313, 357, 364, 450.
- Justice, sentiment of, 201, 224; Solomon on, 451.
- Justin Martyr ascribed the Sabbath to Moses, 226, 280; on the Lord's Day, 282; referred to, 525, 526.
- Juvenal referred to, 512.
- KAMES, Lord, on the variety of men's minds, 247; on opposite principles of human nature, 373; referred to, 200, 429.
- Kant on social amusements, 369.
- Keimer, Judaical notions of, 175.
- Kennet, Bishop, his History of England referred to, 146, 148, 320.
- Kennicott, Dr, labours of, 156.
- Kenrick, John, on Hebrew primeval history, 87; on translations of the Bible, 156.
- Kilns on Sunday, 339.
- Kindliness. See *Benevolence*.
- King, Archbishop, referred to, 549.
- , Dr David, on the introduction of new species, 75; on geology in relation to Scripture, 106; on the Sabbath, 557; referred to, 77.
- , Lord, his Life of Locke referred to, 423, 468, 552.
- Kings, divine right of, 127, 195.
- Kirk-sessions in Scotland, their efforts to promote Sabbath-observance, 307 *et seq.*
- Kirkton, James, on the state of reli-

- gion and morals in Scotland in the year 1660, 441.
- Kitto, Dr, on the number seven, 512; his *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* quoted, 188, 513, and referred to, 67, 76, 90, 94, 95, 96, 157, 166, 220, 281, 283, 508, 514, 515, 517, 521, 524, 531, 543.
- Knight's History of England quoted, 336, 337; referred to, 468.
- Knoek, Sabbatarian petition from the parish of, 458.
- Knowledge, natural, importance of, to religion, 205 *et seq.*, 558, note †; influence of its diffusion upon the clergy, 393; not hostile to religion, 425; duty of diffusing, 474; imperfection of religious knowledge, 259. See *Ignorance*.
- Knox, John, no Sabbatarian, 123, 292, 484; his preference for the Old Testament, 173; advocated the capital punishment of Roman Catholics, 176; his Confession of Faith, 123, 256, 257; suppressed all holidays but Sunday, 306.
- , Dr Vicesimus, on Sunday-recreation, 121; referred to, 128.
- LABOUCHERE, Right Hon. Henry, on Sunday-trains, 404, 408, 409.
- Labour, more done in a week with Sabbath-rest than without it, 277.
- Labourers, holidays to, 270; the Sabbath meant for the refreshment of, 218, 225, 226, 371, 503, 553.
- Laity, religious rights of the, 116, 117; their servility to the clergy, 373; their comparative authority in theology, 389; their duty with respect to religion, 392, 396.
- Lambert, General, his preaching at Edinburgh, 443.
- Lancashire, Sunday in, 142, 295, 319; over-labour in machine-works in, 272.
- Language, interpretation of, 104, 552; ambiguous, 227, 544, 552.
- Lardner, Dr Nathaniel, his Unitarian opinions, 47; on the Apocalypse, 524; referred to, 188, 281, 539, 549.
- Laud, Archbishop, 143, 153, 297, 321, 465.
- Laws bind only those on whom they are imposed, 164; natural origin of civil laws, 198; source of willing obedience to, 205, 206, 209, 274; moral and positive laws, 217, 218, 329, 504, 516. See *Acts, Legislation*.
- Laws of nature, 74, 239, 450 *et seq.*, 558. See next article.
- Law of nature, 198, 218, 222, 223, 224, 227, 263, 267, 455, 486, 489, 501. See last article.
- Law of Moses, a republication of the law of nature, 204; given only to the Israelites, 166; adapted to their habits and circumstances, 176; whether, and how far, abrogated, 166, 184, 221, 224, 323, 327, 494 *et seq.*; never bound the Gentiles, 164 *et seq.*, 177, 222, 224, 324, 357, 494-504; how far useful to them, 196, 222, 224; excellent moral precepts in, 196; was obeyed by Jesus, 166, 329, and by Paul, 529; whether intended by Moses to be publicly read on the Sabbath, 543; doctrine of the Churches of England and Scotland respecting it, 494; Luther's doctrine, 502. See *Judaism, Pentateuch*.
- Law, Dr Edmund, bishop of Carlisle, Paley's dedication to, 67; on proselytes to Judaism, 188; on the aid given by science to religion, 206; on differences of opinion, 245; on the observance of the Sabbath by the early Gentiles, 511; referred to, 188, 258, 471, 549.
- Law's Memorials referred to, 444.
- Lawson, John Parker, on the tyranny of the Scotch Presbyterians, 314.
- Laycock, Thomas, M.D., on hysteria, 72; referred to, 66.
- Layman, A, on the Crystal Palace, 240; on the Sabbath, 168, 281, 283, 490, 517, 519, 520 *et seq.*
- Leader, the, quoted, 105.
- Le Clerc on the additions to the Pentateuch, 182; his satirical advice to ecclesiastical historians, 461; on the Sabbath, 542; referred to, 266.
- Lee, Dr John, Principal of Edinburgh University, on the Bible as the only sure basis of moral rules, 210, 211; on Sunday tasks, 276; on Sabbath-observance in Scotland, 298, 306, 440; on the liberty given to servants to walk on Sundays, 345; on the need of Sabbath-legislation, 350; refutation of his statement that the time of the Covenanters was one of great religious light and purity of morals, 440.
- , Dr Robert, referred to, 468, 470.
- Legacies for religious purposes, 478, 479.
- Legate, Bartholomew, burning of, 466.
- Legislators, ancient, established festivals, 225, 226, 345; claimed divine authority, 345.

- Legislation, an error in, 213; its province in regard to religion, 29, 151, 152, 343; in regard to the Lord's Day, 342, 343, 347, 348, 557; grounds of legislation for Sunday-trains, 404. See *Acts, Laws*.
- Leith, Sabbatarian memorial from ship-masters, &c. in, 495.
- Leo I., ordinance of, 282, 285.
- Levites, 175. [266.]
- Lewger, Chillingworth's Letter to, Lewis, G. Cornwall, referred to, 107, 114, 125, 254, 379, 468.
- Liberty, religious, principles of, 2 *et seq.*, 32, 36, 398; right to act according to one's belief, 26; controversies about, 28; Sir H. Moncreiff a champion of, 340; in the United States, 394; true spirit of, 462; slow progress of its principles, 467; history of, 467 *et seq.*; liberty of publication of opinions, 474. See *Protestantism*.
- Lies, God will not be served with, 100. See *Frauds, pious*.
- Light, creation of, 78, 106, 548.
- Lightfoot, John, 135; extracts from his Journal of the Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, 135, 521; on the Sabbath, 436.
- Limborch referred to, 482, 484.
- Lindsey, Theophilus, referred to, 38, 46, 47; quoted, 44.
- Linus on the seventh day, 512.
- Liturgy, English, authority of, 109; in relation to the Sabbath, 289 *et seq.*; revival of, 338, 391.
- Lochcarron, a Sabbatarian petition from, 458.
- Locke, John, on religious liberty, 15, 29, 343, 470; on truth, 32; on the alleged corruption of human nature, 39; against blind submission to authority in matters of faith, 129-31; on Confessions of Faith, 141; his improved mode of exegesis, 159, 160, 552; on the division of Scripture into verses, 162; on the variety of men's minds, 244; his Unitarianism, 117; on the duty of the magistrate as to religion, 343; on recreation, 422, 423; on fundamental truths, 471; on prejudice, 387; on the dogmatism of churches, 398; his use of the word "solemnity," 552; referred to, 38, 131, 165, 247, 266, 474, 485; Lord King's Life of him referred to, 468.
- , Joseph, his bill to compel railway companies to carry passengers on Sundays, 390, 404, 408, 483.
- London, Sunday plays in, 293, 294; accident at Paris Garden, 293; James I.'s carriages said to have been arrested on a Sunday by the Lord Mayor, 319, 320; Sabbath-observance in, 331, 334; selling of fish on Sundays, 334; Great Fire of, 456; Bishop of, quoted, 347.
- London Lord's Day Society quoted, 364.
- Longevity promoted by Sabbath-observance, 269. See *Health*.
- "Lord of the Sabbath," misuse of the phrase, 160, 247, 323, 483.
- Lord's Day, why so called? 330, 514, 525; figuratively called the Christian Sabbath, 281; whether the Fourth Commandment applies to it, 284, 323, 327, 363, 487, 493, 500 *et seq.*; needs no such Jewish prop, 212; origin of its observance, 173, 280, 282, 335, 536 *et seq.*; not confounded with the Sabbath during the first two centuries, 526; alleged transference of the Sabbath to, 12, 163, 221, 281, 333, 485, 518, 530, 533; was it observed by the apostles? 59, 221, 329, 514, 532; if Jesus had intended it to be observed, he would have given a fit injunction, 326, 507; its joyful character, 55, 120, 336, 554, 563; church-authority as a ground for its observance, 120, 333; reasons for now adhering to it, 268; Horsley on the mode of its observance, 120; children's tasks on, 276; its use to working men, 371, 503; its observance in England, 369, 371, 428, 517, 558; in Scotland, 216, 275, 334, 337, 353, 362, 440, 517, 557; in Ireland, 557; in Germany, 55, 121, 216, 369; in Holland, 55, 62, 216, 301; in France, 215, 277, 338, 558; when first called the Sabbath-day in Scotland, 306. See *Apostles, Fourth Commandment, Jesus, Recreation, Railway Trains, Sabbath*.
- Lord's Supper, 521.
- Lorimer, Dr J. G., on religious liberty, 26, 32; on the Sabbath in Holland, 56, 62, 503; ignores Rom. xiv., 56; calls the Sabbatarians "the true Israel," 170; his reply to the objection that Sabbath-observance is not a moral duty, 220; on the doctrine of the English Church about the Sabbath, 290; his complaint of relaxed views about the Sabbath, 390; charitable concession by, 390; on cooking upon the Sab-

- bath, 440, 561; on God's judgments against the Stewarts, 453, 556; on the almsgiving at Corinth, 523; on the change of the Sabbath-day, 530, 534; on the necessity of the Fourth Commandment to Sabbatarianism, 537; on the festive character of the Sabbath, 550, 556; referred to, 301, 508, 548.
- Louisiana, religious liberty in, 471.
- Lucian, referred to, 511, 512.
- Luke, St, a peculiarity of his manner as a historian, 522.
- Luther, his hostility to the Copernican system, 63; on the Sabbath, 121, 257, 285, 484, 503; on theatrical representations, 122; extract from letter prefixed to translation of his Table-Talk, 256; left much of the work of reformation undone, 260; on music, 429; Blackwood's Magazine on, 468; on the Mosaic law, 502; on the Apocalypse, 524.
- Lyell, Sir Charles, on the repeal of the edicts against Galileo, 104; his remark that great calamities are regarded as "judgments," 313; on the disingenuousness of the learned clergy, 391, 394; on imperfect religious liberty in America, 394.
- MACAULAY, Rt. Hon. T.B., on the reaction in England against Puritanism, 448; his character of the Puritans, 562; referred to, 468.
- M'Crie, Dr Thomas, on the Book of Sports, 148; on the state of learning in Scotland at the close of the 16th century, 301; on the state of religion there about 1650, 445; referred to, 178, 379, 468, 469, 551.
- , Dr Thomas, secundus, on a "national tribute to the Lord of the Sabbath," 160; on Sir Andrew Agnew and his opinions, 170, 356, 357; on the positive character of Sabbath-duties, 217; on the Scottish clergy in the end of the 16th century, 300; on legislation for Sabbath-observance, 348, 352; an ungallant observation of, 361; on the Jewish mode of spending the Sabbath, 436; his attempt to lessen the authority of John Nicoll, 444; on the Sabbatarian memorials, 461; referred to, 468.
- Macfarlan, Rev. Duncan, on searchers for Sabbath-breakers, 312; on the Sabbath, 505; ignores Rom. xiv., 517; on the study of the laws of nature on Sunday, 558; referred to, 513, 557, 558.
- Macfarlane, Dr P., claims the superintendence of national religious education for "the churches who hold God's truth," 153.
- Mackerel, selling of, 334.
- Mackenzie, Henry, on the drama, 427.
- Mackintosh, Sir James, on the law of nature, 263; his freedom from dogmatism, 375; on the Independents, 470.
- Macknight, Dr, quoted, 523.
- Maclaren, Charles, referred to, 79.
- M'Neil, Alexander, 461.
- M'Owen, Rev. Peter, on Sunday feasting, 561.
- Maddery, Sabbath-desecration at, 309.
- Magistrate. See *Legislation, Government, King*.
- Mahometans entitled to circulate the Koran, 476.
- Mahon, Lord, referred to, 426.
- Mails, carriage of, on Sundays, 406.
- Malevolent feelings are excited by uneasiness, 72, 275-6.
- Man, the saying that the Sabbath was made for, 508. See *Human nature*.
- Manchester Sanitary Association, 272.
- Manes, heresy of, 420; his followers the first who observed the Lord's day sadly, 563.
- Mann, Horace, on the value of physiological knowledge, 274.
- Manna, the Sabbath given at raining of, 487, 540.
- Manual Labour Academies, 422.
- Mapei, Signor, on the creation of the sun, 105.
- Marchand, Dr Emile, on sobriety in warm countries, 416.
- Marjoribanks, Mr, referred to, 417.
- Markets on Sunday, 342; on Monday, 316.
- Marriage, right of parents in regard to that of their children, 177; with a deceased wife's sister, 190 *et seq.*, 211; scriptural law of, 220.
- Marsh, Bishop, on additions to the Pentateuch, 94, 183; referred to, 45, 90, 157.
- Marshall, Andrew, on the obligation of the Mosaic law, 223.
- Martial referred to, 512.
- Martineau, James, referred to, 34, 107, 366, 468, 469.
- , Miss, referred to, 276.
- Martyrs, Book of, 464.
- Mary, Queen of England, her persecution of the Protestants, 465.
- Massachusetts, the Sabbath observed from sunset to sunset in, 309; clergy, 393; physiological instruction, 415;

- religious liberty, 469, 471; law for punishment of rebellious children, 499; laws of, 561.
- Masters and servants, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 495, 558.
- Maurice, Prof. Frederick Denison, on the Sabbath, 548.
- May-games on Sunday, 309.
- Maynooth, College of, 153. [258.]
- Meadley's Memoirs of Paley referred to, Mede, Joseph, his tolerant spirit, 254.
- Medicine, blind deference formerly paid to Hippocrates in, 111.
- Melancholy, a cause of intemperance, 417; Luther's cured by music, 429; religious, 71, 237.
- Melancthon on the Lord's Day, 287, 484; approved of the burning of Servetus for heresy, 466; on the Mosaic law, 496.
- Melchisedeck, 175.
- Melito, Bishop of Sardis, his letter to Onesimus, 500.
- Melmoth on diversity of opinions, 245.
- Melrose, state of morals at, 200 years ago, 444.
- Melville, Andrew, 501.
- , James, fond of music, 300.
- Memorials of Sabbatarians against Sunday-trains, 13, 58, 360, 361, 404, 408, 457.
- Memory, pleasures of, 449.
- Mengzies, Thomas, an independent Aberdonian, 313.
- Mercy, works of, 4, 5, 504, 558; better than sacrifice, 504.
- Merton, parish of, 441.
- Mesmerism, 66.
- Michaelis, John David, Prof. of Philosophy at Göttingen, on the laws of Moses, 176; on usury, 180; on the Mosaic law as binding only on the Israelites, 188; on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 193; on the divine right of kings, 195; on an error in legislation, 213; on the connection and limits of ethics and politics, 348; on the Sabbath, 435, 439; on festivals, 437; on the equal rights of true and false religions, 476; on the Apocalypse, 524; referred to, 45, 156, 157, 166, 456, 490, 511, 517, 543, 550, 557, 563.
- Middleton, Dr Conyers, on the allegorical interpretation of Gen. i. and ii., 89, 95.
- Milk, selling of, on Sunday, 310, 331, 332, 333, 366.
- Mill, John Stuart, upon Bentham's greatest-happiness principle, 201.
- , Dr, of Cambridge, 193.
- Mills on Sunday, 339.
- Miller, Hugh, referred to, 493.
- Milman, Dean, on the Jewish Sabbath, 436, 543.
- Milner, Dr, on the burning of Catholics in Q. Elizabeth's reign, 465.
- Milton, John, religious opinions of, 36, 479; on religious liberty, 36-37, 155; would not subscribe slave in taking orders, 116; on the Westminster Assembly, 134, 155; on Selden, 135; on the abolition of the Jewish law, 166; rejects its authority, but departs in practice from his principle, 180; on usury, 180; on the Gospel as the law of God to us, 197, 499; on imaginary sins, 213; ceased to attend public worship, 230; on the beneficial effects of differences of opinion, 251; on the progressiveness of religious knowledge, 259; on the Sabbath, 121, 170, 484, 491, 526, 542; on Protestant intolerance, 378; on servility to the clergy, 398; on the delights of philosophy, 425; on music, 429; on the Decalogue, 493; on Christ's appearances after the resurrection, 520; new edition of his Prose Works, 520; on the meeting at Troas, 521; on the laying by of alms at Corinth, 522; referred to, 266, 470, 476, 517.
- Mind influenced by bodily states, 71-73, 274, 275; its dependence on the brain, 207; needs recreation, 422, 423, 439; diversity of minds, 244.
- Ministers. See *Clergy*.
- Miracles, argument from, 185, 191.
- Mirth a feature of the Jewish festivals, 433 *et seq.*; particularly the Sabbath, 561; increases benevolence, 449.
- Misery favourable to vice, 276, 448. See *Melancholy*.
- Missiary operations, 476.
- "Modern Sabbath Examined, The," 280, 530; referred to, 529, 530.
- Moncreiff, Sir Henry, character of, 340.
- Monday, 513; Blue, 438.
- Montaigne on the good effects of discussion, 253.
- Montesquieu on religious laws, 214.
- Montgomery, Rev. John, on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 192, 220; on the authority of the Jewish law, 225; on polygamy, 535.
- Month, origin of the, 513.
- Moon, its phases the probable origin of the week, 513.

- Moore, Dr, referred to, 73.
 Moral, ambiguity of the word, 227.
 Moral law, 197 *et seq.*, 218, 222, 223, 224, 227, 267, 481, 486, 489, 490; moral and positive duties, 169, 218, 227, 329, 504, 516; Sabbath-observance not a moral duty, 217, 490.
 Moral sentiments, 40, 198 *et seq.*; three in number, 201; deficient in some, 201.
 Morality, foundations of, 196; its alleged connection with Sabbath-observance, 212; state of morals under the Covenanters, 440 *et seq.*
 More, Hannah, 337.
 —, Sir Thomas, on religious liberty, 249; referred to, 469.
 Mosaic Law. See *Law of Moses*.
 "Mosaic Sabbath, The," quoted, 168; referred to, 490, 517.
 Moses, his alleged profound knowledge of geology, 101; held by the Fathers to be the author of the Sabbath, 226; does not teach the existence of a future state, 268, 548; not an ascetic, 433. See *Law of Moses, Pentateuch*.
 Mosheim on the Judaizing Christians, 279; referred to, 468.
 Motion considered as the effect of divine energy, 76.
 Muir, Dr William, on vain and idle recreation, 216, 421.
 Murder, capital punishment of, 189; forbidden by the law of nature, 223.
 Murray, Lord George, adventure of, at the Bridge of Bruar, 359.
 Museums, 433.
 Music, 55, 216, 300, 309, 336, 351, 429, 436, 555, 556, 563.
 Myth, 90.
 NADAB and Abihur, 452.
 National judgments, 454. See *Judgments*.
 National Covenant of Scotland quoted, 151.
 Nations, differences of religions of, 53; ignorant, have most pride, 375.
 Natural history, study of, 424.
 Natural religion, importance of, 202-211; preferable to atheism, 480; is a test of all religions professing to be revealed, 204, 263, 480; bequest for essay on, 478.
 Natural sounds and scenery, 430, 431, 432.
 Nature asserts her rights, 423, 558.
 Nazarenes, 279-80.
 Neal's History of the Puritans quoted, 140, 148, 331; referred to, 149, 152, 466.
 Neander, Dr Augustus, on the injunction of Paul to the Corinthians about alms, 523; on the observance of Sunday, 538; referred to, 280, 281, 511, 517, 563.
 Necessity, works of, 4, 5, 124, 363, 504.
 Nehemiah's care for Sabbath-observance, 188, 487; festival in his time, 434.
 Nervous diseases, 70; of women, 66, 72.
 Netherlands, religious persecutions in, 466.
 New England. See Massachusetts, United States.
 "New England Puritan," quoted, 223.
 New Monthly Magazine, referred to, 345, 417.
 New moons, 516, 560.
 New Testament, the law for Christians, 197. See *Christianity*.
 Newcome, Archbishop, referred to, 157.
 Newhaven Medical Association, resolutions of, 277.
 Newman, Francis W., referred to, 492.
 Newnham, Mr. referred to, 73.
 Newspapers, Scotch, generally advocate Sunday-trains, 403, 410.
 Newton, Bishop, on the moral nature of man, 204; a disbeliever in eternal punishment, 234; on spiritual pride, 366; on self-respect, 374; on the use of the passions, 374; on the drama, 427; on the Mosaic cosmogony, 548.
 —, Sir Isaac, became a Unitarian, 43, 479; his work on Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture, 44, 46; his timidity, 46; opposition to his philisophy, 110; how Dr Clarke introduced it at Cambridge, *ib.*; on the importance of natural to moral philosophy, 207; a disbeliever in eternal torments, 233; his discovery of gravitation, 471; referred to, 76.
 —, Rev. John, 70, 337.
 Niene council, 137.
 Nicholson, Dr John, on German theology, 96.
 Nicoll, John, his diary quoted, 442.
 Niebuhr, B. G., on change of opinion, 35; referred to, 40.
 Niemyer, Dr H. A., referred to, 124.
 Night-work, 271-2.
 Noah, history of, 189; his Flood, 549.
 Nonconformists. See *Dissenters*.
 "Nonconformist, The," on the rights of Atheists, 377.
 North British Railway, Sunday-trains on, 402.
 North British Review, on the Sabbath, quoted, 539, 548, 553; referred to, 513.

- Nuisance, law of, in relation to Sabbath-observance, 351.
- OATHS, lawfulness of, 180.
- Oban, Sabbatarian petition from, 458.
- Obedience, disposition to, 373; source of willing obedience to God's laws, 205, 206, 209, 274; passive, of subjects, 127, 195.
- Obligation, moral, 199. See *Duty*.
- Ocean, sound of the, 430-31.
- Offence to "weak brethren," 351.
- Old Testament, preference of the Calvinists for, 173; how far Christians are concerned to maintain its authority, 189-191; misuse of the, 214; was only an object of curiosity to the primitive Gentile Christians, 499; why preferred by the Puritans, 562. See *Bible*, *Pentateuch*.
- Oliver, Alex., on the Sabbath, 60, 267, 506, 507, 508, 512, 528; referred to, 277, 504, 513, 520, 539.
- Omnibuses in Glasgow on Sundays, 355.
- Onesimus, his letter to Melito, 500.
- Opinion, 31; change of, 34-51, 248; unity of, impossible, 242 *et seq.*; is but knowledge in the making, 251; variety of, not prevented by subscription of articles, 259; duty of acting according to, 473; influence of public, 347.
- Oppression, how to be diminished, 350. See *Intolerance*.
- Oratory, general love of, 427.
- Organ, the, 430.
- Oriental style of teaching, 89, 492, 549.
- Oriental nations worshipped the planets, 514; hence, probably, the sacredness of the number seven in the East, 514.
- Origen referred to, 89, 91.
- Original sin, 36, 33, 233.
- Orme, William, on Baxter's treatise on the Lord's Day, 121, 328; on the state of morals in Scotland two hundred years ago, 444; on the Brownists, 469; referred to, 35, 45, 55, 67, 325, 468.
- Orthodoxy, 113, 115, 399, 400, 473; standards of, 33, 379; playing at, 236.
- Osorius against persecution of the Jews, 376.
- Ostervald, J. F., on the alleged corruption of human nature, 39; on the servility of commentators, 112; on books of divinity, *ib.*; on the interpretation of Scripture, 158; on the misapplication of Scripture texts addressed to Jews, 165, 328; referred to, 502, 504.
- Ovid, cosmogony of, 101-2; referred to, 511.
- Owen, Dr John, on the Unitarians, 48; on a case of change of opinion, 50; on the Sabbath, 55, 330, 490, 505, 506, 511; on the purification of England from episcopacy and monarchy, 128; improved manner of interpreting the Bible introduced by, 158; on the progressiveness of religious knowledge, 259; his account of the Sabbath controversies in the 17th century, 322; on magisterial dictates in religion, 326; on results as an index of soundness of principles, 446; on religious liberty, 469; referred to, 29, 379; Orme's *Life of*, quoted and referred to, 55, 325, 444, 468.
- Oxford Tracts, 381.
- PAINE, Thomas, on the Fourth Commandment, 98.
- Paley, Dr, on universal redemption, 54; on the Sabbath, 60, 168, 484, 516, 518, 520; on rational religion, 67; on the Old Testament, 190; on the foundations of moral obligation, 199, 200; on the beneficial effects of differences of opinion, 251; on subscription of articles, 252; on pious frauds, 341; his impartiality, 377; fond of the theatre, 427; Dr R. W. Hamilton's attack on, 60; referred to, 119, 468, 471, 514, 521, 525, 557; his *Memoirs* referred to, 258.
- Papias referred to, 525.
- Papists. See *Roman Catholics*.
- Parables, 89, 90, 492, 549.
- Parents, Jewish law for respect to, 174, 196, 223, 499, 505; their right as to marriage of their children, 177.
- Paris, sobriety in, 215, 415; Sunday in, 388.
- Paris Garden, London, accident on a Sunday in, 293.
- Parker, Theodore, on the Hebrew cosmogony, 77; referred to, 500.
- Parkhurst on the meaning of the word translated *holy*, 550.
- Parliament. See *Acts*, *Agnew*, *Legislation*.
- Parr, Dr Samuel, his character of Horsley, 121, and of Taylor, 127; a disbeliever in eternal punishment, 234; on the impossibility of uniformity of opinion, 249; on keeping company with dissenters, 377; on

- the word toleration, 473; referred to, 29; his Life referred to, 48, 423.
- Party-opinions, 130; party-ties of the clergy, 388; party-spirit of ecclesiastical historians, 461.
- Pascal on doubt and submission, 52; on truth and error, 61; on the decree against Galileo, 104; on a trick of the Jesuits, 211.
- Passions, 423; use of the, 374.
- Passover, 433.
- Paterson, trial of, for blasphemy, 250.
- Paul, on the observance of days, 56, 61, 172, 288, 291 n., 326, 330, 514 *et seq.*, 439, 530-2; continued to the end to obey the Mosaic law, 167; observed the Jewish Sabbath, 527-9; before Festus, 224; at Troas, 329, 488, 521, 560, 561; travelled on a Sunday, 59, 522; his speech at Athens, 344; laboured with his hands, 422; appealed to "wise men," 535; on faith, 161.
- Pearson, Bishop, referred to, 563.
- Peel, Sir Robert, on Sabbath-legislation, 347.
- Peevishness an effect of disease, 275; and of unhappiness, 276, 448.
- Pennsylvania, imperfect religious freedom in, 394.
- Penny Cyclopædia quoted, 334; referred to, 90, 468, 514.
- Pentateuch, post-Mosaic additions to, 94, 182, 493, 543; language of, 96. See *Bible, Law of Moses, Moses*.
- Pentecost, meeting of the Apostles on the day of, 521.
- Percival, Dr. Paley's letter to, 252.
- Persecution, 150; argument against, 242; modern forms of, 243, 257; T. Gordon on, 245, 246; spirit of, 254; by so-called Protestants, 376, 378, 394, 462; of the Jews by Christians, 376. See *Intolerance*.
- Persians worshipped the Sun, 539.
- Persius referred to, 512.
- Perth, great inundation at, 314; spiritual despotism at, 316; punishment for Sabbath-desecration, 317; state of morals 200 years ago, 444.
- Petitions, sabbatarian, 457.
- Phædrus on recreation, 421.
- Pharisees walked in the fields on the Sabbath, 229, 311, 440; feasted on that day, 439, 561; their scrupulosity as to its observance, 504, 554; modern, 153, 243, 364, 365, 389, 455.
- Philagatharches referred to, 473.
- Phillips *v.* Innes, case of, 353.
- Phillipotts, Bishop, on marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 193.
- Philo on the Fourth Commandment, 186; on the Sabbath, 511, 543; referred to, 89, 91, 493.
- Philosophy, study of, 425.
- "Philosophy of Evil, The," referred to, 563.
- Philostratus referred to, 511.
- Phrenological Journal quoted, 411; referred to, 66, 72, 73, 185, 250, 375, 416, 422, 444.
- Phrenology, 39; moral sentiments according to, 201.
- Physical training, 422.
- Physicians, their former blind deference to Hippocrates, 111; labour on the Sabbath, 269.
- Physiology, use of knowledge of, 72, 73; its importance a means of human improvement, 207, 240, 273; ought to be taught to all, 272, 415; in relation to the Sabbath, 268, 438.
- Pinel on religious insanity, 418.
- Pitcairn's "Criminal Trials" referred to, 444.
- Pittenweem, Sabbath-desecration at, 309.
- Planets of the ancient astronomers, 513; worshipped in the East, 514.
- Plato on festivals, 225; his saying that the happiest men are the best, 369.
- Playfair, John, on the opposition to Newton's philosophy, 110; on Calvin's defence of usury, 180; anecdote of, 557.
- Plays. See *Drama*.
- Pleasures, whether forbidden on the Sabbath, 437, 555. See *Happiness*.
- Pliny's epistle to Trajan, 537, 539.
- Plitt, Rev. Theodore, quoted, 368, 369.
- Plumptre, Mr., on Sabbath-legislation, 349, 357.
- Plutarch on superstition, 55.
- Poland, catechism of the Unitarian churches of, 162.
- Police regulations for observance of Sunday, 351.
- Politics, limits of, 348. See *Government, Legislature*.
- Polycarp referred to, 525.
- Polygamy, 176, 177, 193, 220, 535.
- Pomfret quoted, 128.
- Poor, alms at Corinth for, 522.
- Pope, Alexander, his universal prayer quoted, 51; on the enjoyment of God's bounties, 236; on reason and passion, 374; on pride, 375; on the laws of nature, 456.
- Popery. See *Infallibility, Romanism*.
- Popham, Judge, his opposition to Sabbatarianism, 305.

- Porson, Richard, referred to, 45.
- Porteus, Bishop, his exertions to promote Sabbath-observance, 336.
- Positive duties, 169, 218, 516 : Sabbath-observance one, 217, 490 ; subordinate to moral, 218, 329, 504.
- Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, a common fallacy, 10, 346, 347.
- Post-office, Sunday-labour in the, 366, 406, 458.
- Powell, Rev. Baden, on the Hebrew cosmogony, 79 ; on credulity in theology, 104 ; on the inconsistency of Protestants, 115 ; on their errors as to the Bible, 163 ; on diversity of opinion, 255 ; criticised in the Presbyterian Review, 492 : referred to, 34, 76, 393, 471.
- Power, love of, 373 *et seq.*
- Powys, the Hon. Lyttelton, on legislation for religion, 343.
- Practice should accord with principles, 3, 27, 161, 473 ; Protestant principle and Protestant practice, 462.
- Predestination, 233.
- Preferment, expectation of, 387.
- Prejudice, 107, 130, 131, 158, 380, 387, 388, 535.
- Presbyterians, intolerance of, 46, 149, 150, 151, 259, 315, 339, 470 ; accused of impiety by English Churchmen, 381.
- Presbyterian Review on the positive character of the Sabbath-law, 490 ; on the Sabbath, 535 ; referred to, 551.
- Press, influence of the, 477 ; freedom of the, 474.
- Price, Dr Richard, his Unitarian opinions, 48, 479.
- Price's Patent Candle Company, holidays given to their work-people, 270.
- Pride, 375 ; spiritual, 326, 365, 366, 373, 376, 382, 473.
- Prideaux, John, bishop of Worcester, on the Sabbath, 507.
- , Humphrey, dean of Norwich, on Ezra, 96 ; on natural religion as the test of revelation, 204 ; referred to, 480, 543.
- Priesthood, natural kind of, 117 ; proverbial arrogance of the, 376. See *Clergy*.
- Priestley, Dr Joseph, on the imperfections of the Reformation, 260 ; on the perpetuity of the Jewish ritual, 495-6 ; referred to, 38, 266, 479.
- Prodigies, 67, 443, 456.
- Profaneness, laws against, 339. [542.
- Profanation of the Sabbath, what, 488, Profligacy on Sundays, 10, 216, 452, 557.
- Prophecy, in relation to the Christian Sabbath, 290, 488, 507, 508, 560.
- Prophets, poetical style of their writings, 437, 563 ; false prophets, 345.
- Proselytes to Judaism, 187, 511 ; equal rights of all sects to make, 476.
- Prospective Review referred to, 77.
- Prosperity, sources of, 451.
- Protection, alleged need of, in regard to Sabbath-observance, 349 *et seq.*
- Protestant inconsistencies, 49, 108, 115, 161, 243, 257, 267, 339 ; infallibility, 376, 378, 381, 383, 398, 399, 536 ; persecutions, 46, 178, 378, 394, 462 ; Protestants use against Dissenters the arguments which Romanists use against them, 49 ; their treatment of the Roman Catholics, 178 ; have less excuse than the Catholics for persecuting, 467.
- Protestantism, what, 114, 256, 378 ; right of private judgment, 3 *et seq.*, 32, 36, 45, 48, 49, 61, 138, 467, 468 ; right and duty of acting according to it, 26, 473 ; is a safe way to salvation, 265.
- Providence, general and particular, 70-76. See *God, Laws, Judgments*.
- Prudence included by Butler among the virtues, 200.
- Psychological Medicine, Journal of, referred to, 66, 73, 420.
- Public opinion, 198, 347, 367 ; state of, in Scotland, as to Sunday-trains, 400.
- Publication, free, of opinions, benefit of, 474 *et seq.* ; laws against, 477.
- Punishment, under the law of nature, 452 ; capital, of murder, 189 ; doctrine of eternal, 230 *et seq.*, 447.
- Puritanism, 420, 421, 436, 437 ; reaction against, in England, 448 ; in the Highlands, 457 ; unintentionally promotes vice, 557.
- Puritans, 62, 120, 121, 129, 141, 142, 143, 146, 149, 150, 154, 216, 227, 237, 259, 275, 276, 518, 551 ; their Sabbath-doctrine, 486 ; their mode of interpreting the Bible, 159 ; regarded the Mosaic law as binding on the Gentiles, 164 ; their preference for the Old Testament, 173, 179 ; their writings on the Sabbath, 293, 294 ; Sabbatarianism introduced by, 301 *et seq.* ; 503, 535 ; their legislation for Sabbath observance, 331 ; their mode of Sabbath-observance, see *Sabbath* ; Macaulay's character of them, 562.

QUAKERS, 55, 121, 215, 347.

Quarterly Review quoted, 45, 428 ; referred to, 34, 70, 152, 336, 379, 453, 457, 468, 548.

RAILWAYS, accidents on, 270, 454.

Railway-trains on Sundays, 1, 17, 226, 352, 358, 359, 390, 449, 483, 557 ; Arnold on, 363 ; grounds of legislation for, 404 ; public opinion regarding them in Scotland, 400 ; memorials against, 457 ; railway-servants employed on Sunday ought to rest on another day, 270, 558.

Railway companies, Sabbatarian manoeuvres in, 19, 361, 362, 400, 408.

Rammohun Roy, referred to, 185.

Ramus, Peter, 108.

Ray, John, on the works of creation, 493.

Reading, pleasure from, 425.

Reason, human, soundness of, 40 ; should be employed in religion, 52, 246 ; authority of, 202 *et seq.*, 265 ; revelation to, 533.

"Record, The," quoted, 160, 358, 372.

Recreation, 10, 120, 142 *et seq.*, 225, 226, 241, 279, 286, 294, 295, 297, 304, 305, 306, 309, 487, 488, 318, 332, 354, 339, 341, 369, 355, 371, 402, 449 ; different kinds of, suit different persons, 226 ; recreations on the Sabbath were not forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, 229, 433, 559-60 ; but the reverse, 433, 554 ; grounds on which they are said to be forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, 543 *et seq.* ; recreation a Sabbath duty, 420 ; a means of preventing and curing drunkenness, 216, 417.

Redemption, doctrine of universal, 54.

Reformation, see *Protestantism* ; expected new one, 261-3.

Reformers, the, left much undone, 260 ;

their intolerance, 244, 378, 462 ;

their doctrine of the Sabbath, 55,

121, 285 *et seq.*, 484, 503.

Refreshment the beneficial purpose of the Jewish Sabbath, 120, 219, 371, 420, 433, 553, 554. See *Recreation*.

Relaxation, 225. See *Refreshment*.

Religion, its alleged connexion with Sabbath-observance, 212, 219 ; sincerity in, 214, its state in Charles II.'s reign, 334 ; effect of the French Revolution upon it in Britain, 335 ; tinctured by men's tempers, 237 ought to be cheerful, 237, 417, 448, 554 ; damaged by ignorant fanatics, 341 ; and by pious frauds, 341 ; not

adverse to amusements, 423 ; its alliance with knowledge, 425 ; music in relation to, 429 ; has not always the consequences expected, 467 ; true religion, what, 204 ; true, known by its fruits, 446, 447 ; true and false have equal rights, 476 ; religious enthusiasm, 246, 389, 418 ; religious insanity, 71, 418, 474 ; natural religion—see *Natural* ; religious liberty—see *Liberty* ; religious people generally ignorant of God's natural laws, 210.

Remonstrants, 466.

Reprobation, 54, 230, 232.

Rest, man's need of, 268, 420 ; is the only thing enjoined in the Fourth Commandment, 547, 553.

Resurrection, Christ's, in relation to the Lord's Day, 327, 330, 335, 487, 519, 524, 525, 526, 531, 532, 538.

Reuchlin, John, 173.

Revelation, Dr Jortin on the importance of, 211 ; Bishop Warburton on, 345 ; natural religion as a test of, 204, 263, 480 ; internal and external evidence of, 191 ; the Book of, 524. See *Bible*.

Reverence, sentiment of, 201.

Reynolds, Dr, a Sabbatarian, 295.

Rhau, George, 429.

"Rhymed Plea for Tolerance" quoted, 213, 248, 453, 546.

Rice, Mr Spring (now Lord Monteaule), on visits to the Zoological Gardens on Sunday, 356.

Richmond, excursions to, 342.

Ridley, Bishop, his opinion of the Sabbath referred to, 119, 291, 484.

Right and wrong, 199 *et seq.* See *Conscience, Duties, Moral*.

Robertson, William, D.D., quoted, 466 ; referred to, 467, 549.

———, Rev. William, an Irish clergyman, 48.

Robinson, Archbishop, 48.

———, Dr E., referred to, 543.

———, Rev. Robert, became a Unitarian, 47.

Rochefoucault on pride, 375.

Rogers, Henry, referred to, 29, 266, 374.

———, Dr John, quoted, 302.

Romanism, 107, 131, 243 ; whether a saving faith, 49 ; not now what it was, 462 ; a source of corruptions of, 161 ; Roman Catholic Sabbath, 559. See *Infallibility*.

Roman Catholics, rights of, 28 ; Knox's severity to, 178 ; Dr Chalmers on persecution of, 178 ; treatment of,

by Protestants, 153, 315, 377, 466; acts against, 315; disabilities of, 462; causes of hatred to, 463; many burnt by Protestants, 464.

Romans, ancient, their just laws, 224; their festivals, 226; the Sabbath generally ridiculed by, 512; but observed by some, in imitation of the Jews, 511; their calendar, 514.

Roscoe, William, quoted on religious liberty, 118.

Ross, Alexander Leith, quoted, 301.

Royal Society, its influence in dispelling superstition, 69.

Ruell, Rev. David, quoted, 345.

Rural walks, 229, 311, 341, 431, 440, 488, 560; sounds, 430.

Rush, Dr Benjamin, on the drama, 427; referred to, 73.

Rushworth, John, on historical forgeries, 321; his Collections referred to, 134, 140, 149, 150-1.

Ruskin, Mr, on the Church of Scotland, 127.

Russell, Francis, on the Lord's Day, quoted, 509; referred to, 281, 508, 514, 531.

Rutherford, Samuel, 133; his book against liberty of conscience, 150, 179; on seducers to idolatry, 224.

Rutherford, Lord, his speech on Sunday-trains, 409. [209.

Rutherglen, Sabbath desecration at,

SABBATARIANS, properly so called, who keep holy the seventh day of the week, 176, 297, 327.

Sabbath, alleged primeval, 72-106, 170, 226, 322, 335, 481, 484, 487, 511, 515, 518, 536.

——, Jewish, 167, 486; first instituted when manna was sent, 540; formally enacted at Sinai, 182; adapted to the circumstances of the Jews, 177; and to the constitution of man, 16, 212, 268, 558; its purposes,—(1.) to give rest and refreshment to man and beast, 218, 225, 226, 371, 503, 553; (2.) to be a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, 217, 553; (3.) to be a sign of the covenant between God and them, 167 *et seq.*, 218, 357, 491, 553; mode of sanctifying it, 540-3; meaning of "hallow," "keep holy," or "sanctify," 487, 544; was a joyful festival, 435, 439, 555; how spent by the Jews, 435, 546; lasted from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday, 308, 309, 439; whether a moral or a

positive institution? 169, 200-9, 212, 217, 322, 327, 481, 490, 495, 553; this question practically unimportant, 220; was not imposed upon the Gentiles, or kept by them, except in imitation of the Jews in later times, 167, 217, 227, 228, 354, 357, 511; never observed by Gentile Christians, 173, 279; gradually ceased to be kept by Hebrew Christians, 173, 279; thought by the Reformers to be a type of spiritual rest, 290; can no longer be regarded as a memorial of the creation, 72-106, 553; grounds on which it is said to be a Christian institution, 12, 481, 485 *et seq.*; erroneously called by the Sabbath Alliance the badge of our homage to God, 170; doctrine and practice of Jesus, the Apostles, and the Fathers, concerning it—see *Jesus, Apostles, Fathers*; doctrine of the Schoolmen, 285; of the Church of Scotland, 55, 123, 325, 340-1, 486; of the Free Church of Scotland, 247; of the Church of England, 119, 214, 282, 289, 302; of English Non-conformists, 121; of foreign Protestant divines, 55, 121, 285 *et seq.*, 502—see *Calvin, Luther, &c.*; controversies about it in Holland, 56, 62, 503; in England, 289 *et seq.*; in Germany, 503; debate concerning it in the Westminster Assembly, 136; prevalent misapplication of the phrase "Lord of the Sabbath," 160, 247, 323, 483; history of modern Sabbatarianism, 279; Puritanical observance of the so-called Christian Sabbath, 10, 23, 120, 216, 275, 301, 303 *et seq.*, 335, 336, 339, 436, 437, 440, 446, 450, 452, 487, 535, 547, 555, 561. See *Fourth Commandment, Lord's Day.*

Sabbath Alliance, curiosities of the, 481; its formation and principles, 367, 481; labours, 389, 409, 457; financial condition, 16, 404, 410, 452, 482; proclaims that the Sabbath is the badge of our homage to God, 170; maintains the vital importance of the Fourth Commandment to morality, 196; resemblance of its conduct to that of the Jesuits, 200-212; its contemptuous treatment of the law of Christ and the law of nature, 197, 198, 489, 494; its misstatement about a meeting of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Company, 484; accuses all non-sabbatarians of dishonesty, ignorance, or stupidity,

- 484, 547; its astounding assertion about the common consent of the Christian world to one of its principles, 485; speaks of reverence for places as a Christian duty, 495; on the meaning of "keep holy," 547; its Tracts referred to, 508, 519.
- Sabbath-breaking said to be the first step to crime, 55, 56, 345-7; "God's vengeance" against its perpetrators, 450; acts against it—see *Acts, Legislation*.
- Sabbath-day's journey, 435.
- Sabbatical Year, 181.
- Sacrifices continued at Jerusalem till the destruction of the Temple, 167; whether still possible by the Jews, 496; on the Sabbath, 543, 549.
- Sacrilege, 221.
- St Andrews, Sunday plays at, 299; foreign students at, 301; Sabbath-observance at, 306, 308.
- St Crispen's holiday, 438.
- St Cuthbert's parish, Sabbath-desecration in, 309.
- Salmon-fishing on Sunday at Aberdeen, 313; act prohibiting, 339.
- Salt-pans, 339.
- Salvation, conditions of, 49, 53, 232, 387.
- Sanctification of the Sabbath, 540, 542-4.
- Sanctify, meaning of, 487, 544 *et seq.*
- Sanctuary, reverence for, 181, 221, 281, 495.
- Sanitary improvements will diminish drunkenness, 414; Sanitary Association of Manchester, 272. See *Health, Physiology*.
- Satan, "buffetings" of, 72. See *Devil*.
- Saturday, 514.
- Saxon race less sober than Celtic, 415; old Saxon names of days, 513.
- Scenery, pleasure derived from, 432.
- Scepticism, 52; Dr Hetherington's notion of, 152, 343.
- Schism, 49, 151, 366, 378.
- Scholastic divinity, 112.
- Schoolmen, their doctrine of the Sabbath, 285.
- Science, the study of it dispels superstition, 69, 70, 425; in relation to Scripture, 77, 189, 263, 327, 391, 394, 548; value of it in a religious point of view, 205 *et seq.*, 558 note †; Divine authority of its teaching, 208.
- Scot, Reginald, on witchcraft, 65.
- Scotch Reformers' Gazette on immorality in Glasgow on Sundays, 216; exposure of Sabbatarian tricks by, 459, 460.
- Scotland, burning of witches in, 94, 443; standard of religious truth in, 132; intolerance in, 151; unfair demands of clergy in, 153; Sabbath-observance in, 123, 149, 275, 298, 306, 334, 440; state of religion and morals 200 years ago, 440; observance of holidays in the reign of James VI., 306; What are the feelings and opinions of the people of, in regard to Sunday trains? 400; proposed standing committee for license of Sunday travellers, 411; prejudice against music in, 430; the Covenanters, 173, 381, 440, 466, 470; Scotland under Cromwell, 470; state of religious liberty in, 472, 478; Puritanism in the Highlands, 457. See *Church of Scotland*.
- "Scotsman, The," quoted, 25, 400, 406, 409, 458.
- Scott, Dr A. J., referred to, 543; quoted, 558.
- , Rev. Thomas, on the sufficiency of the Bible, 210.
- , Sir Walter, on apparitions, 68; on the credulity of the Presbyterian clergy in regard to witchcraft, 135; referred to, 64, 152, 312, 444.
- Scottish Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day, 358.
- Scourging for Sabbath-breaking in Scotland, 308.
- Scripture. See *Bible*.
- Scudder, Henry, 153.
- "Searchers" for Sabbath-breakers in Scotland, 299, 310, 311, 312, 317.
- Seasons, changes of, took place long before the creation of man, 79.
- Seceders, Scotch, their protest against the repeal of laws against witches, 64.
- Secker, Archbishop, on the law of nature, 204; on servility to the clergy, 386; referred to, 138, 157, 379.
- Sectaries, toleration of, 151, 152. See *Dissenters, Toleration*.
- Sects, rivalry of, 389.
- Sedgwick, Professor, on diversity of opinions, 253; referred to, 379.
- Selden, John, on free inquiry, 52; on the endlessness of disputes in religion, 129; his speeches in the Westminster Assembly, 135; his learning, *ib.*; on interpretation of the Bible, 138, 160, 365; on the obscuration of truth in troubled times, 141; on tithes, 175; on usury, 180; on getting rid of contracts under colour of obedience to God, 411; on God's judgments, 456; on the Sabbath, 512, 514; referred to, 34, 158.

- Self-esteem, 255, 373. See *Pride*.
- Seneca on festivals, 225; referred to, 512.
- Septenary institutions, origin of, 512-514.
- Sermons, 238, 370, 378, 393; hints for the improvement of, 238; attractiveness of eloquent, 427.
- Serpent in Gen. ii., 89, 91.
- Servants, 345, 350, 351, 352, 354, 363, 495, 558.
- Servetus, burning of, 28, 466; his Life referred to, 468, 469.
- Servility to authority in religion, 51, 107, 113; servility of the laity to the clergy, 373, 383, 398, 399.
- Seven, sacred character of that number, in the East, 512, 514.
- Seventh Commandment, 220, 515.
- Shaftesbury, Lord, referred to, 254, 379.
- Shakespeare quoted, 56, 201, 552.
- Sharp, James, Archbishop of St Andrews, 308.
- , Dr John, Archbishop of York, on belief as the rule of practice, 473.
- Sheldon, Dr, 119.
- Sherlock, William, Dean of St Paul's, his controversy with Dr South, 128.
- , Thomas, Bishop of London, on the New Testament, 198; on the Jewish law, 164; on the law of nature, 204, 223; referred to, 499, 527, 549.
- Shooting on Sundays, 286, 300.
- Shopkeepers, alleged need of protection of, 349, 352.
- Sign, the Sabbath as a, 167 *et seq.*, 218, 357, 491, 553.
- Silkworm, cultivation of, 369.
- Siloam, tower of, 456.
- Simon, Richard, 157.
- Sin, bad effects of setting up a false standard of, 213; original, 36, 233.
- Sinai, "sanctified" by Moses, 545, 546; giving of the law at, 182. See *Decalogue*.
- Sincerity in religion, 214. See *Hypocrisy*.
- Sismondi on the intolerance of the Reformers, 244; referred to, 29.
- Sisters, marriage of two at the same time forbidden by Moses, 192.
- Sleep, 271, 421, 433.
- Smalridge, Bishop, anecdote of, 387.
- Smith, Adam, referred to, 480.
- , Dr John Pye, quoted on Scriptural astronomy, 62; on the production of new species, 74; on the meaning of "firmament," 105; referred to, 76.
- Smith, Rev. Sydney, on the effects of extensive religious study in producing mutual respect between opponents, 50; on the impossibility of uniformity of opinion, 249; on Protestant persecutions, 462; referred to, 375, 377, 471.
- Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities quoted, 226.
- Sobriety. See *Drunkenness*.
- Social affections, their culture on the Sabbath, 278, 554.
- Socinianism, catechism of, 162.
- Socinians, 44, 48.
- Socinus, Faustus, fixity of his opinions, 479; referred to, 29.
- Socrates referred to, 480.
- "Solemn" and "solemnity," meaning of the words, 551.
- Solomon quoted, 40, 375, 420, 451.
- Somerville, Mrs, on the week, 514.
- Sophistry, conscious, criminality of, 475.
- Sounds, natural, 430.
- South, Dr, Robert, on the Socinians, 48; on reason in religion, 54; his controversy with Sherlock, 128; on sinless error, 265.
- Southey, Robert, his Life of Wesley quoted, 54; on the spiritual regimen under which Cowper was put by John Newton, 70; his abhorrence of bigotry, 142; on change of the meaning of words, 227, 550; disbelieved in eternal torments, 235; on the Book of Sports, 321; on Sunday in the country, 431; on cheerfulness in religion, 420; on Calvinism, 420; his "Doctor" quoted, 556.
- Southwark, Sunday plays in, 294.
- Spain, Scottish merchants forbidden by the clergy to trade with, 316.
- Spalding quoted, 316.
- Spencer on the Sabbath, 456, 542.
- Spener referred to, 512.
- Spirituous liquors, 416. See *Drunkenness*.
- Sponsors in baptism, 214.
- Sports, 286, 332; Book of, 142-9, 318, 321, 331, 332, 369, 453, 556. See *Recreation*.
- Spottiswoode Miscellany referred to, 312, 444; quoted, 314.
- Sprat, Bishop, on dogmatical philosophy, 112; referred to, 456.
- Stage. See *Drama*.
- Stage-coaches, 336, 354.
- Standards of faith. See *Belief*.
- Starvation a cause of drunkenness, 412, 414, 416.
- Steamers on Sunday, 216, 353.

- Stebbing, Dr, on Church authority, 109.
 Sterne referred to, 276.
 Stewart, Dugald, on the criminality of
 conscious sophistry, 475; referred
 to, 76.
 ———, General, quoted, 359.
 Stewarts, their despotic conduct, 127;
 "God's judgments" on them for
 authorising profanation of the Sab-
 bath, 453, 556.
 Stone, Dr T., on witchcraft, 66.
 Stornoway, Sabbatarian petition from,
 458.
 Stowe, Mrs Beecher, referred to, 438.
 "Strangers within thy gates," 187.
 Strangled animals, abstinence from,
 172, 515.
 Strype's Life of Aylmer quoted, 295.
 Stuart, Moses, referred to, 94, 96; on
 the meaning of "firmament," 105.
 Study, refreshment and pleasure from,
 424 *et seq.*
 Submission, tendency to, 373.
 Subscription. See *Articles, Tests.*
 Suicide, Calvin's law against, 174.
 Sully on religious liberty, 469.
 Sumner, Charles R., on Milton's aban-
 donment of Trinitarianism, 36.
 ———, John Bird, Archbishop of Can-
 terbury, on injudicious preaching,
 41; on the allegorical interpretation
 of Gen. i. and ii., 91; on geology
 and Scripture, 102; on the law of
 nature, 203; on seasons of relaxa-
 tion, 225; on evils from ignorance,
 240; on the duties of legislators,
 343; case of a shopkeeper mentioned
 by, 349, referred to, 377.
 Sun, creation of the, 78, 86, 106, 548;
 was worshipped by the Persians,
 539; day of the, 322, 513, 514, 539.
 Sunday, origin of the name, 322, 513,
 514, 539. See *Lord's Day.*
 Superstition, what, 204; Bacon on, 54;
 instances of, 64-69; science adverse
 to, 69; bad effects of, 231, 238.
 Sweetser, Dr, referred to, 73, 423.
 Swift, Jonathan, on change of opinion,
 35; epigram by, 236.
 Swiss churches, their doctrine of the
 Lord's Day, 286.
 Sydenham, Crystal Palace at. See
Crystal Palace.
 Sykes, Dr, referred to, 158.
 Sympathy, 278.
 Synagogues, origin of, 436, 543;
 Christ's custom of attending, 329,
 488, 560; the apostles' custom, 329,
 523, 529.
- TABERNACLES, feast of, 434.
- Tables of stone at Sinai, 96, 100, 182,
 185, 492, 495, 501.
 Tacitus referred to, 512.
 Taff Vale Railway, 450.
 Talbot, Miss, referred to, 438.
 Taverns on Sunday, 331-334.
 Tay, inundation of the, 314; Sunday
 steamer on, 353.
 Tayler, John James, on Locke's im-
 proved mode of exegesis, 159; re-
 ferred to, 152, 157, 337.
 Taylor, David, bequest by, 479.
 ———, Isaac, on the true value of
 phrases, 104; on the low state of
 sacred science, 105; on the Lord's
 Day, 284.
 ———, Jeremy, bishop of Down, on
 God's unwillingness to be served
 with a lie, 100; on the non-existence
 of an infallible judge of truth, 107,
 125; character of, 127; on the di-
 vine authority of conscience, 204;
 on the positive character of the
 Fourth Commandment, 217; on sin-
 less error, 265, 266; on the example
 of the apostles, 328; on the scruples
 of "weak brethren," 351; on sub-
 scription to articles, 396; on recrea-
 tions, 421; on cheerfulness in reli-
 gion, 448; his principles of reli-
 gious liberty, 470; on the Sabbath,
 484, 528; on the Decalogue, 489;
 referred to, 29, 119, 375, 480.
 ———, Dr John, of Norwich, on ori-
 ginal sin, 39; on the Jewish law,
 167, 495; on the origin of weeks,
 513; referred to, 258.
 Tea-gardens on Sundays, 55.
 Teelling, a Dutch Sabbatarian, 503.
 Teignmouth, Lord, his Life of Sir W.
 Jones referred to, 93.
 Temper tinges religion, 237; effect of
 health on, 71, 72, 275. See *Benevo-
 lence.*
 Temple, Sir William, referred to, 375.
 Temple of Jerusalem, 496; its services
 attended by the apostles, 329; de-
 struction of, 537.
 Ten Commandments. See *Decalogue.*
 Tendency of principles an index of
 their soundness, 446.
 Tertullian ascribed the Sabbath to
 Moses, 226; on Sunday, 539.
 Tests, religious, 252, 340; university,
 233, 462, 472.
 Teutonic race less temperate than
 Celtic, 415.
 Teviot, sudden decrease of its water,
 in the year 1838, 68.
 Texts, misapplication of, 160, 552. See
Bible.

- Thames, watermen on the, 334.
 Theatrical spectacles. See *Dramatic*.
 Theocracy, Jewish, 179, 222, 450, 452, 454, 498, 553.
 Theological science, low state of, 105.
 Theology, systems of, 162, 385; defects of, 239; scholastic, 112.
 ———, natural. See *Natural, and Nature, law of*.
 Third Commandment, 490.
 Tholuck, 301.
 Thomas, Joseph S., quoted, 346.
 Thompson, Lieut.-Col. Perronet, referred to, 515, 517.
 Thomson, Dr Andrew, late minister of St George's, Edinburgh, 340; on blindness to hostile texts of Scripture, 161.
 ———, Dr Andrew, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, on the Sabbath, 59; on the blindness of those who do not wish to see, 535; referred to, 533.
 ———, Rev. George, on the zeal, piety, and immorality of our forefathers, 444. [112.
 ———, John, M. D., referred to, Thomson's Seasons, the God of, 231, 237; referred to, 70, 444.
 Thought, necessity of leisure for, 277.
 Thoughts, worldly, on the Sabbath, debate upon, in Westminster Assembly, 136; said to be forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, 488, 544.
 Thraske, a Sabbatarian, 297.
 Thugs, the, 27.
 Thurloe's letter to H. Cromwell, 467.
 Thursday, 513.
 Tibullus referred to, 511.
 Tillotson, Archbishop, on damage to religion from asserting more than can be proved, 100; on the law of nature, 202; on a trick of the Jesuits, 211; on the goodness of God, 232; on clerical opposition to reform, 398; called an Atheist by Dr Hickeys, 247; referred to, 343.
 Timeserving in religion, 386.
 Tindal's attack on Christianity, 184, 189.
 Tithes, alleged perpetual obligation of, 179; Selden and Cobbett on, 175; were "holy to God," 544.
 Tolerance, 249, 254, 330.
 Tolerated sects, 479.
 Toleration, long opposed by the Presbyterians, 151, 152, 259; Sir H. Moncreiff an advocate of, 340; history of, 28, 467 *et seq.*; arrogance implied by using the word, 473.
 Tomline, Bishop, letter from Bishop Watson to, 233.
 Torments, eternal, doctrine of, 230 *et seq.*, 447.
 Toulmin's Life of Servetus referred to, 29, 468, 469; quoted, 162, 480.
 Town-Councils, Scotch, are mostly in favour of Sunday-trains, 403, 408, 410.
 Tractarianism, 380, 381.
 Trading on Sunday. 341, 342, 349, 352.
 Tradition, 115.
 Tragedy, 427.
 Trajan, Pliny's Letter to, 537, 539.
 Transubstantiation, 532; argument for, unwittingly supplied by Dr Bruce, 509.
 Travelling, pleasure and benefit of, 449; on Sundays, 1, 17, 333, 336, 341, 352, 353, 363, 400 *et seq.*, 439, 558; to church, 125; proposed standing committee for the license of Sunday travellers, 411.
 Trees, fossil, concentric rings of, 79.
 Trent, council of, 399.
 Trevelyan, Sir W. C., 246.
 Trinity, doctrine of the, 35, 47, 93, 243, 387, 399, 466.
 Troas, Paul's visit to, 59, 329, 488, 521, 560.
 Truth, God's and Man's, 3, 31, 262, 377; standard of religious, 32, 33, 113; difficulty of ascertaining, 106; Locke on the pursuit of, 130; is a match for Falschood, 56, 178, 394, 476, 480; argument against forcible propagation of, 242; fundamental truths, 471.
 Tucker, Abraham, on pious fear of investigation, 51; referred to, 375.
 Tuesday, 513.
 Tunstall, Dr, on the importance of knowledge of human nature, 207.
 Turner, Sharon, against dogmatism, 383. [125.
 Turriff, Free Church Presbytery of, Twisse, Dr, 154.
 Tyndale on the Lord's Day, 287, 484.
 Typical character ascribed by some to the Sabbath, 290.
 Tyrants, resistance to, 127.
 UDEMANN, a Dutch Sabbatarian, 503.
 Unchastity, laws against, 174, 228, 499, 515.
 Underhill, E. B., referred to, 468.
 Unitarianism, 38, 93, 117; catechism of, 162; bequest for the propagation of, 479; laws against Unitarians, 46.

- United States, Sabbath-observance in, 369; clergy of, 391, 393; imperfect religious freedom in, 394, 471.
- Unity of opinion impossible, 242 *et seq.*
- Universal History, ancient, referred to, 514, 549.
- Universal redemption, doctrine of, 54.
- University-tests, 232, 462, 472.
- Usher, Archbp., renounced the doctrine of reprobation, 48; his Life referred to, 468.
- Usury, laws against, 180, 499.
- Utopia, 249, 469.
- Utrecht, Sabbath-observance at, 55, 301.
- VANE, Sir Henry, 470.
- Variety of men's minds and opinions, 442 *et seq.*
- Vegetable diet, 416.
- Veitch, Mrs Wm., fanaticism of, 276.
- Veneration, sentiment of, 201.
- Verses, division of the Bible into, 162.
- "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," 74.
- Vice, 198 *et seq.*; fostered by misery, 276, 448.
- Vincentius Lirinensis, maxim of, 113.
- Vinet, Alex., on the characteristic of Protestantism, 114, 256; referred to, 468.
- Virgil, quoted, 425.
- Virginia, law for religious liberty in, 471.
- Virtue, 198 *et seq.*; promoted by happiness, 72, 238, 276, 369, 370, 448, 449, 554; Butler on, 239, 240; affected by health, 275.
- Visible Church, the, 179.
- Visiting on Sunday, 439.
- Vitringa on the Sabbath, 542.
- Voet, Gisbert, on the immobility of the Earth, 62.
- Voltaire, his attacks on Christianity through the sides of Judaism, 191.
- Vulgate, 192, 510.
- WADE'S Hist. of the Middle Classes referred to, 276.
- Waggons, public, on Sundays, 336.
- Wakefield, Gilbert, on the alleged corruption of human nature, 39; on the language of Scripture, 91; on the obliquity of Bishop Horsley, 100; on public worship, 230; letter to him on disingenuous subscription of articles, 252; his sacrifices to Liberty and Conscience, 253; on the bad effects of established creeds, 386, 387; referred to, 47, 158; his Memoirs referred to, 254.
- Wakley, Mr, speech of, 356.
- Waldenses, their doctrine of the Sabbath, 285.
- Wales, South, Sunday trains in, 450.
- Walker, Peter, quoted, 68.
- Walking on Sunday, 55, 120, 121, 149, 236, 309, 310, 339, 341, 435, 554.
- Walton, Isaac, on the Westminster Assembly, 134.
- Warburton, Bishop, on demoniacs, 66; on the positive character of the Sabbath, 169, 218; on the Mosaic law a republication of the law of nature, 204; on ancient legislators, 345; referred to, 119.
- Wardlaw, Dr Ralph, on the Sabbath, 57, 219, 220, 506, 507, 508, 513, 526, 541, 545, 546, 547; on Paul's visit to Troas, 329; on the Mosaic law, 501; referred to, 504, 523, 537, 557, 563.
- Waterland, Dr Daniel, candour of, 45.
- Watermen on the Thames, 334.
- Waters, noise of, 430.
- Watson, Bishop, on religious liberty, 28, 49, 113, 116; on suspension of judgment, 52; on free inquiry, 61; on the two copies of the Fourth Commandment, 97; on Papal infallibility, 108; on subscription of articles, 115, 328, 338; on the example of the Apostles, 129; on the need of an amended translation of the Bible, 156; on the misuse of texts, 161; on "Taylor's Key to the Apostolic Writings," 167; says that the Christian religion is wholly comprised in the New Testament, 198; on Calvinism, 233; on differences of religious opinion, 248; against judging one another, 256; on Sunday-traveling, 336; on errors of missionaries, 338; on the expediency of revising the standards of the Church of England, 338; a sermon dedicated to him by Sir H. Moncreiff, 340; on impious notions of God, 344; his disclamation of dogmatism, 383; on the bad effects of established systems of theology, 386; referred to, 37, 54, 109, 113, 157, 183, 258, 377, 471; his Collection of Theological Tracts referred to, 112, 166, 167, 183, 186, 513, 542, 543, 550.
- , Dr Robt., referred to, 467.
- Watts, Dr Isaac, said to have become a Unitarian, 47; referred to, 132, 157.
- "Weak brethren," offence to, 351; have their duties as well as rights, *ib.*

- Weaklings, moral, 198, 201.
- Wealth, how far it secures religious freedom, 395.
- Weather, its effect on appetite, 416.
- Weber, M., on the Mosaic law, 496.
- Wednesday, 513.
- Week, origin of the, 511 *et seq.*
- Weightman, Edward, burning of, 466.
- Welwood, Dr, quoted, 147, 148, 153.
- Wemyss, Thomas, on the Sabbath, 58.
- Wesley, John, on election and reprobation, 54; influence of, 337.
- Westminster Assembly, 133, 151, 331, 521, 561; error of its members in regarding the Jewish law as binding on the Gentiles, 164; members of, 133, 237, 437. See *Catechism, Confession*.
- Westminster Review quoted, 204, 433-436, 549; referred to, 94, 158, 174, 210, 514.
- Whately, Archbishop, on the excellence of human reason, 40; on Protestant deference to authority in matters of faith, 108; on general consent as a test of truth, 113; on the Sabbath, 119, 219, 221, 284, 484, 504, 536, 542; on the division of the Bible into chapters and verses, 162; on the punishment of idolatry, 179; on the book of nature as a source of knowledge of God's will, 205; on pious frauds, 214; on *our* relation to duties prescribed in the Jewish law, 222; on the glory of God, 343; on the corporate spirit and party ties of the clergy, 388; on the diminution of their authority by requiring them to subscribe articles, 397; on Protestant Popery, 397-8; on the right use of national afflictions, 454; on the subordinate influence of religious tenets, 467; on proselytising, 476; referred to, 34, 100, 105, 107, 119, 125, 150, 239, 276, 281, 379, 444, 456, 468, 471, 542.
- Whiston, William, on the character of Sir Isaac Newton, 46; on the timidity of Dr S. Clarke, 47; on lay theologians, 117; opposed the doctrine of eternal torments, 233; his anecdote of Bishop Smalridge, 387; on the demoralising influence of subscribing articles of faith, 397; on the Mosaic cosmogony, 548; referred to, 43, 44, 45.
- Whitby, Dr Daniel, religious opinions of, 37, 38.
- White, Bishop, on the Sabbath, 297.
- White, Joseph Blanco, on Christian truth, 33, 109, 468.
- , W., on the sermons of the English Dissenters, 238.
- Whitefield, George, influence of, 337.
- Whitelock, Bulstrode, on the Westminster Assembly, 134.
- Whitgift, Archbishop, opposed the Puritan Sabbath, 305.
- Wierus on witchcraft, 64.
- Wilberforce, William, Bishop Watson's letter to, 336; influence of, 337; on recreations, 421; on the heaviness of the Sabbath, 452.
- Wilkins, Bishop, on the law of nature, 202; on the source of willing obedience to God's laws, 205.
- William III., Sabbath acts in his reign, 334, 339.
- William IV., Sabbath acts in reign of, 334.
- Williams, Bishop, a play said to have been acted in his house on a Sunday, 298.
- , Roger, not the first who understood religious liberty, 469; eulogy of, 470.
- Secular School, Reports of, 210.
- Wilson, Arthur, 146; character of his History of James I., 147, 320.
- , J. P. and G. F., on holidays to workmen, 270.
- , Rev. Mr, quoted, 153.
- , Thomas, referred to, 260.
- Wisdom, Solomon on, 451.
- Witchcraft, burning for, 64, 135, 443; King James on, 64; Addison on, 66; Baxter on, 67.
- Witham, Henry, referred to, 79.
- "Witness, The," quoted, 228, 481; referred to, 461.
- Wodrow, Robert, quoted, 308; referred to, 300, 311, 312, 318.
- Wollaston, William, on truth, 31; on innocent pleasures, 424; referred to, 344.
- Women, nervous diseases of, 66; often control the clergy, 389; religious insanity of, 419.
- Wonder, sentiment of, 68, 69.
- Wontner, John, quoted, 346.
- Wood, Anthony, quoted, 147.
- Woodbridge's American Annals of Education referred to, 422.
- Woods, noise of the, 430, 431.
- Words govern the ignorant, 457, 550; ambiguity of, 227, 544-552; change of meaning of, 550.
- Wordsworth, William, quoted on rural walks, 432.

- Wordsworth, Dr Christopher, referred to, 35.
- Work alone forbidden in the Fourth Commandment, 542 *et seq.*; meaning of work, 439; Is work on six days enjoined? 548.
- Worship, old meaning of the word, 551; duty of, 169, 228, 344, 490; Jewish, 549; heathen, 515.
- , public, 120, 219, 220, 229, 278, 284, 324, 329, 370, 438, 447, 452, 503, 518; not enjoined in the Fourth Commandment, 542-3, 546-7, 559; or by Christ, 229; suggestions for its improvement, 230; music in; 429, 430; opposition by the Church of Scotland to toleration of the practice of it by Dissenters, 315.
- Wortley, Mr, his bill for legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 192; his speech on Sunday-trains, 405, 406.
- Wrong and right, 199 *et seq.*
- YOUNG'S Night Thoughts quoted, 58, 422.
- Younger, John, on the vital importance of the Decalogue, 212.
- ZEAL, religious, 366.
- Zoological Gardens, 356.
- Zuinglius on the Lord's Day, 287, 484; understood and practised the principles of religious liberty, 468.

THE END.

WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

MACLACHLAN AND STEWART, EDINBURGH; AND
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO., LONDON.

I.

THE PRINCIPLES OF PHYSIOLOGY APPLIED TO THE PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, AND TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EDUCATION. By the late ANDREW COMBE, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; Physician Extraordinary in Scotland to the Queen; Consulting Physician to the King and Queen of the Belgians; and Corresponding Member of the Imperial and Royal Society of Physicians of Vienna. Fourteenth Edition, edited by JAMES COXE, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—CHAP. I. NATURE AND USES OF PHYSIOLOGY.—II. CAUSES OF THE NEGLECT OF PRACTICAL PHYSIOLOGY IN SOCIAL LIFE—SLOW AND INSIDIOUS ORIGIN OF DISEASE.—III. RELIGIOUS OBJECTIONS TO THE STUDY OF PHYSIOLOGY CONSIDERED.—IV. STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SKIN.—V. CONDITIONS OF HEALTH OF THE SKIN, AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE GENERAL SYSTEM.—VI. NATURE OF THE MUSCULAR SYSTEM.—VII. RULES FOR MUSCULAR EXERCISE.—VIII. THE BONES, THEIR STRUCTURE, USES, AND CONDITIONS OF HEALTH.—IX. ON THE BLOOD AND THE ORGANS OF CIRCULATION.—X. THE LUNGS, THEIR STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS—RESPIRATION AND ITS USES.—XI. LAWS OF RESPIRATION—CONDITIONS OF HEALTH OF THE LUNGS.—XII. THE BRAIN AND NERVES CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATION TO THE REST OF THE BODY AND TO THE MENTAL FACULTIES.—XIII. CONDITIONS OF HEALTH OF THE BRAIN—LAWS OF MENTAL EXERCISE.—XIV. APPLICATION OF THE PRECEDING PRINCIPLES TO THE HEALTH OF THE BRAIN AND NERVOUS SYSTEM, AND TO GENERAL EDUCATION.—XV. INFLUENCE OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM UPON THE GENERAL HEALTH.—XVI. APPLICATION OF THE PRECEDING PRINCIPLES TO THE ORIGIN AND PREVENTION OF BAD HEALTH.

“A treatise which contains more sound philosophy, more true practical wisdom, relative to the all-important subject of preserving health, than any other volume in our language: and which, while it is calculated to please and benefit the public generally, is no less adapted for the study of professional men. The extremely large sale of the former editions of this work is at once evidence of its merits, and a gratifying proof that the reading part of the public are becoming daily more awake to the importance of that branch of philosophy of which it treats.”—*British and Foreign Medical Review, October 1841.*

“The work of Dr Combe is, to a great extent, we think, original. . . . The style is so plain, and the arguments so convincing, that no person can fail to perceive how intimately

his health and happiness are connected with the truths which the author has endeavoured to enforce. . . . The aim of the author has been to speak to the whole community. . . . His book most admirably applies to persons of all conditions, and to every variety of situation."—*Quarterly Journal of Education, October 1834.*

"We should have been contented to have left the merits of this volume to the decision of journals whose more immediate province it is to discuss such matters; but, on looking over the book, we have found so much to interest us, and so much that is of importance to our readers to know, that we feel we should have neglected a duty had we omitted to recommend it to the public."—*Monthly Magazine.*

II.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF DIGESTION CONSIDERED WITH RELATION TO THE PRINCIPLES OF DIETETICS. By ANDREW COMBE, M.D., &c. Ninth Edition; Edited, and adapted to the Present State of Physiological and Chemical Science, by JAMES COXE, M.D. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—CHAP. I. GENERAL REMARKS ON WASTE, GROWTH, AND NUTRITION.—II. THE APPETITES OF HUNGER AND THIRST, AND THEIR USES.—III. GENERAL QUALITIES OF FOOD.—IV. MASTICATION, INSALIVATION, AND DEGLUTITION.—V. ORGANS OF DIGESTION: THE STOMACH AND ITS STRUCTURE.—VI. ORGANS CONCERNED IN INTESTINAL DIGESTION.—VII. AGENTS CONCERNED IN DIGESTION: THE GASTRIC JUICE, ITS PROPERTIES AND MODE OF ACTION.—VIII. CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR SECURING HEALTHY DIGESTION.—IX. TIMES OF EATING.—X. ON THE PROPER QUANTITY OF FOOD.—XI. CONDITIONS TO BE OBSERVED BEFORE AND AFTER EATING.—XII. THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF CONSTITUTION AND OF FOOD CONSIDERED WITH RELATION TO EACH OTHER.—XIII. ADAPTATION OF DIET TO CONSTITUTION, AGE, SEASON, AND MODE OF LIFE.—XIV. ON DRINKS.—XV. ON THE PROPER REGULATION OF THE BOWELS.

"To none of our readers, we trust, can it be necessary to say a word in recommendation of this excellent treatise; since we hope that every one of them is acquainted with the rare merit it possesses, as being one of the few books which may be read with pleasure and profit both by the public and the profession. To the former it is adapted by the simplicity and clearness with which the body of valuable information it contains is put forth; to the latter, it recommends itself by the scientific accuracy, sterling sense, and sound discrimination which pervade every portion of it, and which render it unsurpassed as a treatise on the principle of dietetics, by any works of more ambitious character.

"We learn from the advertisement to this edition, that shortly before his death Dr A. Combe expressed the wish that his nephew, Dr J. Coxé, should undertake that revision of his works which he saw it never would be in his power to effect; and the edition before us constitutes the first-fruits of that gentleman's editorial labours. We have great satisfaction in expressing our hearty approval of the manner in which he has performed them. . . . The additions made by Dr Coxé have reference chiefly to the composition and properties of different kinds of food, as determined by the more recent chemical researches; and they are, for the most part, in good keeping with the method and style of the original."—*British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review, January 1850.*

"Dr Combe seems to us to stand alone in the power which he possesses of imparting interest to the matters that employ his pen, without deviating from the sobriety and gravity proper to philosophic exposition."—*Spectator.*

"His physiological works are beyond all praise."—*Westminster Review.*

III.

A TREATISE ON THE PHYSIOLOGICAL AND MORAL MANAGEMENT OF INFANCY: Being a Practical Exposition of the Principles of Infant Training, for the Use of Parents. By ANDREW COMBE, M.D., &c. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—CHAP. I. GREAT MORTALITY IN INFANCY PRODUCED BY REMOVABLE CAUSES AND PARENTAL IGNORANCE.—II. INFANT HEALTH NOT THE RESULT OF ACCIDENT BUT OF FIXED LAWS.—III. INFLUENCE OF THE

CONDITION OF THE PARENTS ON THE HEALTH OF THE PROGENY.—IV. CONDITIONS IN THE MOTHER AFFECTING THE HEALTH OF THE FUTURE CHILD.—V. ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INFANT AT BIRTH.—VI. THE NURSERY, AND CONDITIONS REQUIRED IN IT.—VII. THE MANAGEMENT OF THE INFANT IMMEDIATELY AFTER BIRTH—WASHING AND DRESSING.—VIII. FOOD OF THE INFANT AT BIRTH.—IX. ON THE CHOICE, PROPERTIES, AND REGIMEN OF A NURSE.—X. ARTIFICIAL NURSING AND WEANING.—XI. CLEANLINESS, EXERCISE, AND SLEEP, IN EARLY INFANCY.—XII. MANAGEMENT OF THE INFANT DURING TEETHING.—XIII. MANAGEMENT FROM THE TIME OF WEANING TO THE END OF THE SECOND YEAR.—XIV. NATURE AND OBJECTS OF MORAL TRAINING IN INFANCY.—XV. THE MENTAL CONSTITUTION IN INFANCY.—XVI. PRACTICAL REMARKS ON THE MORAL MANAGEMENT OF INFANCY.

“After a careful perusal of this little volume from beginning to end, we do not hesitate to pronounce it to be one of the most valuable and most important works that has issued from the medical press for years. We make this statement in reference as well to the matter of the book as to the manner in which it is written, and also the probable extent to which it will be read. . . . Indeed we are persuaded, from long experience and observation, that there are few members of the profession who will not derive some benefit from this little work; while to young practitioners, and to all enlightened parents, it cannot fail to prove of inestimable value.”—*British and Foreign Medical Review*.

“It is beautifully clear and convincing.”—*Scotsman*.

“It is a work which will reveal clearly to any person of common understanding the main causes of health and sickness in children.”—*Westminster Review*.

“The very high character given by us on the appearance of the first edition, scarcely a year since, has been triumphantly confirmed by the profession and the public, as is proved by the demand for a second impression after so short a period. The volume was originally so complete that little room was left for improvement, and we believe the edition is substantially the same as the former. We feel it a duty to recommend Dr Combe's Treatise in the most earnest manner to all our readers, and, through them, to all fathers and mothers, as the best guide extant to the physical and moral management of infants.”—*British and Foreign Medical Review, July 1841*.

IV.

PHRENOLOGY—Its NATURE and USES: An Address to the Students of Anderson's University, Glasgow, at the opening of Dr WEIR's First Course of Lectures on Phrenology in that Institution. By ANDREW COMBE, M.D. 8vo, 6d.

V.

EXPERIMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE GASTRIC JUICE AND PHYSIOLOGY OF DIGESTION. By WILLIAM BEAUMONT, M.D., Surgeon to the United States Army. Reprinted, with Notes by ANDREW COMBE, M.D., &c. Post 8vo. Price 7s.

“We speak advisedly when we assert, that we know no more valuable contribution to physiology within our memory.”—*Dublin Medical Press*.

VI.

SELECTIONS FROM THE PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL, comprising Forty Articles in the first five volumes, chiefly by GEORGE COMBE, JAMES SIMPSON, and ANDREW COMBE, M.D. Edited by ROBERT COX. 12mo, 5s. 6d.

VII.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF RELIGION INTO COMMON SCHOOLS. By ANDREW COMBE, M.D., &c. (Extracted from his Life and Correspondence.) Price 2d.

VIII.

ESSAYS ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THEIR POLITICAL GUARANTIES. By E. P. HURLBUT, late one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. With a Preface and Notes by GEORGE COMBE. Royal 8vo, price 2s.

CONTENTS.—ORIGIN OF HUMAN RIGHTS.—TRUE FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT.—CONSTITUTION OF GOVERNMENT.—CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS.—ELECTIVE FRANCHISE.—RIGHTS EMANATING FROM THE SENTIMENTS AND AFFECTIONS.—RIGHTS OF WOMAN.—RIGHT OF PROPERTY, AND ITS MORAL RELATIONS.—INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—APPENDIX OF NOTES, BY G. COMBE.

IX.

THOUGHTS ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND THE TRUE MODE OF IMPROVING THE CONDITION OF MAN. By CHARLES CALDWELL M.D., Professor of the Institute of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence, Louisville, Kentucky. With a Recommendatory Preface by GEORGE COMBE. Second British Edition. Royal 8vo, price 1s.

“Dr Caldwell’s ‘Thoughts on Physical Education’ contains facts and principles of great interest to every parent and teacher, and is calculated to be highly useful in advancing the cause of rational education.”—*Dr A. Combe’s Physiology applied to Health and Education.*

“Dr Caldwell’s views are very judicious, and presented in such a form as to be intelligible to all.”—*Lancet.*

“We earnestly recommend to all who have children to educate, an attentive perusal of these ‘Thoughts.’”—*Analyst.*

“It is concise, luminous, and philosophical, and written throughout with energy and eloquence.”—*Glasgow Constitutional.*

“This work should be in the hands of every person intrusted with the education of children; it should be perused by every mother, and it will be read with instruction and advantage by thousands who hitherto fancied they had little to learn on the subject.”—*Edinburgh Chronicle.*

X.

MENTAL HYGIENE; or, an Examination of the Intellect and Passions, designed to illustrate their Influence on Health and the Duration of Life. By WILLIAM SWEETSER, M.D., late Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physic, and Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Royal 8vo, price 1s. 6d.

WORKS BY GEORGE COMBE.

I. THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF ANDREW COMBE, M.D. In one vol. 8vo, with a Portrait, pp. 563. Price 14s.

“In whatever frame of mind the reader opens the above memoir, whether of simple curiosity or friendly interest, it may safely be predicted that he will close it with feelings of admiration akin to reverence; for the history it contains is one that appeals to all hearts and needs no peculiar gifts of intellect or knowledge fully to comprehend and appreciate it. It contains the portrait of an upright, manly, and thoroughly well-balanced mind, gifted with a singularly clear and comprehensive intellect, and animated by a benevolence so lofty and so ardent that it overcame all difficulties, vanquished all infirmities, and shone as clear through the last hours of failing strength, as in those bright moments of anticipated achievements, when we see nothing of our intended enterprises but their expected results.”—*Scotsman*, 1st May 1850.

II. THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN Considered in Relation to External Objects. By GEORGE COMBE. Post 8vo, pp. 507, price 8s., *Eighth Edition*; and also “*The People’s Edition*,” in royal 8vo, pp. 111, double columns, price 1s. 6d. This work has gone through six editions in America, and been translated into French, German, and Swedish. Ninety thousand copies of it have been printed in Great Britain and Ireland.

“A work of great originality—abounding with valuable information, and reasonings the most admirable; conveyed in a style so plain as to be level to the meanest capacity, and yet so eloquent, from the force of its arguments, as to go home equally to the understandings of the most illiterate and the most learned.”—*Courier*.

“This work we regard as a contribution of high value to the philosophy of man; and though the author modestly states in his preface that it contains few or no ideas which may not be found elsewhere, we persist in thinking that it is one of the most original books produced in modern times.”—*Scotsman*.

“Such writers as Combe on the Constitution of Man convey to the world more useful information, and a greater stimulus to thought on the subject of Providence, as developed in the operation of material laws, and in the laws of mind and the history of society, than are to be reaped from the labours of ecclesiastical teachers.”—*W. J. Fox*.

“I have been instructed by your views of the laws of our nature, and of the connection between our obedience to them and our happiness. . . . I was particularly gratified by the earnestness with which you insist on the supremacy of the moral faculties, and point out the inevitable miseries which society is to endure until this fundamental principle be recognised by the individual and the community.”—*W. E. Channing, D.D.*

III. MORAL PHILOSOPHY: or, the Duties of Man considered in his Individual, Domestic, and Social Capacities. *Second Edition*. In 12mo, pp. 440, price 7s. 6d. *Same work*, royal 8vo, pp. 116, price 2s.

CONTENTS:—I. ON THE FOUNDATION OF MORAL SCIENCE.—II. ON THE SANCTION BY WHICH THE NATURAL LAWS OF MORALITY ARE SUPPORTED.—III. ADVANTAGES OF A KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS: DUTIES PRESCRIBED TO MAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL: SELF-CULTURE.—IV. PRESERVING BODILY AND MENTAL HEALTH, A MORAL DUTY: AMUSEMENTS.—V. THE DUTIES OF MAN AS A DOMESTIC BEING.—VI. ON POLYGAMY: FIDELITY TO THE MARRIAGE VOW: DIVORCE: DUTIES OF PARENTS TO THEIR CHILDREN.—VII. IT IS THE DUTY OF PARENTS TO EDUCATE THEIR CHILDREN.—VIII. THEORY OF PHILOSOPHERS RESPECTING THE ORIGIN OF SOCIETY.—IX. X., and XI., ON THE PAST, PRESENT, AND PROSPECTIVE CONDITIONS OF SOCIETY.—XII. PAUPERISM AND CRIME.—XIII. TREATMENT OF CRIMINALS CONTINUED.—XIV. DUTY OF SOCIETY IN REGARD TO THE TREATMENT OF CRIMINALS.—XV. DUTIES OF GUARDIANS, SURETIES, JURORS, AND ARBITRATORS.—XVI. GOVERNMENT.—XVII. DIFFERENT FORMS OF GOVERNMENT.—XVIII. and XIX. RELIGIOUS DUTIES OF MAN.—XX. OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.—APPENDIX.

“I refer to your Outlines of Moral Philosophy. Your opinions on this point of science seem to me very valuable. With many of them I entirely accord.”—*W. E. Channing, D.D.*

IV. A SYSTEM OF PHRENOLOGY. *Fifth Edition, revised* by James Coxe, M.D., 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 1037, with 4 plates and about 70 woodcuts. Price 15s. This work has been reprinted in the United States, and translated into French and German. It presents a full view of the science of Phrenology and its applications.

V. ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY. *Seventh Edition*, proved and enlarged; 12mo, pp. 225, with plates and 42 cuts on wood. Price 3s. 6d.

VI. OUTLINES OF PHRENOLOGY. 8vo, pp. 33. *Second Edition*. Illustrated by engravings on wood. Price 1s.

VII. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CEREBELLUM, by GALL, VIMONT, and BROUSSAIS; translated from the French by GEORGE COMBE. In one vol. 8vo, pp. 390. Price 8s.

VIII. LECTURES ON POPULAR EDUCATION. pp. 82. *Third Edition*, corrected and enlarged. Price 1s. 8d.

IX. NOTES (Moral, Religious, Political, Economical, Educational, and Phrenological) on the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. 3 vols. post 8vo, £1, 11s. 6d.

PAMPHLETS BY GEORGE COMBE.

X. REMARKS ON NATIONAL EDUCATION. 8vo, pp. 38. *Fourth Edition*. Price 6d.

XI. WHAT SHOULD SECULAR EDUCATION EMBRACE? 8vo, pp. 36. Price 6d.

XII. ANSWER TO THE ATTACK ON "THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN" by the Rev. C. J. KENNEDY, sanctioned by "The Society for Opposing Prevalent Errors." 8vo, pp. 15. Price 3d.

XIII. THOUGHTS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT. 8vo, pp. 16. Price 3d.

XIV. FOUR ADDRESSES ON SECULAR UNSECTARIAN EDUCATION; one delivered to a Meeting of the Working-Classes in Edinburgh on the 21st of January; one in Glasgow on the 18th of March; a third in Aberdeen on the 25th of April; and a fourth in Edinburgh on 25th November 1851. Price 1d. each, or free by post 3d. each.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

