



TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

No. I, ON THE SABBATH AND ITS DUE OBSERVANCE

*Reprinted from the "Hawke's Bay Herald":—
September—December 1878*

"These (men of Beria) were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they searched the Scriptures daily (to see) whether those things (advanced by Paul) were so."—*ACTS*, xvii. 11.

"It was better to have no 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"—*BACON*, *Essay* 17.

"Every one truth is connected with every other truth in the great Universe of God. Therefore to accept as a truth that which is not a truth is an evil having consequences which are indeed incalculable. There are subjects on which one mistake of this kind will poison all the wells of truth, and affect with fatal error the whole circle of our thoughts."—*DUKE OF ARGYLL*, *Reign of Love*, p.54–5.

NAPIER
PRINTED BY DINWIDDIE, MORRISON & CO, TENNYSON STREET
MDCCCLXXXIII



This edition published electronically in September 2018 by the Colenso Society,
32 Hawkestone St, Wellington as a supplement to *eColenso* ISSN 1179-8351.

A FEW THOUGHTS AND FACTS

CONCERNING

“THE SABBATH”

AND

ITS DUE OBSERVANCE

By William Colenso

(REPRINTED FROM “THE HAWKE’S BAY HERALD”)

“Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”—JESUS.

Speak thou the TRUTH. Let others fence,
And trim their words for pay;
In pleasant sunshine of pretence
Let others bask their day.

Guard thou the FACT: though clouds of night
Down on thy watch-tower stoop;
Though thou shouldst see thine heart’s delight
Borne from thee by their swoop.

Face thou the WIND. Though safer seem
In Shelter to abide,
We were not made to sit and dream
The safe must first be tried.”

A FEW THOUGHTS AND FACTS CONCERNING "THE SABBATH" AND ITS DUE OBSERVANCE.

"I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say."—*Paul.*

I. INTRODUCTORY.

IN your issue of September 9th, you give a pretty full and clear account of a sermon preached the day before by the Rev. D. Sidey in the Presbyterian Church, Napier, on "Sabbath Observance." I trust, therefore, you will allow me the like courtesy of giving publicity to a few of my thoughts (or matured convictions) on this subject in your columns. I wish to make them public for several reasons. Before, however, that I briefly give those reasons, I would say,—that I have greatly desired to make known what I believe on this head in a series of lectures in Napier, admission free; where I should have more scope, and where what I should state could be taken down (by Mr Harding or some other equally competent writer), and, if approved of by my audience, printed: and did I belong to any one Public Denomination among us, I think I should have done so. Now my reasons for making known my convictions on this subject, are, (1) I believe, that whatever knowledge any man has gained, —whether by enquiry, experiment, travel, good luck, study, deep research, or experience, in whatever branch of Science or knowledge, — that he should not keep it locked-up in his own breast, but should seek to make it known to his fellow-men (2) especially if he reasonably believes such to be for their future welfare: (3) more particularly so, if (as in my own case) he should be nearing the allotted "three score years and ten" of man. To such a person and at such a time, the wise saying of the ancients is most appropriate and should act as a spur, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work nor

device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." (4) Further, I utterly disbelieve that unreasonable remark, which we so often hear, viz, that things of great—or of momentous—interest to mankind,— things popularly believed as more pertaining to the soul and to a future state of being, (generally lumped together as "religious matters,") should not be entered on in the columns of a newspaper! Why not? Can this be reasonably answered? For my own part I verily believe, that it would be far better for us all, if more of truth of science of reason and of *true* religion were taken up in all our papers in a proper spirit,—especially in those which are looked upon as family Papers. And so with theatres and theatrical performances; these should be sought to be raised from their present low standard (especially here in Napier), by the reasonable and intelligent and by the religious portions of the community uniting and endeavoring to do so. For do what we may, man will have amusements as well as instruction,—such are natural to him and cannot be abolished. Let such, however, who oppose this view (and, no doubt, there are some who do so, as they believe, conscientiously, religiously,) let such just quietly ask themselves the question,—Where did Jesus, and, after him, his disciples, teach and make known their views and opinions? Was it not the streets and highways, in the desert and on the mountain, in the houses of the Pharisees and in the courts of the temple, in the village of Mary and Martha and at the grave of Lazarus, by the pool of Siloam and the sea of

Galilee, on land or on the water, on Mar's hill at Athens or in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus,—wherever “a multitude” was found to listen, among whom were, sometimes, a few followers, but always plenty of enemies and scoffers. As then, so now. Principles have not altered, these are permanent; outward things, such as rules and methods, have, these are changing. Can it be reasonably supposed, that if the art—the great Science—of Printing, with all its advantages and blessings, was then known,—and if Jesus and his disciples knew how to write for the Press, that they would not have done so? Sure I am, that he,—one of the greatest of Reformers and a true Protestant,—would have done so gladly, if he could have found any Jewish Editor of a Paper willing to print his articles. Neither Jesus nor his followers would have entertained such a thought for a moment, as that his teachings—even the holiest and highest—could be lowered or contaminated by being published to the world in the columns of a newspaper. Such a notion was the very antagonistic opposite of all his and their teaching. And why? Because Great is truth and must prevail. Indeed he had early said to his followers “What ye hear in the ear” (from me, when we are alone, or it may be travelling together,) “proclaim upon the housetops,”—as an Oriental Muezzin or public crier;—or, in other and modern words,—Make known through the *Daily Press*.—

The great Jewish doctor Ebn Ezra said, —“God has given the Law to men of intelligence only, and those who have no intelligence have no Law.” (This saying involves a beautiful principle.) Most intelligent men have their own peculiar studies, their own particular knowledge; indeed, this, in a higher or lower degree, belongs to all craftsmen and trades. Hence, with our fathers, in order to secure it to their children, the 7 years apprenticeship. Now without boasting (all such ill becomes *me*.) I may perhaps he allowed to say, that there

are a few (and only a few) things, (during a long and active life, of which I trust I know a little, viz.:—

1. The Polynesian language, and, in particular, the Maori dialect.
2. The Botany of New Zealand.
3. This subject of the Sabbath (and with it two or three other kindred matters).

And therefore it is, as I have said before, that I wish to make known what little I have gained on this head—of the Sabbath.

And if any one among us should still be inclined to ask, (1) How should I particularly know such a subject? my answer must be, Because I have for *many years* painfully and closely studied it, in all its bearings, and with the help of every aid. And if the further question should arise,—(2) Do you think you understand it better and know it more than the Rev. D. Sidey, or the Rev. Mr. Irvine, or the Rev. Messrs Oliver and Lockwood, or Archdeacon Williams, or even Bishop Stuart? My quiet answer must be (if I am to speak what I believe to be the truth)—YES: (1) Because I have, as I have already said, made it my *particular* study,—having had ample means, in desire, time, books, and opportunity, which all those persons have not so largely possessed: (2) Because I am older: and (3) Because I am, (thank GOD!) set free from all Denominational and Ecclesiastical bias and prejudice,—rules, or “blinkers.” Did I not thus firmly believe I were an ass to undertake to write upon this subject.

And, lest any one should deem me to be boasting (a thing I hate), let me add,—Just look at our English Surgeons, or Physicians; they are all alike “Doctors” yet one has paid extra attention to diseases of the ear,—and is, therefore, an acknowledged Aurist; another to those of the eye,—and is, therefore, an Oculist; another to Midwifery,—and is, therefore, looked-up to in all such matters; now all these are alike “Doctors,” yet each possesses his own peculiar skill and knowledge in that *which*

he made his particular branch of study. While, to the churchman, in addition, I would also say,—bear in mind the words of the Poet (not David) in the 119 Psalm (v. 99, 100),—“I am wiser than my enemies; I have more understanding than all my teachers.” On which verses Canon Perowne, in his new translation of the Psalms (2nd Edition), strikingly remarks,—“The teachers whom he has outstript may have been those whose disciple he once was;—or he may refer to authorized teachers, to whom he listened because they sat in Moses’ seat, though he felt that they had really nothing to teach him.” (*Verb. sap.*)

I purpose, then, prosecuting my subject thus:—

1. Introductory.
2. Historically.
3. Ecclesiastically.
4. Reasonably (including, (1) Theologically, and (2) Humanly).
5. Concluding Remarks.

I cannot close this first, or Introductory part of my subject better, than in the glowing words of a true man and a great mod-

ern writer—EMERSON: whose name, I am happy in knowing, will be perpetuated here in Napier. He says,—“There is a persuasion in the soul of man that he is here for cause, that he was put down in this place by the Creator to do the work for which He inspires him, that thus he is an overmatch for all antagonists that could combine against him.— — Napoleon said well, “My hand is immediately connected with my head;” but the sacred courage is connected with the heart. The head is a half, a fraction, until it is enlarged and inspired by the moral sentiment. For it is not the means on which we draw, as health or wealth, practical skill or dexterous talent, or multitudes of followers, that count, but the aims only. The aim reacts back on the means. A great aim aggrandises the means. The meal and water that are the commissariat of the *forlorn hope* that stake their lives to defend the pass are sacred as the Holy Grail, or as if one had eyes to see in chemistry the fuel that is rushing to feed the Sun.”

II. HISTORICALLY.

(*Before the Birth of Christ.*)

HERE, one great difficulty presents itself at the very threshold, namely, the popular opinion respecting the Bible. I call it, the popular opinion; and yet it may not quite amount to that. Be this as it may, it is that notion, that the Bible is peculiarly one book,—comprising an entirety or complete whole in itself; that as such it is also the only Revelation, or direct Word of God to man. I can very well understand how ready some good folks are to bristle up, and to shew fight, at even the bare mention of a doubt of such being the case; and I can make every allowance for them, aye, and sympathise with them,—for I once so believed and so acted myself. And I did

not readily give in, either,—until long (oh! very long) and painful and prayerful research and study brought me to see clearly that such a position was no longer tenable,—*could not*, in fact, *be any longer truthfully held or supported*,—and so I was obliged to give in, after contesting every position inch by inch. But have I, as a Christian, really lost any truth,—any good thing, thereby? No, by no means; very far from it, as I hope to shew in the end. This much, however, in passing, I will here say, that the Sacred Volume,—notwithstanding its unhistorical character, its variance with scientific certainties, its discrepancies, and contradictions,—the more it is studied the

more Divine it seems, the more full of real support and solid comfort for the soul of man.

I must, however, remind my reasonable and thoughtful readers,—to consider (briefly) a few needful facts respecting the Bible.—

(1) It is a volume containing writings made by many and different writers extending over a period of several hundred years.

(2) That many of the several separate books themselves were not written by a single individual, but by several persons, and that, too, from time to time; and that the writers of many of those books are wholly unknown.

(3) That, in addition to what Protestants know as the Old and the New Testaments, there are also the ancient books called (by them) “the Apocrypha,”—in which, however, are to be found some Divine passages, as much so as any we read in the Canonical writings; which are received alike with the other books by both the extensive Roman and Greek Christian Churches,—comprising, by far, the larger part of Christendom.

(4) That at the time of the Jewish captivity under Nebuchadnezzar (600 years before Christ), their sacred books had been burnt, and that thus the Jews account for their reproduction.—

This tradition stands recorded in the second book of Esdras, where Esdras, or Ezra, is introduced as saying, “*Thy Law is burnt*: therefore no man knoweth the things that are done of Thee, or the works that shall begin. But, if I have found grace before Thee, send the Holy Ghost into me, and I shall write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning, which were written in Thy Law; that men may find Thy path, and that they, which live in the latter days, may live.” And Ezra further says that his prayer was heard, and he received a command to retire into a

private place with five men, “ready to write swiftly, and many tables of box-wood to write upon.—And they sat forty days, and they wrote in the day what he told them, and at night they ate bread.”

In this way Ezra is supposed, in the tradition of the Jews of that age, to have recovered the very identical words of the Pentateuch. And several of the ancient fathers of the Early Christian Church seemed to have fully believed this strange story. Thus Clement of Alexandria says

“When the Scriptures had been destroyed in the captivity of Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Artaxerxes the King of the Persians, Esdras the priest, having become inspired, renewed again and produced prophetically all the ancient Scriptures.”—

And Irenæus says:—

“In the time of Artaxerxes, the King of the Persians, He inspired Eadras the priest to set in order again all the words of the former prophets, and restore to the people the legislation by Moses.”

And Jerome says:—

“Whether you choose to say that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, or Esdras the renewer of the work, I make no objection.”

But the truth is, that we know nothing certainly about this. Here I will briefly quote from *The Bible and its Interpreters*, by the learned Dr. Irons, Prebendary of St. Paul’s, London; he says, “There is no proof that Ezra did it.” And even if we allow that Ezra did all which is ascribed to him, yet then, as Dr. Irons justly observes, — “It is on the gifts and inspiration of the transcribers in Ezra’s day, that we are really depending,—gifts and inspiration, which yet are a mere hypothesis, of which the possessors tell us no single word! And before Ezra’s day we are thus owning, unmistakably, that the literary history of the Old Testament is lost! Let all those, who would identify this with God’s entire Reve-

lation, see to what they have brought us?"

But, I would say, let us not do this. For, while I agree entirely with this author—that “a more hopeless, carnal, and eventually sceptical position, it is impossible to conceive,” than that “which identifies the Written Word with God’s only Revelation” of Himself to man,—and because I believe it to be so unsound and dangerous,—I will do my best, God helping me, to show you “a more excellent way.”

To return:—the first direct mention of the Sabbath in the Old Testament as a rule to man, is at the giving of the Manna to the Israelites in the Wilderness (Ex. 16.). Shortly after, however, we have it more fully stated as a Law among the ten Commandments given on Mount Sinai (Ex. 20). And here let me call your particular attention to *the reason* assigned for so keeping the Sabbath:—“For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: *therefore* the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.” This, however, is very differently given in Deuteronomy (5. 15),—“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.” And note further, that *both* statements are equally said to be the very words of God, and to have been engraved by Him in stone.

How is this great discrepancy to be reasonably accounted for?

Did Moses really write those 5 Books called the Pentateuch?

In our *English* translation they are termed the first (second, or third, &c.) Book of Moses, but that is an addition, such not being in the original. Such, however, may mean *about Moses*; just as the Books of Samuel, Job, Esther, &c., are

about them, and were not written by them.

It is highly doubtful if the first four were written by Moses; and it is all but absolutely certain the 5th. (or Deuteronomy) was never written by him.

If Moses wrote the *first* account of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai (in Exodus), is it possible that he could have forgotten what was then said when he wrote the *second* account (in Deuteronomy)? and so set down contrary words, and say, that God uttered them? If Moses did not forget, could he have dared to alter them? And, if he either forgot, or dared to alter,—what becomes of the so-called inspiration, the Infallibility, the entire truthfulness of the story? But if, as I have said above, the book of Deuteronomy was *not* written by Moses, then we can see clearly how another person, writing some hundreds of years after, could thus write; *provided that he did not himself regard the 10 Commandments in their original form as Mosaic and Divine and therefore inexpressibly holy*; for if he did, then he could no more have dared to change them than Moses himself. Moreover, if such a Commandment concerning the Sabbath was so given—amid earthquakes and thunderings and lightnings—and with the penalty of death recorded for doing any work, or even kindling a fire in any house (Ex. 31. 15) on the Sabbath-day, how comes it to pass that the Sabbath was not observed by the Jews? Especially with that dreadful story in Numbers (15), of the man found gathering sticks in the wilderness on the Sabbath-day having been put to death, and that sentence too as being immediately pronounced by the Lord!

But who can possibly believe that such a command as that ever proceeded from the Ever-Blessed God? a command, too, which would appear to have been powerless to prevent the Evil, which it proposed to cure,—which did not hinder the people at large from defiling the Sabbath with

pollutions infinitely worse than that of gathering a few sticks for a fire,—“Your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot away with: *Your hands are full of blood.*” (Is. 1.) And what a noble work is that of Modern Biblical Criticism, which enables us to regard the Bible with true reverence, as containing the words of a Divine Revelation, with out therefore maintaining that it has been supernaturally protected from all the defects and faults of human productions,—which relieves the character of God our Heavenly Father, from the dark stains, which such narratives as these must in any reflecting mind attach to it, if believed to be divinely-guaranteed statements of infallible truth! For here, in this very story we have a proof that it was not written by Moses.—The words are, “*While the children of Israel were in the wilderness,*”—how could those words be written by Moses, who never came out of the wilderness, who “died there in the land of Moab”?

But now, with respect to the Jewish Sabbath, it is very noticeable that, except in the Pentateuch itself, where the laws are thickly laid down for its observance, as an express Divine Institution, there are no signs of its having ever been kept with strictness, or of any attempt having been made, by the most pious Kings or prophets, to enforce the keeping of it, before the time of King Josiah,—that is shortly before the Babylonish Captivity. On the contrary, in the very few passages in which the Sabbath is mentioned at all, it is put upon the same level as the day of the “new moon.” Not at all as having any peculiar honour,—as having been enjoined by express Divine authority amidst the terrors of Sinai. Thus, in the affecting story of Elisha and the Shunammite mother, whose child was dead, she determines to “run to the man of God, and come again.” Upon which her husband says, “Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither *New Moon* nor Sabbath.” (From which story it may

also be fairly inferred, that they commonly *rode* on the Sabbath.) So, also, the prophet Isaiah (i. 13, 15); Amos (viii. 4, 5); and Hosea (ii. 11.) Again, in the book of Chronicles,—a book written after the return of the Jews from the Captivity, (or 1000 years after Moses,)—brief mention is made of the Sabbath but always with the new moons and feasts; but great care must be exercised in using this book. Here I will briefly quote from Dr. Irons:—“The writer of the book of Chronicles gives us certain statements of the authorities referred to for the history of his people. But he does not say who was authorised to draw up the summaries of the story, which now are called ‘Books of Samuel,’ and ‘Kings,’ or his own ‘Chronicles.’ In fact, the writings of Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Ahija, Shemaiah, Iddo, Azariah, Hanani, Jehu, Elijah, and Chosai, and the Chronicles of Isaiah and others (all referred to as the *literary* basis of the National History), *have perished without exception.* The outlines which survive are by another hand and *have been drawn with a design of their own.* Nothing can exceed the plainness, with which the sacred author of the Chronicles acknowledges that *they, who seek mere History, must look for it elsewhere.* He is writing for another purpose.... The results are simply and undeniably these —that after the Jewish Captivity in Babylon (within a hundred years of that event) the merely *historical*, as distinct from the *sacred*, records of their nation—having no doubt been examined—*disappear*; and the *religious* Books, called Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, are *found in their present form.*”

The two books of Chronicles, in a very great part of their contents, are not historically true,—they are written, as Dr. Irons says, “with a design of their own;” and that “design” is, evidently, to blot out as much as possible from the earlier history of the people, as it is written in the older Books

of Samuel and Kings, the plain signs which those Books exhibit, that the Law of Moses—the laws of the Pentateuch—were habitually disregarded by the very best of the Kings of Judah, and to represent them as in force all along. Now this fact—that of the unhistorical character of the narrative in the Chronicles—is one of the greatest importance, therefore it is that I so dwell upon it. For you cannot possibly acquire a clear idea of the real History of Israel, (from the time of the conquest of Canaan down to the Captivity,) unless your minds are disabused of the traditional notion, as to the infallible accuracy of every line and letter in the History of the Chronicler, while yet his statements repeatedly contradict the statements of the older Books and even his own. You may easily satisfy yourselves on this point, by merely reading your Bible, carefully, with open eyes and clear understandings, employing a Bible with the marginal references and making use of them.

You will find that the Chronicler never gives a hint of David's sins of adultery and murder,—nor of Solomon's taking many heathen wives, and of their turning away his heart from the Living God: he says nothing of Solomon going after "Ashtaroth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites,"—of his "building a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon."

Again, the writer of the Book of Kings tolls us that "Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, walked in all the sins of his father, which he had done before him, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God" (1 K 15),—and mentions only that "there was war between Abijah and Jeroboam" (v. 7);—but the Chronicler, writing centuries afterwards, says not a word about Abijah's wickedness, but makes him

lead out a host of "400,000 chosen men" against 800,000 chosen men of Jeroboam, mighty men of valour." Abijah is then described (by the Chronicler,) as addressing this immense host of 800,000 men in most pious language, declaring that in Judah the Law was strictly obeyed;—and calling on them not to fight against God. However, they did fight, and in this one battle, we are told, Abijah's 400,000 warriors slew of Jeroboam's 800,000,— "five hundred thousand chosen men." (2 Chron. xiii.)

Now let me here call your attention (1) to the actual size of these two petty kingdoms, which, together, formed what is called the Holy Land. (As many, I know, have not yet considered this.) Those two kingdoms together, were not so large as the small tract of country extending from Napier to Cape Palliser, and from the Ruahine mountain range to the sea. While that of Judah, alone could be comprised between Napier and Takapau. (2) The total loss of the Allied army in the great and memorable battle of Waterloo, including "British, Germans, Hanoverians, Brunswickers, Prussians, and Belgians," was 4,172 men. (From *Alison*.)

Thus, once more, the Chronicler tells us, (1 ch. xxiii.) that when David was old the Levites were numbered, 38,000,—of whom 24,000 were to set forward the work of the House of Jehovah, 6,000 were officers and judges, 4,000 were gatekeepers, 4,000 choristers;—that is, he reckons 24,000 ministering Levites, 4,000 gatekeepers, and 4,000 choristers, for a small tent, probably not so large as one of our own Napier churches, just exactly half the size of the Temple of Solomon, and might hold, if crowded, perhaps, 300 people! He also tells us of *one* Levite family, in which there were "2700 chief fathers and 1,700 officers"—altogether 4,400 rulers.—out of one single family of the tribe of Levi! Possibly the key to all this (and

much more of the same kind) is, that *he was a Levite himself*:—there is a great deal in Chronicles in support of this.

But I forbear. I have brought forward all this (long known to me), to show you how the truth stands in respect to the Books of Chronicles; and you will find much more of the same kind for yourselves, *if you will only thoughtfully read the narrative and compare it with what is written in other places.*

In the after times however of the history of Israel, we find the later prophets—Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the later Isaiah—laying great stress upon the observance of the Sabbath as the sign of Jehovah's covenant with Israel; and so, too, in the Book of Nehemiah, written after the return from the Captivity, we find mention made of Jehovah having "made known unto them his holy Sabbath," and of strenuous efforts being made to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath by labor and traffic. (N. ix., xiii.)

[Here I must remind my readers that this "later Isaiah," (or the unknown prophet, whoever he was that wrote the last 27 chapters of the present Book of Isaiah,) must not be confounded with the older and former Isaiah, who wrote the earlier portion of the Book which goes by his name; the former was contemporary with Hezekiah (B.C. 710): the later Isaiah lived some 200 years after,—after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar; (as a proof, see Is. 64, 10, 11: 63, 18 :) and it is from him that we have some of the most beautiful utterances in the Old Testament.]

That very ancient Book of the Jews, the Talmud, (in general use long before the birth of Jesus,) contains, as might be expected, several excellent remarks concerning the Sabbath, together with many rules for its observance. The learned and unprejudiced modern *Jew* Commentator Dr. Kalisch, says,— "The Talmud distin-

guishes 39 chief labours which are forbidden on the Sabbath; but in cases of illness, and in any, oven the remotest, danger, a deviation from the rigorous precepts is permitted; and in general were those principles followed,— "The Sabbath is delivered into your hand, not you into the hand of the Sabbath:" and, "The least danger of life invalidates the Sabbath." (Talmud, *Mishna Joma*.) Further, Dr. Kalisch says, "that the Sabbath was a day of holy assembly; but it was also a day of recreation of joy and of convivial meetings." (Pointing out Luke 14. 1, 12.) "Fasting was expressly forbidden."

Having mentioned the *Talmud*, and given the foregoing striking quotation from it, (which will serve to remind my readers of Mark ii. 27, 28,) and as the Book itself is so very little known among us, I am tempted to make a few more quotations, which may also serve a similar purpose.—

The Talmud denounces swearing, or oath-taking, and recommends "a simple Yes Yes, or No."

"Do not to others what you would not have others do to you."

"A single light answers as well for a hundred men as for one."

"The place honours not the man, 'tis the man who gives honour to the place."

"Deem nothing impossible."

"Man sees the mote in his neighbour's eye, but knows not of the beam in his own."

"First learn, and then teach."

"Charity is greater than all,—is more than sacrifices."

"Who gives charity (alms) in secret is greater than Moses."

"The Bible was given us to establish peace."

"He who raises his hand against his fellow in a passion is a sinner."

"God allows the poor to be with us

ever, that the opportunities for doing good may never fail.”

“When our ancestors in the wilderness were saved from death by gazing upon the brazen serpent, it was not the serpent which killed or preserved. it was the trustful appeal to the Father in heaven.”

“The men of Nineveh believed in God’s mercy, and though the decree had been pronounced against them, yet they repented; therefore, neither sack-cloth nor fasting will gain forgiveness, but repentance of the heart and good deeds.”

There are also numerous parables, and similar stories, strongly reminding one of those later ones of the New Testament.

In these later times, then, of the history of Israel, the Sabbath was kept with great strictness, by some devout men, as Nehemiah, and by others who, like the Pharisees, made a great profession of religion, but substituted too often outward observances like this for the inward service of the heart which God delights in. But in earlier days we find no trace of this spirit,—no sign that the Sabbath was put on a higher level than the New Moon. And this fact is accounted for, when we find that the first copy of the Decalogue, as well as the second, dates from a late age in the history of Judah,—that it was never really binding on the Jews, as the traditionary view supposes, as having been uttered by the Divine Voice, under a tremendous sanction, from the top of Sinai. Let us now consider what Nature also teaches us as to the duty or the wisdom of setting apart one day in seven.— And here I will first quote the words of that eminent Jewish scholar upon this point (Dr Kalisch, already mentioned, in his Commentary on Genesis):— “The simple and obvious explanation of the holiness of the number seven is, that the Ancient Israelites, as most of the Eastern nations, counted originally their months

after the course of the Moon, which renews itself in four quarters of seven days each, and after this time assumes a new phase These periodical and extraordinary changes of the Moon produced a powerful impression upon the susceptible minds of the ancient nations: they excited them to reflections on this wonderful phenomenon, and every thing connected with it assumed in their eyes a peculiar significance. Hence the day of the *New Moon* was generally celebrated with some distinguishing solemnity, which, like all festivals, is regulated and fixed in the Mosaic Law; and the New Moon is, in the Old Testament, frequently mentioned with the Sabbath.... But the division of the week into seven days was known and adopted by the most different nations, as the Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, Peruvians, (hut not the Persians,) and many African and American tribes, which never came into intercourse with the Israelites, and later by the Greeks and Romans, who followed the Egyptians. We must therefore recognise therein, not an exclusively theocratical, but a general astronomical arrangement, which offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of every people.”

And Similarly, the ancient Talmud:— “In ancient times the men called ‘wise’ placed their faith and dependence upon the planets. They divided these into seven, apportioning one to each day of the week. Some nations selected for their greatest god the sun, other nations the moon, and so on, and prayed to them, and worshipped them. They knew not that the planets moved and changed according to the course of nature, established by the Most High, a course which he might change according to His will, and into their ignorant ideas many of the Israelites had entered. Therefore, as they considered the planets as seven, God made many other things depending on that number, to show that as he made them, so had He

made the planets. The seventh day of the week he made the Sabbath."

In this way, then, the seven days' week appears to have originated, among so many different nations in all parts of the Earth; by their common observation of the time, which it takes for the moon to pass from one of her chief phases to another, which interval is to all appearance seven days, though in reality a fraction more. In this way originating the seven-days' week may justly be said to be an institution of the Law of Nature, and therefore one of Divine appointment. We no longer suppose that the Creation of the work took place in six days, with successive outward Divine utterances, as described in the first chapter of Genesis. Yet for all this, and notwithstanding that the Hebrew writer may have held mistaken notions about the time, manner, order, of the creation,—about the nature, magnitude, and distances of the Sun, Moon, and Stars,—he discerned the eternal underlying truth when he wrote, "And God said,"—"said," not with outward audible utterance, on the fourth day of the Creation, hut said in the depth of the Divine Mind, conceived in eternity as a Divine Idea, and expressed in time by that Divine Word, "by which all things were made,"—"Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and for years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth and it was so." The day, then, is given to us by Nature, and therefore by Nature's God, for labour, and the night for rest. And so is it with regard to the week and the weekly rest.

Further: it is true the lunar month, in which the Moon goes through her different phases, consists really of 29 days, so that from one chief phase to another would be a fraction more than seven days. Still with rude nations this difference

would not be noticed. And, "that the seven days' week really originated among as many different nations in all parts of the earth from watching the phases of the Moon, is indicated by the fact that the Peruvians not only divide the lunar month into halves and quarters by the Moon's phases, but they have also a period of nine days, the approximate third part of a lunation, thus showing the common origin of both, and so the Romans had the ninth day of the month, which was a holiday even for slaves, and the Greek lunar month, consisting alternately of 29 and 30 days, was divided into sets of ten days. (Prof. Baden Powell, *Christianity without Judaism*.)

So, also, Dr. Hessey in his Bampton Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford; he says:—"To what, it may be asked, is the division of time by weeks of seven days to be traced? I answer, without hesitation, to man's observation of those 'lights in the firmament of heaven,' which God placed there to divide the day from the night,' and of which He said further, 'Let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years.' It required *no special revelation* to direct men to these, as convenient indicators of time. The course of the Moon, and especially the appearance of the New Moon, would suggest a division, roughly stated, of months of twenty eight days. This, perhaps, would be the first and most prevalent division. It certainly was all but a universal one; for it is found even where weeks were alone unknown, and where they are still unknown,—among the aborigines of the New World.— — — — Our purpose is merely to show that a septenary division of time might have suggested itself to man's reason, acting upon the luminaries, which we find God's Providence intended for his guidance in such matters; without any special revelation, much less any hint of the Sabbath being necessarily implied in the

existence of such a division.”

Another able writer observes, on this point:—“The phases of the Moon supply a familiar mark of time to the simplest and rudest nations,—the phenomena of the new and full Moon, especially, being such that men cannot fail to notice and employ them as the natural rule of their calendar. And, if a two-fold division of the month is thus a matter of necessity to ordinary observation, a four-fold division also is at least inevitably suggested by the Moon’s intermediate phase.—Thus we have the week of seven days. It is almost impossible, then, to avoid the conclusion to which we are pointing, when once we have discarded (as the majority of thoughtful men have consented to discard) the notion of an actual six-day’s period of creation. So long as that notion was maintained indeed, and was considered as a necessary part of religious belief, we could respect and even sympathise with the fixed determination to see nothing in the facts we have referred to beyond a singular coincidence. But now that we perceive ourselves both permitted and compelled to regard the seven Mosaic days as a figure of speech, an accommodation to some previously existing mode of thought, we are prepared to listen in a totally different attitude of mind to what reason and history have to say.” (Quoted in Cox’s *Literature of the Sabbath Question*, i. p.290.)

Yes:—no doubt that is true. That “the week of seven days,” was really the object of the weekly Sabbath among the Hebrews is still more plain from the fact that the New Moon was—at least in the olden times—regarded by them as a more important day than the ordinary Sabbath, and accordingly, in addition to the usual daily sacrifice, the Levitical Law provides a “burnt-offering” on *the New Moon* of “two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs,” with a kid for a sin-offering,—whereas on *the Sabbath* the additional

sacrifice was *only* a burnt-offering of “two lambs.” (N. 28, 9. 11.) The New Moon, in short, was the first Sabbath of the month, which was specially announced by trumpet sounds, and gave the law, as it were, for the rest, the first, eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second days of every month being kept as days of rest, and the next Sabbath being the first of the following month; though, as the lunar changes are completed—not in 28, but—in 29½ days, it would seem that the last week of the month must have contained sometimes eight and sometimes nine days, and probably lasted until the New Moon was seen. Hence the New Moon is always named first in connection with the Sabbath by the prophets before the Captivity,—as I have already shewn. It was only about the time of the Captivity that greater stress was laid upon the observance of the Sabbath. And here, I would observe, that it must be clearly understood that with the Hebrews (as with other Oriental nations), the terms month and moon were alike: they having 13 months, or moons, in their year, and not like the moderns 12.

Before, however, I leave this part of my subject on which so much depends, I would call attention to two wonderful modern discoveries, bearing on the matter before us,—which have justly created such a sensation among thoughtful and intelligent men, viz. (1) the finding of the engraved MOABITE STONE; and (2) the decyphering of the cuneiform writing, or inscriptions, engraved on the ASSYRIAN TABLETS of burnt clay. Truly we have “*sermons in stones*, and good in everything,” to a degree that Shakespeare never dreamt of! I can, however, only just refer to them here; each, to do it justice, would take much time and writing. From those wonderfully preserved *Assyrian tablets*, (dug out of the ruins of the palace-library of the ancient Kings of Assyria, and written several thousand years ago! and only

lately decyphered,) we learn very many things of the first consequence in Biblical Criticism, the same being highly elucidatory of the Old Testament narrations, and of their sources. But, what I would particularly notice now is, those tablets which contain the great astrological and astronomical work of the ancient Babylonians,—“composed for Babylonian Kings before the 16th century B.C.,”—or, more than a 100 years before the Jews left their slavery in Egypt. These are full of statements about the moon and the other planets and the stars, and their conjunctions and eclipses; and how they were predicted and watched for, and regularly noted down at their observatories, and sent in punctually to the Royal Court. The Babylonian Year was divided into 12 months of 30 days each, with an intercalary (or additional) month every 6 years. (Thus: *Ancient Babylonia*, $12 \times 30 = 360 \times 6 = 2160 \div 30 = 2190$; *Modern European*, $365 \times 6 = 2190$.) How astonishingly accurate! being *quite correct!* and that, too, without the aid of the telescopes and the hundred other helps of modern discovery invention and science. Further: with them “according to the lunar division, the 7th., 14th., 19th., 21st., and 28th., were *days of rest*” (Sabbaths), “on which certain works were forbidden.” So that, we see, what with our scholars and reasonable men a few years ago was but a belief, a conjecture, a possibility,—based, however, on a direct logical conclusion,—now passes into a certainty. The Assyrian names of the months also closely agree with the Hebrew, beginning also with Nisan (*Nisannu*, Assyrian).

Very much more may be reasonably expected and looked for from those interesting remains ; at which many highly-skilled scholars from all countries are now hard at work, which will tend more and more to throw light on our Bible,—both the Old Testament and the New. This

saying may seem strange to some, viz., that those very ancient Babylonian and Assyrian records can throw any light on the New Testament, whatever they may do on the Old one; therefore, I will just give an instance. There is “the holiness of the number seven;” with “the song of the seven evil spirits (or demons) which haunt or enter into a man at once,”—with the proper demoniacal “exorcism, &c., for driving them out.” One tablet has it,—

“The Song of the Seven Spirits.”

They are seven! they are seven!

In the depths of ocean they are seven!

In the heights of heaven they are seven!

In the ocean stream in a palace they were born.

Male they are not: female they are not!

Wives they have not! Children are not born to them!

Rule they have not! Government they know not!

Prayers they hear not!

They are seven, and they are seven!

Twice over they are seven!

“This wild chant touches one of the deepest chords of their religious feeling. They held that seven evil spirits at once might enter into a man: there are frequent allusions to them, and to their expulsion, on the tablets. One runs thus:—

“The god (. . .) shall stand by his bedside:

Those seven evil spirits he shall root out, and shall expel them from his body.

And those seven shall never return to the sick man again.”—

Compare this with what is said of Mary Magdalene, (Mark 16. 9: Luke 8. 2,) and of the last state of an unfortunate man), (Mat. 12. 45: Luke 11. 26.)—also of the number seven in many other passages.—Here I would remark, that it is very noticeable, that this peculiar demoniacal lore, or at least the beginning of it, the Jews appear

to have brought back with them when they returned from Babylon: for never read of any reference to the existence of a devil in any of those parts of the Bible, which were written *before* the Babylonish Captivity,—Thus, the moving of David to number Israel (2 Sam. 24.), is, in the older book ascribed to Jehovah, but in the later book of Chronicles (1 Ch. 21.) is ascribed to Satan. And so in the time of Jesus (as is seen, for example, constantly in Josephus) the belief in the possession of men by demons, was thoroughly established among all the Jews, with the exception of the Sadducees alone. —

The *Moabite Stone* was lately found among the ruins of Dibon in the land of Moab, on the E. side of the Dead Sea. It had engraved in really good old Hebrew (or, more properly speaking, Phœnician) characters, a most interesting record of 3 series of events in the reign of Mesha King of Moab. For nearly 3000 years that stone had lain there exposed to all the elements uncared for! and now it was found with all its inscriptions most beautifully preserved. Among other things we find the following, which may be here very briefly noticed.—(1) It was erected about the year 890 B.C., (only 75 years after Solomon's time,) by Mesha King of Moab, as “a stone of salvation and thanks to their god Chemosh, for enabling Mesha to see his desire upon his enemies, and to deliver his people from their enemies the Israelites,” to whom they had been tributary. (Just as Samuel is said, 230 years before, to have erected a similar stone, “Ebenezer,” for the Israelites, on their defeating the Philistines (1 S. 7. 12.)) (2) In the Moabites beating the Israelites, they took away from them, some towns and country and many people, and also their golden vessels from Nebo, one of their high places, which the Israelites had dedicated to their national god Jehovah,—and these the Moabites now dedicated to the services of their god

Chemosh, (3) The whole is given in very plain language, nothing high-flown or stilted; almost remarkable, in this respect, for an *Oriental* production; occupying altogether 34 lines of inscription. (4) But its plain statement varies astonishingly from the wonderful account of the *same* transaction—*the same war*—as given us in the Book of Kings (2 K. 3). (5) And then comes the question.—Which of the two is the *correct* statement? One thing is certain,—THEY CANNOT BOTH BE TRUE.

Now with the many, among “religious” people,—including, I fear, not a few Ministers and Sunday School Teachers,—the “Bible” statement must be true.

Notwithstanding, two or three wee things, I may, perhaps, be allowed to call their attention to.—

1. The Moabite Stone was engraved and erected *at the time*, to commemorate that particular deliverance; it was a public thing open to all, all could see it, all might read it in their own tongue. But the Jewish story was written (as I have already shewn) some 450 years after,—after, too, the return of the remnant of the Jews from their long Captivity; and its writing was altogether more of a private character.

2. The Moabites never again became tributary to the Israelites, although living so very close to them; so that one might reasonably infer the Jews had had enough of it on that occasion. Besides the Israelites were bound, by their Levitical laws (Deut. 23. 3), never to be neighbourly with them; which old spite, it appears, they also endeavored to renew after their return from the Captivity (Neh. 13. 1), although their most famous king, David, was descended from Ruth the Moabitess! who was his great grandmother; and, to the care of the King of Moab, David had also sent his parents for protection, when in great trouble from Saul. (1 Sam. 22. 3. 4.)

3. The yearly tribute which Mesha the

King of Moab had to pay to Israel according to the story in the Bible (2 Kings, 3.), was "100,000 lambs, and 100,000 rams, with their wool." Now this petty kingdom of Moab only comprised a small tract of country, about 40 miles long by 10 broad, (just like a narrow slip extending from Napier to Waipawa,—but nothing like it, in its grass, or water, or in its general fertility,)—and most of my readers here in New Zealand can better understand *all about* that amount of *annual* tribute (200,000 sheep) from such a sterile tract of country on the shores of the Dead Sea, than very many others in England and elsewhere. But read attentively the whole story, in that chapter of 2 Kings already mentioned; and I fear that the Hebrew story, as it there stands, will appear to be a fiction; apparently part of some legendary account handed down from the olden time concerning Elisha.

(Time of Jesus and his apostles.)

Let us now proceed to enquire,—(1) How Jesus and his followers acted; how they kept "the Sabbath" of their nation. Like good Jews they upheld the national Institutions, (Luke 2.21: 22.7, 8, 13, 14.)—often going into the synagogues on "the Sabbath-day," as "his custom was," to read and to teach,—which office, according to the Jews, was alike open to all. They kept the Sabbath, however, in a liberal way. We find him on a Sabbath-day going to a feast at the house of a chief Pharisee (or ruler), where there were a great company of guests, (which must have certainly caused the servants a deal of unnecessary labour in preparing the banquet and in waiting upon the guests,) and where there was also a scramble for the chief seats. But this kind of convivial meeting on the Sabbath, was allowed by the Pharisees, as we have already seen. On that occasion, the scrambling which Jesus saw was evidently the cause of two of his noted parables respecting a supper,

or feast, delivered at that time,—and, also, of the rule which he then gave for the proper giving of a feast. (Luke 14.). Indeed Jesus often so acted,—laying hold of passing events, and so suiting the word to the time, or occasion. Again, we find that on several Sabbaths, both Jesus and his disciples were often charged with having "broken the Sabbath," and with having "done that which was not lawful on the Sabbath-day;" and it was this (among other things) which so greatly enraged the Pharisees against him. We are told of several remarkable cases of healing performed by Jesus on the Sabbath-day; as, the man with the withered hand,—the woman who had been bowed for 18 years,—the impotent man, who had spent a dreary 38 years in that state,—the man with the dropsy,—and the blind man. Now (1) these cases were all old, longstanding ones; not peculiarly dangerous and pressing ones of the day immediately affecting life; and, therefore, they might have well stood over until the following day, or week; and (2) they were not only cured on the Sabbath-day, but that in the most public manner, mostly in the synagogue (or "Church") itself before all the Congregation; and, sometimes, accompanied with other "work," (as, in the *making of clay*,—and in the ordering the impotent man to *carry his bed*,—and the blind man *go to Siloam and wash*,) which must have additionally galled the Jews. Then again, we have recorded by three of the Evangelists, their *walking* through the corn-fields on the Sabbath-day and their *gathering* the corn, and *rubbing-out* the grain as they went for food; and the memorable reply of Jesus,—in almost the very words of the Talmud (already quoted by me), which, no doubt, he had often heard and read,—"The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." (Mark

2.) Where were these Corn-fields? Scarcely within "the Sabbath-day's journey" allowed by the Jews; which was only six *stadia* = 2000 paces, or, about, 6 furlongs, (not quite as far as the "Maori Club" on the White Road is from the Government Buildings,)—so that, it appears, that in this respect (*of distance*) the Sabbath was also broken. Now in all this we perceive a certain something done openly, all tending to lessen "the traditions of the elders" and the Pharisaic sanctity of the Sabbath.—

(2) How, or what, did Jesus *teach* concerning their Sabbath, in his many teachings, discourses and parables? Here however, we can gain but little, because there is but little recorded. There is "The sermon on the Mount" (as it is called), but it is worthy of notice, that while very many subjects are therein mentioned and brought forward, including several of the "ten Commandments,"—there is *nothing* concerning the Sabbath. There is, however, his noble and open and oft-repeated statement, that "it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days" (Mat. 12.12); further illustrating his meaning by the works of lifting a sheep out of a pit, and of leading an ox or an ass to water; which, with that precious saying already mentioned ("The Sabbath was made for man, &c."),—one would think would have been quite enough for his followers for all time!

There is also a highly curious and characteristic saying of Jesus about the Sabbath,—which is not found in our New Testaments, and is only found in *one* very ancient Greek manuscript and in *one* equally ancient Latin one (known to scholars as *Codex Bezae*), which date from the 5th century, and therefore holds a place among the five oldest Greek Manuscripts. As far as I know, it has not been translated and printed in English, but I will give a translation. It is an additional verse coming after Luke 6.4, (the 5 *v.* being placed in those two manuscripts after the 10 *v.*) and runs thus:—"In the same day, Jesus

seeing a certain man tilling his ground on the Sabbath, said unto him, Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou art doing thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not thou art cursed, for thou art a transgressor of the law."—Does not this strongly remind us of Paul's saying,— "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." (Rom. 14.22)—Which may indeed be grounded on it; much as Paul has given us a peculiar saying of Jesus,— Acts 20.35. And it may also be further noticed, that the very peculiar and strong Greek word for "*Curse*," used here,—is only used twice besides in the whole New Testament,—viz. in John 7.49, (where the Pharisees used it concerning the people who *knew not the law*,—from which very circumstance Jesus might have adopted it;) and, again, in Gal. 2. 10, 13, (where Paul uses the word in his strongly emphatic way);—it is not the word commonly used in the New Testament for curse. The same Greek word which is in Rom. 14, 22. translated "*Happy*" I have here translated *Blessed*; as in Mat. 5. 3-11. Some of our first modern Greek Scholars and Commentators believe in the originality and authenticity of that saying of Jesus.

3. What Jesus further said concerning the Sabbath, incidentally or otherwise, in his many questionings concerning the "Commandments," made to those who came to him. Here, again, we find ourselves at a loss; although Jesus seemed to have pretty closely questioned several who came to him about their keeping of the "Commandments"; as in the very particular case of one who, on coming to Jesus to enquire what he should do to obtain eternal life, called him "*Good Master*"; (and, was, apparently, first rebuked by Jesus for giving to him that title of *Good*,—which belonged to *God alone*;) Jesus told him, that if he would enter into life he should keep the "Commandments"; and then Jesus repeats *six* out of "the 10 commandments" to him,—but excludes all mention

of that peculiarly great one among the Jews—the Sabbath (Mat. 19. 18.)

This remarkable interview is also mentioned in three of the Gospels, (Mat. 19, Mark 10, Luke 18,) with but little variation. Mark also gives another and a similar one, (12. 28-34,) which I have ever considered as one of the truly grand conversations related in the Gospels. Here, the inquirer asks, “Which is the first Commandment of all?” Jesus replies,—as a true Jew,—saying,—(in sublime and beautiful language, quoted from the Old Testament, and well-known among the later Jews, as the standard article of their belief, and their war-cry in battle,)—“The first is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the *first* Commandment.” And then Jesus adds,—“And the second is like, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other Commandment greater than these.” And his questioner also answers discreetly and beautifully inasmuch that he was highly praised by Jesus for so doing. Yet here, again, we find not a word about *the Sabbath*,—that great and peculiar institution of the Jews!

(1) Why is this omission,—if that of the Sabbath were indeed really given from the burning summit of Mount Sinai, amid lightnings and thunderings and earthquakes? (2) If that of the Sabbath were, as Nehemiah and the few later prophets repeatedly say,—the sign of the Covenant between the Israelites and God?

Moreover, here arises an important question to the *thoughtful* mind:—(1) Why did Jesus when asked—What was the *first* commandment of all? Why did he not quote from the “ten Commandments,” giving the *first* of them,—if such had been really spoken by the majestic voice of God from Sinai, and engraved by His holy fingers on stone? (2) Again,

when Jesus also adds the *second* (great) commandment,—Why are the “10 Commandments” (including that of the Sabbath), again passed by? (3) And why are *all* (even including *those* “*ten*”) said to hang on *these two*?—which were *not* given openly by God himself with dreadful pomp and terror on the burning mountain (as recorded in Exodus), but merely quietly written down many many years after, by some unknown yet inspired scribe in the books of Deuteronomy (6) and Leviticus (19).

It is of no use attempting to blink the facts before us;—If those so-called “ten commandments,” said to have been so spoken by the *One* Unchangeable and Blessed God Himself, and by Him also engraved in stone; If such had ever really been so spoken and so given,—Jesus could never have overlooked them never have spoken thus.—

(Time of the Apostles.)

We are come down now to the time of the Apostles, *after* that of Jesus; and, in like manner, we will quietly prosecute the enquiry.—

1. How did the Apostles *act*, with especial reference to the Sabbath?

Of their positive doings *re* the Sabbath-day, we have very little indeed recorded;—but of those of Paul (“the Apostle of the Gentiles”) we have a fair share.—And, in briefly considering Paul’s actions and teachings concerning the Sabbath-days, we must ever bear this in mind,—that Paul was (as he himself tells us), one of the strictest (narrowest) religious sect among the Jews, “a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee.”

(1) At first we find Paul commonly, during his travels, going into the Jewish synagogues (or Churches) on the Sabbath-day, and teaching (that is, exhorting and preaching) therein, after the manner of the Jews; (viz., at Antioch, Acts 13. 14-16, etc., at Thessalonica, Acts 17. 2, and

at Corinth, Acts 18. 4 ;) just like Jesus himself did at Nazareth (Luke 4. 16) and other places before him, as we have already seen.

(2) After several years of travel and teaching we find Paul returning to Jerusalem, and there “with the Apostles and elders” assembling to consider certain grave matters pertaining to the Jewish religion; for the Pharisee believers of Jerusalem had said,—“It was needful to command the Gentile believers *to keep the Law of Moses.*” This, however, Peter, who was also present, strongly opposed, terming it a “tempting of God”—to seek “to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples” (the Gentile believers) “which,” said Peter, “neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.” And so we find this first and best Council, composed of Jewish Christians, after having thoroughly discussed these important matters *concerning the keeping of the Law of Moses*, laying down *four simple rules only* for the Gentile Christians,—on whom “they (the Apostles) would lay no greater burdens than these (four) necessary things”; and this decision, they also declared and wrote, had “seemed good to the Holy Spirit as well as to themselves” acting together.

Now, (1) If the keeping of the Sabbath-day was really a *Divine Institution*, does it not seem strange that nothing was then said about it? Seeing, too, (2) that such comparatively small matters—as the abstaining from things strangled, and the eating of blood—(both long ago broken and thrown aside!) should have been then sent forth as rules, or decrees? Therefore, it must follow, that the keeping of the Sabbath-day was not, in the opinion of the Holy Spirit and of the Apostles, any great matter.

3. After this, on several occasions, we find Paul writing to the various churches, or congregations, of Christians; and particularly laying down what to avoid (“works

of the flesh”), and what to follow and do. Now it is highly noticeable,—(1) that in those long lists of evil works and practices given by him (viz., Gal, 5. 19-21, Eph. 5. 3, Col. 3. 5, etc.) we find nothing of “Sabbath-breaking”! Although, in his “lists,” Paul is sometimes so diffuse as to state the same thing (generically) under different heads (specifically): (2) that in what he plainly directs the Gentile Christians to do,—(viz., Eph. 5, 6: Col. 3, 4: 1. Thess 5, &c.,)—although he even, at times, quotes from “the Law of Moses” (Eph. 6. 2)—yet Paul never once says a word about keeping “the Sabbath”! And, again, (3) in that particularly affectionate portion of his letter to his beloved Philippians (ch. 4),—in which Paul sums up all good things, as it were, saying,—“*Those things*, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do”; and here, again, is no mention of “the Sabbath.”

How is this?—If the strict keeping of “the Sabbath-day” was of such very great importance?

I know very well what kind of answer I shall get to all this evidence that I have hitherto brought forward,—That all such is of a negative character, and therefore proves nothing.

Be it so. I come then to the *positive teaching* of the Apostle Paul on this subject. He says distinctly to the Colossians,—“Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days which are a shadow of things to come” (2. 16):—and to the Romans,—“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." (14. 4.)

On those two passages the late Dean Alford of Canterbury wrote, in his new edition of the Greek Testament:—"If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been wholly impossible for the Apostle to uphold or commend the man, who judged all days alike worthy of equal honour.— —I therefore infer that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognised in Apostolic times." (On *Rom.* 14. 5.) "If the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, *in any form*, of lasting obligation on the Christian Church, it would have been quite impossible for the Apostle to have spoken thus. The fact of an obligatory rest of one day, whether the seventh or the first, would have been directly in the teeth of his assertion here." (On *Col.* 2.16.)

(I bring this forward now,—as it is a single comment on these particular texts.)

Again, Paul says to the Galatians,— "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, 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. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (4. 9-11.) Here, of course, Paul alludes to Jewish festivals as commanded by "the Law of Moses," of which the Sabbath days, the New Moons, and the Sabbatical

years were examples. And note, how depreciatingly how loweringly Paul speaks of those very things which he once believed to be so high and so holy. — *Wheatly* here well observes,— "the Christians were no more obliged to observe the Jewish festival, than they were concerned in the mercies therein commemorated, and this is the reason that when the Judaizing Christians would have imposed upon the Galatians the observation of the Jewish festivals, as necessary to salvation; Paul looked upon it as a thing so *criminal* that he was afraid the labour he had bestowed upon them to set them at liberty in the freedom of the Gospel had been in *vain*."

In concluding this part of my subject, I would again remark,—it is very noticeable that, throughout the New Testament, there is not a single instance of any stress whatever being laid on the strict observance of the Sabbath-day. Jesus himself and the apostles (as we have seen) observed it,—but in a very liberal kind of way; they never, in any act or work recorded in the Gospels or Epistles, inculcate either by example or by precept, a Sabbatarian spirit. Rather, so far as their words and acts imply anything in this respect, they tend to discourage and discountenance such a spirit. And expressly in the famous decision of the Church at Jerusalem, which was forwarded to the believing Gentiles at Antioch, by the hands of Paul and Barnabas, Judas, and Silas, they laid no "burden" on them of Sabbatical observances.—

III. ECCLESIASTICAL.

(1. *Primitive*.)

AFTER the time of the Apostles we find that the early Christians did not specially and as a rule keep the Sabbath-day holy. No doubt those who were Jews, or de-

scendants of Jews, for some time longer kept up their weekly assembling on that day; but such observance,—not having been appointed by the Apostles and left

free (as we have seen),—naturally fell into neglect. Bingham says,—“If it be inquired, why the ancient church continued (for a time) the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, when they took it to be only a temporary institution given to the Jews only, as circumcision and other rites of the law; (which is expressly said by many of the ancient writers, particularly by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Eusebius;) it is answered by learned men,—that it was to comply with the Jewish converts as they also did in the use of other indifferent things, so long as no doctrinal necessity was laid upon them. For the Jews being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still maintained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath,—and were therefore very loth it should be laid aside. For this reason, it seemed good to the prudence of those times, (as in other of the Jewish rites, so in this) to indulge the humour of that people and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices; but when any one pretended to carry the observation of it further,—either by introducing a doctrinal necessity, or pressing the observation of it after the Jewish manner, they resolutely opposed it as introducing Judaism into the Christian religion.” Some, indeed, kept *both days*, the Jewish Sabbath and the Sunday; yet in rites and ceremonials a difference was made, and the preference was given to the Lord’s-day (or Sunday) above the Sabbath. “For first,” (Bingham continues,) “we find no Ecclesiastical laws obliging men to pray standing on the Sabbath; nor, secondly, any imperial laws forbidding law-suits and pleadings on the Sabbath; nor, thirdly, any laws prohibiting the public shows and games; nor, fourthly, any laws obliging men to abstain wholly from bodily labour. But, on the contrary, the Council of Laodicea has a canon for converts, forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the Sab-

bath, any further than was necessary for public worship; but they were to honour the Lord’s day, and to rest on it as Christians; and if any were found to Judaize, an anathema is pronounced against them. — — For this reason the sect of the Ebionites were condemned for joining the observation of the Sabbath according to the Jews with the observation of the Lord’s day after the manner of the Christians. Against such the Council of Laodicea pronounces anathema, that is,—such as taught the necessity of keeping the Sabbath a perfect rest with the Jews. And in this sense we are to understand what Gregory the Great says, That antichrist will renew the observation of the Sabbath.” (*Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, lib. xx.)

And this, to me, appears as an additional witness,—of no distinct rule, no law, having been ever laid down by any express apostolic authority respecting the keeping of the Sabbath, or substituting (as some will have it) the first day of the week to be kept *Sabbatically* instead of the seventh. For when the early Christians met together on the first day of the week, they did not dream of taking the 4th Commandment, and putting that forward as prescribing a rule for the religious observance of the first day. That the *first* day of the week, “the day of the Sun,” was observed from very early times among Christians, as a day on which they specially assembled for religious purposes, we know from undoubted authority. But no writer of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday observance to any apostolic authority.—“In the first century, Barnabas (or whoever else wrote the epistle ascribed to him), Justin Martyr, A.D. 147, Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, Tertullian, A.D. 192, Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 192, Origen, A.D. 230, Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250,—all mention or allude to the religious observance of the Sunday; but not one of them even

hints that it originated in any precept of Christ, or in any recommendation of the Apostles, either by precept or example. Yet, had any such precept been given, or example set, it is incredible that it should not have been known in the times of the writers above-named, and hardly to be believed that, if known, it would not have been mentioned by them or by some of them." (Sir Wm. Domville, *The Sabbath*)

I may here quote, also, the words of Justin Martyr,—in his famous *Apology* for the Christians, made to the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius,—“We all of us assemble together on the day of the Sun, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter and made the world. On the same day also Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For he was crucified the day before Saturn’s day; and on the day after Saturn’s day, which is the day of the Sun, he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them what we now submit to your consideration.”

St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 345 says, to his flock,—“Turn thou not out of the way into Samaritanism or Judaism, for Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee; henceforth reject all observance of Sabbath, and call not meats, which are really matters of indifference, common or unclean.”

St. Jerome, A.D. 392, also says:—

“On the Lord’s day” (and, note well, this shows you the manner of its observance amongst the early Christians,) “they went to church, and returning from church they would apply themselves to their allotted works, and make garments for themselves and others. The day is not a day of fasting, but the day is a day of joy; the church has always considered it a day of joy, and none but heretics have thought otherwise.” So that the early Christians did not think it was wrong to make garments for themselves and others on the Lord’s-

day. Such an idea never once entered into their heads! As a modern Divine correctly remarks, (on those words of Jerome,) — “There was no Sunday League in those days, and the only Sabbatarians were Jews. It is curious to observe, that whilst the modern Christians have seldom converted the Jews, the Jews have converted modern Christians in whole sects to Sabbatarianism.” (!!)

(2. *Time of the Reformation.*)

QUOTATIONS without number might be made from the writings of eminent Divines (Reformers), in the Church of England and in other Churches, expressly protecting, and in the strongest terms, against Christians entertaining the idea that the Law of Moses was in any sense binding upon them, and most particularly in reference to the 4th Commandment. Thus *Tyndal*, (the first translator of the Bible into English, who was burnt as a Martyr at Antwerp, A.D. 1536) says:—

“As for the Sabbath we are lords over it, 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.”—

Thus, also, Luther says,—in his usual stirring impulsive way, which made men say “that his words were half-battles, that they had hands and feet.” He says:—

“As for the *Sabbath or Sunday*, 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.” And elsewhere he writes: — “Keep the Sabbath holy for its use both to body and soul. But, if anywhere the day

is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere anyone 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.” Again he says:—“For only faith in God, and love toward our neighbour, are necessarily required, all other things are free;—so that we may freely observe them for one man's sake, and omit them for another man's sake, as we shall perceive it to be profitable to everyone.—We see the same example commonly in Christ, but specially *Matt. 12* and *Mark 2*, where we read that he suffered his disciples to break the Sabbath, and he himself also, when the case so required, did break it, when it was otherwise he did keep it, whereof he gave this reason,—*The son of man is lord even of the Sabbath*. Which is as much as to say,—the Sabbath is free, that thou mayest break it for one man's sake and commodity, and for the sake and commodity of another thou mayest keep it.”

Melancthon, also, says:—“The Scripture has abrogated the Sabbath, since it teaches that after the revelation of the Gospel all the Mosaic Ceremonies may be neglected.”

And so Calvin.—“In this way we get rid 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, while *the moral part remains*, viz., the observance of one day in seven.” We also read of Calvin, that,—“on one occasion when good John Knox paid him a visit on Sunday afternoon, he found the holy man enjoying a game at bowls.”

And the *Homily* of the Church of England, “on the place and time of prayer,” contains these words:—

“Albeit this commandment of God doth not bind Christian people *so straitly*

to observe and keep the *utter* ceremonies of the Sabbath-day, as it was given to the Jews, as touching the forbearing of work and labor in time of great necessity, and as touching the precise keeping of the seventh day, after the manner of the Jews. — — — Yet, notwithstanding, whatsoever is found in the commandment *appertaining to the Law of Nature*, as a thing most godly, most just, and needful for the setting forth of God's glory, it ought to be retained and kept of all good Christian people.”

Mr Sidey, in his published sermon (already referred to), says — “The *right keeping* of the Sabbath has always been a distasteful thing to men of a despotic spirit, and many have been the expedients to which they have resorted to prevent it. In no one of these have they shewn greater skill to *hinder liberty and intelligence*, and those conditions of society which tended to conscientiousness, than in the conversion of the Sabbath into a day of pastime. Charles I. proclaimed the “Book of Sports” to reconcile the English people to their distresses. (*Sic!*) *By this they were required to spend the large part of the day in amusements*, and those who *complied* with the edict were specially *rewarded* for so doing, while those who *refused* wore subjected to *pains and penalties*. In this work he was powerfully helped by Laud, if *he was not directed to it by this prelate*, for reasons of a kindred character (I have quoted this at full length, as I intend to *cut it up*, to shew how easily things are twisted to suit purposes!)

On the foregoing statements of Mr Sidey I would remark—(1) that Mr Sidey is a wee bit wrong in his English History (both civil and ecclesiastical), as well as his chronology; and (2) also, in several of his severe and unfounded charges; and (3) as a matter of course in his conclusions therefrom.

(1) For it was *not* King Charles I, who

issued and proclaimed “the Book of Sports”—but his father, King James I., a Scotsman, and a countryman of Mr Sidey’s!—who issued it in 1618; at which time Laud was quietly and unobtrusively living at his college, St. John’s, Oxford; and had nothing to do with it. Moreover, it should not be overlooked, that James himself, a Presbyterian, when King of Scotland, (only a few years before,) actually wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth in behalf of two Presbyterian English ministers, whom he considered rather hardly treated.

(2) And what does King James say?—“For his good people’s lawful recreation, 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 Maygames, Whitsunales, or Morris-dances, and setting up of Maypoles, 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 bowling.”—

Now I cannot understand why Mr Sidey should say—“the English people were *required* to spend the large part of the day in amusement;” there is nothing of the kind in the King’s injunction.

Again: Mr Sidey says, “those who *complied* were *rewarded*, those who *refused*, *suffered*”—that, however, does *not* appear from the State paper and I also find, from Church History, that while there was more or less of arguments for and against, and many fears among the ministers of that period, as to their being obliged to read

the said Royal Declaration in their several churches,—“That, after so long and so much talking,— — —their own fear proved at last their only foe; the King’s goodness taking away the subject of their jealousy so that *no minister was enjoined to read the book in his parish*, wherewith they had so affrighted themselves.”

(3) Further,—I cannot conceive how Mr Sidey could have written, that such a declaration on the part of the King, was done “*to hinder liberty, and intelligence*;” for, it seems to me, viewing English society as it was then, to be wholly and altogether the other way!

Let us just briefly see what the Historian says about it; how was that peculiar edict brought about; how came it to pass?

In 1616, King James visited his native country Scotland. And the quaint old Church Historian Fuller, (no friend of the High-Church, or Laudian, party,) writes:—“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 his 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, May 14th, the Court being then at Greenwich, he set forth his Declaration” (given above). And then,—after noticing several arguments in use, both for and against it,—he goes on to say:—“However, 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 their fires, or the like. Yea, and in Lancashire especially the Romanists made advantage of this strictness to pervert many to popery, persuading them, that the Protestant religion was one where no lawful liberty was allowed. And no wonder if many common people were hereby fetched off unto them; 'starting aside as a broken bow,' chiefly because overbent for lack of lawful recreation."—So, we may perceive, that the Judaizing Sabbatarians and precisians were really the cause of all this!

Fifteen years after, viz., A.D. 1633—King Charles was *obliged* to republish his Father's Declaration; but on this *second* occasion (Laud being now Archbishop), our Historian says,— "there was *no* express mention in this Declaration that the Minister of the Parish should be pressed to the publishing of it;"—which, however, was in that of King James. As before, so now: the Sabbatarian sect being the sole cause of it (as may be read at large in Church History). Our Historian says:—"Now (A.D.1633) the Sabbatarian controversy began to be revived, which broke forth into a long and hot contention. Bradborn, a minister of Suffolk, began it, setting forth a book entitled, 'A Defence of the Sabbath-day:' maintaining therein, 1. The 4th Commandment simply and entirely moral. 2. Christians, as well as Jews, obliged to the everlasting observation of that day. 3. That the Lords day is an ordinary working-day. The Bishop of Ely was employed by his Majesty to confute Mr Bradborn' erroneous opinion.—And Mr Bradborn, perceiving the unsoundness of his own principles, became a convert, conforming himself quietly to the Church of England."

Just in this juncture of time (A.D. 1634) a Declaration for Sports, set forth the fif-

teenth of King James, was revived and enlarged. "For, his Majesty, being troubled with Petitions on both sides thought good to follow his father's royal example— — — —It was charged on the Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud), at his trial, that he had caused the reviving and enlarging of this Declaration. He denied it, yet professing his judgment for recreations on that day, alleging the practice of the Church at Geneva allowing shooting in longbows, &c., thereon; adding also, that, though indulging liberty to others, in his own person he strictly observed that day." It further appears, "that the Church of Geneva went about to remove the observance of the Sabbath to Thursday; but, it seems, it was carried in the negative."

This "Declaration," or "Book of Sports," (on which, owing to Mr Sidey, I have been obliged to dwell,) must not for a moment be judged of by us, or compared with our manners and customs in the present day; save as to its *principles*: these are sound. We have seen that Calvin himself played at bowls for recreation on "the Sabbath;" and that the Church at Geneva (John Knox's own) allowed of archery, etc.—

I perfectly understand Mr Sidey's *last* words (quoted by me),—but as they have a meaning somewhat foreign to my subject, I let them pass.

(3. *Modern.*)

I particularly note Mr Sidey's phraseology—"the right keeping of the Sabbath." I fear, however, that Mr Sidey means by those words almost the very opposite of what I should mean by them;—aye, of what the Reformers and the Primitive Church, the Apostles and Jesus himself, meant by them as I have endeavoured to show.

In stating what I believe Mr Sidey to mean, I have no need to go back to those times of James and of Charles, to fetch the precise doings of the Sabbatarians of those

days. I will just show, (1) from first and unimpeached Scottish testimony, what a wretched thing the strict keeping of the Sabbath in Scotland was, in the last century; and is still, I fear, in not a few benighted places. —First, however, observing, that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland lays down the law in its “Shorter Catechism,” that—

“The Sabbath 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.” And it goes on further to declare, that— “The 4th Commandment forbiddeth the omission or careless performance of the duties required, and the profaning the day by idleness, or doing that which is in itself sinful, or by unnecessary thoughts, words, or works, about our worldly employments or recreations.”

In that Church a Decree was passed so lately as June 7, 1709, in the following terms:—

“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 in the streets, and vaging [strolling] to fields and gardens and to the Castle-hill*, as also by *standing idle gazing out of windows*,... and finding that there are divers acts for preventing the profanation of the Lord’s-day; therefore the General Sessions do resolve to see to the execution of these good acts, — — — 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 notification, that notice will be taken of such as shall be found transgressing, 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.”

One of those “good acts,” to which this document refers, was probably that passed in 1705, “against the 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, the Pier and Shore of Leith, in St. Ann’s Yards, and the Queen’s Park*,— 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.”

It has been well-observed on the foregoing, and therefore I quote it here:— “If those Inquisitors had been in authority at Jerusalem when our Lord Jesus Christ ‘vaged’ through the cornfields 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 would have outdone that most strict of Jewish sects, by denouncing both him and his followers as Sabbath-breakers, on the score of the ‘vaging’ itself.”

And, again, by the same author:— “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 health could be observed by persons confined all day with no better recreation than theological reading and Sunday ‘tasks,’ to dark, ill-aired hous-

es, in localities so filthy. Above all, think of the imprisoned children, thus trained 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, ennuï, 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 instigation of the arch-enemy of mankind!” (Cox, *Sabbath Laws*, &c.)

A few years before that time last mentioned, it was ordered by the Town Council of Edinburgh, (apparently with reference to Nehemiah 13. 19.) that— “to the effect, people may be restrained from vaging abroad upon the Sabbath, none be suffered to come in or out at any of the ports of this burgh from the Saturday at night till the Monday at morning, nor be found vaging in the streets, or repairing to the Castle-hill of this burgh, under the pain of imprisonment, and farther punishment of their persons at the will of the magistrate.” And, when it was also ordered, that the public wells should be closed on Sunday from 8 A.M. till noon, and from 1 P.M. to 5 P.M.,— “none to bring any greater vessels to the wells for carrying of water, than a pint stoup or a pint bottle upon the Lord’s Day.” (Cox, *loc.cit.*)

Here some one may say,— “That was a century and half ago! and even in Scotland things are changed very much for the better since then. In England, happy England! there are no laws which forbid ‘vaging’ on Sunday; and here in Napier, we have very little of this.” Bide a wee,—is my reply; you shall hear and know more yet, shewing, that this crying evil, this remnant of Judaism or worse, this Sabbatarian

superstition is still seeking to impede the progress of the physical, moral, and religious welfare of the whole community.

(2) I will now show what more recently, some of the best ministers of the Scotch Kirk have said about it.—

The Rev. W.C. Smith a minister of the Free Church, in a speech at Edinburgh, November 10, 1865,—on their miserable “observance of the Sabbath,”—says:— “No street lamps were allowed to be lighted on the darkest Sunday nights, because it was held that nobody had any right to be out of doors at such hours. The Assembly forbade any person taking a walk on the Sabbath, or looking out of a window and therefore all the blinds were pulled down; and there is great reason to fear that the spurious conscience thus created indemnified itself all the gnats it was forced to strain at, by swallowing a variety of camels. No one who knows anything of those days,—with their *universal smuggling and their universal lying*,—will place much reliance on the *law of constraint* which was *substituted for the law of conscience*.”

But I have also the testimony of a more widely-known man and eminent minister of the Established Church of Scotland, the late Dr Norman McLeod, with reference to the actual present state of the Sabbatarian question in Scotland. His words are of more weight, because they were addressed by him to a body of the Ministers of his own Church,—many of whom however, as a matter of course opposed him. Dr McLeod first shows, that though professing to keep the Sunday strictly as a Sabbath, and solemnly enjoining their hearers to keep it, in obedience to the 4th Commandment, they did not really do this themselves! He says:—

“We do not keep the day.... we do not attempt to keep it, even in regard to work. Our servants and our ministers all do what no person living under the 4th Commandment would have dared to have done.

This is simply a notorious fact. What effect has this? I think it has this effect, very strongly, of weakening morality. I think this course a most dangerous one. You are laying burdens upon the shoulders of the people that they cannot bear. You are training men up to one of the worst habits, that of believing in their consciences that a thing is wrong, and yet making it so that they are constrained to do it."

But besides this "weakening of Morality,"—this sense of a discrepancy between the doctrine solemnly taught from the pulpit and in Catechizing, and the actual practice of the teacher himself, when a great *convenience* is treated by him as a *necessity*,—this divine proceeds to speak of the direct evils, which have followed from the efforts still made to maintain the Sabbatharian system in the Church of Scotland. He goes on to say:—

— "The 4th Commandment has produced in our country notorious Judaism—Judaism of the worst description, for which I have no respect whatever. Look at the Judaism of the nineteenth century; look at it, for example, in some parts of our own country in the north. I challenge any Free Church Minister that he would dare to be seen using a razor and a brush on Sunday morning. He would not dare to do it. — — — There is this slavery to the letter over a great part of the country. The clergy themselves have become slaves: they have forged their own chains, from which they cannot escape. They have done so, I think, with honesty, drilling the people in the 4th Commandment and its details, until they are now in a position from which they cannot emancipate themselves, — — — But is this Judaism confined to different parts of the *country*? No; I think you see much of it in our own town, I grant you that there is freedom expressed in the sentiments that have been uttered to-day, which people would not have dared to have uttered twenty years

ago; but I think that this is owing in a great measure to the freedom in Church-matters of Christian *laymen, who are not so bound as we are*. Let us be thankful for it. But I think that there is a vast deal of what I am complaining of in our City of Glasgow. What can be more Judaical than the stringent rules that are sometimes laid down? You may go and hear the organ or any musical instrument in the church; yet you dare not use the same instrument in the house. Then again, in regard to "walking on Sunday,"—I ask you what sentiments with some prevail! I myself lately mentioned, in a speech about a north park for Glasgow, that I thought on Sunday evening the people might walk out. This was commented upon, and, I must say, what was uttered made me, I might almost say, *tremble for the condition we are in in Scotland*, and think that we are standing on the edge of a slippery precipice,—that consequences may ensue of which men are not aware, *as a resistance against such ignorance and such cruelty* — — — What did the General Assembly itself dare to say, in a pastoral address within my own memory, in 1834, when it spoke of 'walking' on Sunday, as 'an impious encroachment on one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Lord's Day?' This is what I call Judaism."—

When a minister of the Scotch Kirk can speak thus freely in the ears of brethren, it is a sign that a great change has passed already over the thoughts and feelings of that Church,—that light is beginning to break, upon this, as upon other subjects, on the eyes of intelligent Christians in Scotland.—

Of course, the larger part of the Presbytery present at that meeting, were against him; but some expressed sentiments on that occasion, which shows that a great departure had already taken place in pious minds in that country from the rigidity and strictness of the old Scotch system.

Thus one said:—“The municipal authorities of Glasgow, the responsible guardians of the working-classes, while they have of late years provided, in their spacious parks, a lounge during weekdays for the rich, have wisely and befittingly intended these also, as an innocent resort for the working-man and his family, when the Sabbath services of the day are over. And, if he be faithful in worshipping his God in the temple of grace, I for one delight to see him quietly and decorously ending his summer day in the vestibule of Nature.”—

Another said:—“I am not here to forbid, even if I could forbid, and I am glad that I cannot, the hard-wrought mechanic to get away from the very sight of the smoky scenes of his daily toil, and to enjoy the air, and the sunlight, and the joy of the fair earth. I am glad to meet, as I often do, pale-faced men and women, with their children in their arms or toddling by their side, on a Sabbath afternoon; for I know they are likely to go home more thankful, and cheerful, and good, than if they had been shut up all the day in some small apartment, opening off from a dirty common stair,”—

And a third observed:—“One would suppose from the way he (Dr. McLeod) spoke, that the people were in such terror of the 4th Commandment, that they dared not breathe the fresh air on the Sabbath evening,—that they were compelled to sit in their ill-ventilated houses, and not daring, from fear of this hated statute, to go to the door. There may have been the time when this was the case in Glasgow, and there may be *some parts of the country in which this is the case still*. But, if anyone sees the Green on a Sabbath evening, or the Dennistown suburb, or the West-End Park he will see quite enough to satisfy him that the 4th Commandment exercises no such power over the people. and that this is only a dream of the imagination.”

I have thus quoted, rather largely for my space, what that eminent and liberal-minded man, Dr. McLeod, and a few of the more intelligent at that meeting of Presbytery said, with reference to the great question of “Sabbath Observance;”—hoping that some of my good Presbyterian friends,—or readers of these lines,—may be the more inclined to heed what some of the best of their own ministers have said upon it. And, further, to those who may wish to know a little more of Dr. Norman McLeod’s sentiments on this important subject, I would say,—Read (if you have not already done so) his little interesting work called the *Starling*, where you will find what bigotry did in Scotland, (wearing, of course, as she always does, a truly righteous and orthodox dress!) in putting a right good and true Christian man—an elder, too!—out of the Church, merely because he simply hung ant a little cage containing the poor bird of his only bairn (lately deceased) on the old nail by the side of his door on the Sabbath! I very early got a copy of that book by Mail, which I lent to Sir Donald McLean. and I shall not readily forget how very much he was taken with it, nor his sensible words to me respecting it,—the story being so true, to the very life! The book should have a place in all our country Libraries.

3. And lest anyone *here* enjoying liberty—away from the Old Country—should think, or say, that, Times are altered there *now*; that the Sabbatarian superstition is dead; I will further shew what a small benighted party *there*, at *present*, are even *now* attempting!—By this last English mail I have received an account of the unsufferable insolence of a small party in Scotland, calling themselves “the Sabbath alliance;” which speaks volumes, and which clearly unfolds what some (with liberty and conscience in plenty on their tongues) mean as to “the right keeping of the Sabbath.”

“SABBATH DESECRATION IN SCOT-

LAND.—The annual meeting of the Sabbath Alliance was held in Edinburgh, on June 20. The Rev. Dr Robertson, who presided, said, they could not shut their eyes to the fact that Sabbath desecration was increasing among the people. — — From the Report it appeared that the North British Railway Company ran twice as many passenger trains on Sabbath, as all the other Scotch companies together. — — The report went on to say,—“Some special incidents took place in the course of the past year which caused considerable *anxiety* and *pain* to many Christian people in Scotland. During the Queen’s visit in September to Loch Maree, SHE and the Princess Beatrice, the Duchess of Roxburgh, and other members of the suite, were conveyed on the Sabbath across the loch in a six-oared boat to the Isle Maree, *where a considerable time was spent*. — — it was *gratifying* to the committee to be informed, that the boatmen who usually ply on the loch *refused to go*, and that the hotel-keeper had been obliged to employ his own servants also, that the *worthy* inn-keeper at Auchnasheen had *refused* to send, or even to convey letters to Loch Maree on the Lord’s Day. Your committee feel they would be guilty of a dereliction of duty were they to withhold their protest against such proceedings. — — They cannot but feel *deeply-grieved* that the Royal Family should so *frequently* manifest disregard for the *sacred* day of rest.” The Report then mentioned the arrival of the Prince of Wales at Hamilton Palace on Sunday, the 13th of January last, as another instance of Sabbath desecration. The Rev. G. Philip, Edinburgh, in moving the adoption of the Report, said, that there was a great deal of desecration of the Sabbath, not only by *glaring acts*, such as those mentioned, but by idleness—that was shewn on Sabbaths by the number of persons seen standing idly on the streets. The Report was adopted,— —

the meeting considering that the principles of Sabbath observance were intimately connected with the prosperity of the country.”

How strongly this reminds us of those Pharisees of old, who said,—“This man is not of God because he keepeth not the Sabbath day.” (*John* 9. 16.) Those men should have the rough and ready old Scotch King, James I. (already mentioned), her Majesty’s ancestor, to deal with them and teach them common manners, and not a quiet Lady like our present gracious Queen. (*Vide* the conference at Hampton Court before King James I., A.D. 1604.)

I say, therefore, that if such—or anything like it—is what Mr Sidey means by “the right keeping of the Sabbath,”—then I have no hesitation in saying, rather than that, I would prefer to see King James’ “Declaration and Book of Sports” again republished with authority among us; or see the Sunday kept at Napier as it is generally on the Continent.

It is a curious thing, and worthy of a passing notice, that throughout the whole world of Christians of various churches and denominations, *three* little Highland countries are at present given to the Sabbatarian superstition! Ethiopia, Armenia, and Scotland. At this very day in the Highlands of Ethiopia there is a so-called Christian Kingdom, dating back from a very early age, where both days are kept in the same manner and with equal strictness, the seventh day and the first,—the Sabbath of the Jews and the Lord’s day of the Christians. And in the mountains of Armenia, we find another church, the Nestorian, in which, as a modern traveller says:—“The Sabbath is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes, which I have seen among no other Christians of the East. I have repeatedly been told by Nestorians of the plain, that their brethren in the mountains would immedi-

ately kill a man, for travelling or labouring on the Sabbath; and there is abundant reason to believe that this was formerly done, though it has ceased since the people have become acquainted with the practice of Christendom on the subject." (Prof. Baden Powell, *Christianity without Judaism*.)

I fancy that great civiliser, *Steam*, whether by water or by land—as the “iron horse,” will work wonders, ere long, in the way of opening the eyes of our Northern Countrymen, and help to cure them of this debasing superstition.

But do not mistake me; for in thus writing I am well aware of the existence of a branch of the Sabbatarian party in England, although it is but a very small, and (I hope) a daily lessening one. We know with what painful strictness the Sabbatical view of the Sunday has been carried out in several excellent families, often with the most serious detriment to the religious life of the children; while the general effect upon ordinary persons, of the graver and more decent sort, though not themselves professing to be more especially religious, has been truly and painfully described by the celebrated Mr Wilberforce (*Practical Views of Christianity*;) as follows:— “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 agree-

ably!— — — Even business itself is recreation compared to religion; and *from the drudgery of this day* of sacred rest, they fly for relief to their ordinary occupations.”

A few years ago some of the Bishops of the Church of England addressed a circular letter to the Directors of the English Railway Companies, calling upon them to put a stop to the practice of sending out “Excursion Trains” on Sundays.— Seeking thus to debar their poorer brethren, who have no means of escaping from the crowded towns on the week-day, from any access, with their wives and families, to the blessings of the country, brought now within their reach by God’s good gift of railways; where they might see the wonders of God in creation and feel the soothing influences of Nature, when perhaps the voice of the preacher may have failed to reach them? Here the lines of one of our great English poets (Southey) seem so very applicable that I cannot help quoting them.—

Go thou and seek the House of Prayer!
I to the woodlands bend my way,
And meet Religion there!
She need not haunt the high-arched dome to pray,
Where storied windows dim the doubtful day;
With liberty she loves to rove
Wide o’er the heathy hill or crowslip’d dale,
Or seek the shelter of the embowering grove,
Or with the streamlet wind along the vale.

And just so, again, another great poet of our own day (Tennyson),—

And forth into the fields I went,
And Nature’s living motion lent
The pulse of hope to discontent.
I wondered at the bounteous hours,
The slow result of winter showers
You scarce could see the grass for flowers.
I wondered, while I paced along
The woods were filled so full of song,
There seemed no room for sense of wrong.
Our artizans, then, if the circular in question could have had its way, were to have

been denied the refreshment for the overwrought body, that solace for the wearied mind, which the sight and taste of these pure joys of Nature are, by God's own gracious ordinance, especially meant to give them. The rich might drive each day of the week along the green lanes, amidst the scented hay or the golden corn,—might “hear the wild music of the wind-swept grove,” or “mark the billows burst in silver light;” but the poor, on *the only day* on which they can (if they will) have a share in this enjoyment of nature, which their Father's gracious care has abundantly provided for them,—a gift of this new time, a compensation, as it were, for some of the evils which our modern civilization has brought with it,—the poor were to have been deprived of their rightful liberty and enjoyment, under the mistaken notion of promoting the due observance of Sunday! Happily the Directors laid that unwise address quietly on the shelf, and gave *no reply* to it.—(Would that some here in Napier had duly remembered *this*.)

It must not be overlooked, that, both in England and in Scotland, (as we have already in part seen,) no small portion of the continuance of this Sabbatarian error *is owing to the two National Churches*. (1) That of Scotland, through her common teaching and *Shorter Catechism* (as I have already fully shown); and (2) that of England, through the enjoined reading of the 4th Jewish Commandment (together with the others) in the ears of the people, in the ante-Communion Service from the Communion Table (which some of her Ministers—Jewishly, Heathenly, or thoughtlessly,—like to miscall “the Altar”!!) At which reading by the Minister, the people have this prayer also put into their mouths,—“Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep *this law*.” As one has said very truthfully and very forcibly,—“Consider the *weekly recitation* of the 4th Commandment, and the *re-*

sponse to it, without one word of comment or qualification on the part of the Church; notwithstanding that no one believes *Jewish Sabbath* to be either binding upon Christians or possible in modern life, and not the strictest Puritan of us all, not even Scotland herself, ever 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 paths of innumerable honest men and women. If the 4th. 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! 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.” — Here we are carried back to Dr Norman McLeod's truthful remark;—“What effect has this? I think it has the effect of *weakening morality*.”

A similar admission, in fact, is made in a volume of “Replies to Essays and Reviews,” published under the express sanction of the late Bishop (Wilberforce) of Oxford, saying;—“Some schoolbooks still teach the ignorant that the earth is 6000 years old, and that all things were created in six days. No well-educated person of the present day shares in the delusion.—Whatever be the meaning of the six days, ending with the seventh day's mystical and symbolical rest, *indisputably we cannot accept them in their literal meaning*. They serve, apparently, as the divisions of the record of Creation, lest the mind may be too much burdened and

perplexed by all these wonderful acts; but *they as plainly do not denote the order of succession of all the individual creations.*" Such is the statement made, under the authority of the (High-Church) Bishop of Oxford. And thus we can now no longer receive this account in Genesis as a record of historical or scientific fact. We see that it is only the attempt of a devout philosophic mind of those ancient times, to express in words the ideas, which either had arisen in his own mind, or which perhaps he had derived from others, as to the creation of the Universe

But, with the historical truth of the account of the Creation, is abandoned also the very basis, upon which the observance of the 4th. Commandment is based in the Book of Exodus. If it can no longer be believed that "in six days" God made the Universe, and rested on the seventh, then the whole basis of the traditionary reason for Sabbatarian observance falls at once to the ground. No reasonable man can any longer suppose that these other laws were actually uttered with a Divine voice from the heights of Sinai; and, as I view it, all Church of England Ministers do wrong if they leave their congregations in doubt about this matter, — if they do not tell them plainly that, in reading those Commandments, beginning with the statement, "God spake these words and said,"—they are merely reading, in obedience to the directions of their Church, a passage from the Bible just as they read by the same authority the Psalms or the Athanasian Creed,—without committing themselves individually to the Psalmist's curses on his enemies, or to the damnatory sentences of the unknown writer of the latter document.

It has often (especially of late years) been a matter of both surprise and pain to me, to see how commonly (habitually?) the Ministers of the Church of England read those words containing the old notion

of the Creation of the World "in six days," without any attempt at disabusing the minds of their congregations respecting it. Can it possibly arise from their training and habit? or from thoughtlessness,—the *not caring* to think, or the *suppressing* of thought? Surely, *some*, at least, of those Ministers must know that such was not the case; that modern science has utterly disproved it? If so; why not (occasionally) tell their congregations as much, and teach them the truth! I need hardly repeat that, with our present knowledge,—*which is the gift of God*—it is no longer possible to regard these narratives as statements of matter-of-fact, historical, occurrences;— that no doubt now remains in the mind of any intelligent, well-educated person, that not even the one world in which we live—much less, the mighty Universe, of which it forms such an insignificant part—was made "in six days," as the Bible statements, honestly interpreted, most certainly imply. But if, on the contrary some of the ministers still believe in the absolute truth of that old Hebrew notion,—all I can say is, —that it is no wonder that they find the people generally to care so little about "going to Church," and about their teachings, seeing they are so very far behind their flock, so *utterly ignorant of the truth*, —even in things which are commonly well-known now-a-days to school-boys.

I can only truthfully say for myself,—that were I now ministering to a Congregation, I could no more coldly [or "impressively"] read, pass by, or slur over, those strange aberrant formularies and portions of Church services (above mentioned), together with the old legends in the lessons from the Bible, *without explaining them* and telling my congregation why I read them,—then I could wilfully bear false witness against my neighbour, or defraud my creditors!

Of those Sabbatarians among us here in Napier,—who, with or without any

thought on the subject, signed the Document against the calling of the Mail Steamers here on Sundays,—how many of them are there (I should like to know), who, when the English Mail arrives here on a Saturday evening or night—as is commonly the case,—are really *willing* to wait patiently till (say) the Monday *afternoon* before getting their letters? for, of course, if their views are correct, the Post Office Officials should not work until the Monday *afternoon*. Again: of those Sabbatarians how many are there who on the Sunday morning are quite willing and agreeable (without kicking the cat or scolding the maid) to go without Milk for their or their children's breakfast, &c., on the Sunday? Did they ever consider, when sipping their Hyson or Coffee at breakfast,—how many poor souls have really transgressed the ancient Jewish Law of "Sabbath Observance," in many hours of heavy toil and work from before daylight, at Clive and at Taradale in milking, and in bringing their milk into town, to enable them to have a nice cup of tea or coffee, and their little ones a cup of milk? As Capt. Cuttle said, I would they would "just take a note of it!"

One thing more I feel inclined to mention, as it has a considerable bearing on our subject of "Sabbath observance;" particularly that side of it,—*the regular attendance at Church*, which, with some, is of the very greatest importance; especially now that such attendance is also become a matter of money and of commercial speculation: for much of this, however, my fellow-townsmen will have to thank themselves. [I pretty well know that I shall displease a few by my plain remarks and statement, but that I must (*again*) bear.] I allude to the horrid money collections, which are now, at every "Divine Service," never omitted, accurately made, and thought very much of. And, I may further say,—that I think I have a right to bring this matter forward, from the fact of my being

the *only* European here who has always consistently opposed it; and I began early to do so. It was in the autumn of 1851 that the late Bishop of Lichfield, Dr. Selwyn, who was then the Bishop of New Zealand, paid his visit here. He staid a week at my house (Waitangi), and on the Friday he informed me, that he wished a Collection (or "Offertory") to be made on the following Sunday in the Church. This took me wholly by surprise; for (1) it had never occurred here before; and (2) the whole congregation of Maoris were utterly without money; I might, perhaps, have a few old coins in my desk, which had not seen the sun for years. On the Saturday I told the Bishop of our situation, and, also of my disliking his proposal (for many reasons), but that of course made little difference to him. So, on the Sunday, when the Bishop began to read the sentences in the Ante-Communion Service, he beckoned to his Maori travelling companion Rota, who came up to the Table, took from the Bishop a small black velvet bag (into which the Bishop put his gift) came to me, from whom he got nothing, and then, having tried some half-a-dozen of the Maoris (who looked on in astonishment!), and also getting nothing from them, Rota returned with his bag to the Bishop. Again, soon after the opening of the first-built little part of St. John's Church here In Napier, some 15-16 years ago, a meeting of the Church Congregation was called, and the Rev Mr St. Hill wished to introduce the money collection or "Offertory;" this I again opposed as being the very opposite of the principles of the Gospel, and as mocking the poor who came to Church, [nearly all of us were poor in money in those days!] but I could only succeed in doing away with that of the Evening Service; and this was agreed to, but only held for a time! I remember saying on that occasion, that I for one would give £5 a year to have no collection on

Sundays,—which was more than I should give supposing I attended every Sunday in the year and gave the customary shilling. A year or two after that I let the Churchwardens know, that I would keep to the old English rule, and only give on the Communion Sunday (*viz*, the first Sunday of the month). But Mr Churchwarden Tiffen would, notwithstanding, persist in shoving his plate into my pew every Sunday,—of course he got nothing from me; however I very soon cured him of that, for I told him, that I would carry to Church copper pennies (the true big *old* coin!)—and if he ever shoved in his plate again (save on the Communion Sunday), he would get a big copper with a jingle! (my pew too being then next to his,) and I knew that others would follow suit. Mr Tiffen being “wise,” kept out of it, and I was never again troubled with that plate.—For my own part I can conscientiously say, that I would not minister in a congregation where such an open support was given to Mammon and to Little-mindedness, to Pride-of-Life and to Backbiting. 'Tis in such matters that “the Devil” (whether that of Mr Oliver or any other person) is truly well served, and he laughs to his heart’s content!! By all means let every Church—every Denomination—support its own Minister,—and *support the faithful one WELL* ; but let that “be done decently and in order,” and *not* at the expense of mocking *the poor*,—to whom the Gospel is *not now* preached. For it is evident,—both from *Advertisements*, and from the touting for and boasting of *money* collections,—that it is with too many Churches just a with the Theatres and other like performances,—*come with money in your pocket or you will not be welcome*. And this (such alas! is human nature) will be sure to act as a powerful lever in the matter of keeping up the “Sabbath Observance” and the going to Church; possibly more so than the 4th Commandment

and the thunders of Sinai! But when the time of solemn thought and of re-action comes, the Congregations will always have it in their power to put all such sordid trafficking down,—by *just acting as I did*.

Of one thing, however, I feel quite sure, —and from it I derive no small comfort,—that the time is coming when,—not only in this matter of “Sabbath Observance” but in all similar and kindred matters affecting true Religion and the whole well-being of Man,—the human race will no longer submit to be ruled or guided,—catechized, preached to, and prayed for, by any mere assuming family or clique of pretentious persons, but will assert their own inalienable birthright, and choose for themselves and for their children able and fitting guides and teachers both lay and clerical. And truly good and wise will the Ministers of the various Churches be in that day, if they heartily assist in bringing all needed Reform to pass.

No doubt, interested folks in Church and in State will ever strongly oppose this; —as, indeed, they have always done,—for no true Reform ever comes from *within!* and they may also, *for a time*, succeed; but such will not, can not, prevent the needed Reform,—scarcely, indeed, delay it,—and will only serve to make it the more complete and effectual when brought to pass.

Already, I may truly say, light is breaking all around, *the result of modern Biblical Criticism*; and to this I would especially call the attention of all thoughtful members of the Church of England. They may see it in the *three* great works in reference to the Bible, which have been taken in hand by leading men in that Church under competent authority, *viz*. (1) The *new Lectionary*; (2) the *new Bible Commentary* “by Bishops and other clergy of the Anglican Church”; and (3) in the *new and corrected authorised version of the Bible* (not yet completed);—all however the results of Modern Bible Criticism; all pro-

fessedly based upon the latest results of learned, as well as devout, study of the sacred oracles.

Take, for instance, the *New Lectionary*, (which, I believe, is in use here.)—some, perhaps many, of the hearers of its lessons read will have hardly noticed this fact, that now for the first time in the History of the Church of England the first 3 verses of the second chapter of Genesis are publicly read for a Sunday lesson in connection with the first chapter of that Book, as the closing portion of the account of the Creation contained in that chapter. Some of the regular congregation will have hardly perceived any difference has been made in that lesson for Septuagesima Sunday,—will have taken for granted that the same words were read on that day in their ears, which have been always read year after year ever since they were old enough to enter a church, and centuries before they were born. But a change has really been made by the lawful authority in that Church—small in appearance, but momentous in its consequences—one which opens up the whole question of Modern Biblical Criticism before the eyes of the whole congregation. But why is the Lesson for Septuagesima Sunday now for the first time made to end with the third verse of the 2nd Chapter of Genesis? A glance at the Bible will shew at once the reason. It is because the matter contained in these three verses is precisely similar in character to that contained in the whole first chapter,—and *quite distinct* from that which follows in the rout of the second chapter and in the third. The attention of thoughtful persons is thus directed to the fact, that there are TWO accounts of the Creation in the Bible; written by *different persons* and at *different times* in the world's history and *widely differing the one from the other*. The old division of chapters, sanctioned by use and the pious ignorance of past ages, which has hitherto

obscured the truth for most English readers, is once for all deliberately set aside, and reason and scholarship are at last allowed their due rights even in the treatment of Holy Scripture. As I view it, it is the duty of all the intelligent members of the Church of England to understand clearly the truth of this matter, which is now brought before them by the highest authorities; and it is certainly the duty of the Ministers (as many of them at least as are really able and willing to do so), to set that truth in a plain intelligible form before the eyes of their congregations. This little Lectionary, though simple in appearance, yet, being established by law in the Church of England, will be found, on close consideration, to involve principles which will tend to revolutionise the whole system of traditionary teaching, admitting light and air into the long shut up, darkened and musty, chambers.—

Moreover, the *new Bible Commentary* (a portion of which *has only just been seen by me*.) admits that we have *no correct copy of the Ten Commandments* as really uttered by the Divine Voice on Sinai; and that “the *two distinct statements*” of them in Exodus and Deuteronomy, *though differing from each other* in several weighty particulars,” are “*apparently of equal authority*” and “each is said, with reiterated emphasis, to contain the words that were actually spoken by the Lord, and written by Him upon the stones.— — — It has been generally assumed that the whole of one or other of these copies was written on the Tables of Stone. Most commentators have supposed that the original document is in Exodus, and that the author of Deuteronomy wrote from memory, with variations suggested at the time. Others have conceived that Deuteronomy must furnish the more correct form, since the Tables must have been in actual existence when that Book was written. But *neither* of these views can be *fairly* reconciled with

the statements in Exodus and Deuteronomy, to which reference has been made. *If either copy*, as a whole, *represents* what was written on the Tables, it is obvious that *the other cannot do so.*" We are also told,—that the Ten Commandments were, probably, originally uttered all in the same *terse* form as those which now remain, as, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," &c., and were, *afterwards*, considerably enlarged by Moses,—a supposition which is, of course, entirely opposed to the usual traditional notion. Thus, for instance, the 4th Commandment, as uttered by Jehovah on Sinai, was merely the brief injunction, "Remember the Sabbath-day to sanctify it"; it was Moses who *afterwards added* the further details, "Six days shalt thou labour, &c.,"—but with the wonderful and perplexing *variations* and *additions*, in the *two* different accounts given in Exodus and in Deuteronomy as to the reason for keeping the "Sabbath;" and *both* equally said to have been authoritatively given by Jehovah himself! Further, this Bible Commentary instructs its readers that, generally, wherever they read in the Pentateuch, "And Jehovah spake unto Moses saying," they are to conclude—not that there was any audible utterance, but only—that Moses felt himself moved by an inward Divine impulse to enact certain laws, *which*, however, *he not unfrequently copied* "from existing and probably very ancient and widely spread heathen institutions;—adopting existing and ancient customs, with significant additions, as helps in the education of his people." And this Commentary also informs its readers, that "it is by no means unlikely, that there are insertions of a later date, which were written or Sanctioned by the Prophets and holy men, who *after the Captivity*, arranged and edited the Scriptures of the Old Testament." (*B.C.* I. pp. 335, 494, 717, &c.)

The *new Translation of the Bible* is

progressing, but it lies at present hidden in the secret chamber and not yet communicated to the world. May I live to see it published! I noted, however, that one of the most eminent of the translators, and a Bishop in the English Church, said openly in Convocation when this work was begun,—"I must own it is my belief that, when the Authorised Version has received all the amendments of which it is capable and which it absolutely requires, this will be found to have effected a very great change in many parts of the Bible; and I think that one effect of this will be that it will deprive many of the clergy, and perhaps still more of Dissenting Ministers, of some of their most favourite texts. We ought not to conceal from ourselves that it will very materially alter the text of Scripture."

Three small matters, all: however, though diverse in kind, being steps in the right direction and highly significant, have also lately taken place here, at which I rejoice:—(1) The opening of our Athenæum News Room on Sunday afternoons: (2) The running of no less than 18 separate trains (going and returning) from Dunedin on the Sunday, between the hours of 9 morning and 6 evening: and (3) the alteration made by the Presbyterian Church, in doing away with their Sacramental *Fast-day* before that of their Church Communion.

To these I might justly and properly add, as a *fourth*,—the great and good matter of State Education—civil and scientific, reasonable and *truly religious*,—recently undertaken by the Government of our Country: but this is yet in its infancy, and would require a whole paper to do it justice. Thus much, however, I would say, as it bears greatly on our subject of "Sabbath Observance,"—that the sooner the various and dissonant *old Church Catechisms* are altered, (Like the *new Bible Commentary*, and the *new translation of the Bible*,) and so made conformable to truth, and to

truthful religious and scientific teaching, the better for the children, (especially those at Sunday Schools,) and for the future generation,—aye, for the rising state of New Zealand.—And here I would call attention to some solemn words of a late Archbishop of the English Church,—words well worthy of being weighed by all Teachers,—whether of Sunday or of Day School—by religions as well as scientific Teachers of all classes:—“He who propagates a delusion, and he who connives at it when already existing, both tamper with Truth. We must neither lead nor leave men to mistake falsehood for Truth. Not to undeceive, is to deceive. The giving, or not correcting, false reasons for right conclusions, false grounds for right belief, false principles for right practice,—the holding forth or fostering false consolations, false encouragements, or false sanctions, or conniving at their being held forth or believed,—are all pious frauds. This springs from, and it will foster and increase, a want of veneration for Truth: it is an affront put upon the Spirit of Truth.” On these words I would ask *one* question—of *Ministers* and Sunday School Teachers. How can we serve the Living and True God, except so far as we are

servants of the Truth? And how can we be servants of the Truth, if we knowingly shut our eyes to facts which *we do not like*, because they *conflict with our preconceived notions*; and if we not only do this ourselves, but attempt to close, or to keep shut, or to throw dust in, the eyes of others under our influence, that they may not be able to see the facts which God’s wise Providence, in this age of the world, has made known to us for our instruction and guidance in life?

Lastly, (before that I leave this part of my subject,) I will say, after more than 20 years serious study of the matter before me,—that it is my conviction, that these three facts may now be regarded as established by a very general consent of competent Modern Scholars, *not pledged* to the support of traditional views,—(1) That no part of the original story of the Exodus can have been composed before the time of SAMUEL: (2) That Deuteronomy was written not long before the Babylonish Captivity: and (3) that the Levitical legislation originated during the Captivity; by which the notion of the Mosaic authorship and infallible Divine authority of the whole, or indeed of any portion, of the Pentateuch is shown to be untenable.

IV. REASONABLY.

Including (1) *Theologically* and (2) *Humanly* or, in plainer words,—for the Glory of God and the Good of Man.

“*The Sabbath*,”—the Lord’s Day, the Sunday, the Day of Rest,—like all other good things,—“*was made FOR man*.” by his bounteous Creator. Let us ever bear this in mind.

And, *first*, let us seek to be delivered from a slavish spirit in respect to the old abrogated Jewish Sabbath-day; toss it overboard, have done with it: then, *secondly*, seek to realize that true “liberty” where-

with the Gospel of Jesus has made us free: and, *then*, we shall be able clearly to comprehend the true, the deep, meaning of those words,—“*The Sabbath was made FOR man*,”—For it is only by so doing that we can arrive at the true enjoyment of the Sunday as a Day of rest, a *Day of refreshing!* and learn to keep it in spirit and in truth with thankfulness of heart as a truly enjoyable day, a day which the Lord hath blessed; a day of strength-recruiting, a day of true refreshment both to body and soul, a day of worship, a day of social rejoicing,

a day which the Bountiful Father has pre-eminently instituted for the good of his creature man!

The old saying still holds good,—“*Tot capita tot sensus*” (So many heads so many minds),—but, not withstanding, by all (I suppose) this will be allowed,—that the *day* is given to us by Nature, and therefore by Nature’s God, for labour, and the *night* for rest; this is certain,—

“He appointed the Moon for seasons; The Sun knoweth his going down.— — — Man goeth forth unto his work, And to his labour until the Evening,”

As a rule, then, there is a law laid upon us by the ordering of our Creator, that we should wake and work by day, and rest and sleep by night. It is, however, a law not meant to be enforced with strict severity, as if we might never work by night or sleep by day: it is a law made known by a wise Father to intelligent children,—by the Divine Reason to His reasonable creatures. The law of the interchange of day and night was “made *for man*,”—not man for the law. The law of daily toil and nightly rest is to be our *rule*, our general guide,—though we are left at full liberty, of our own free will, when we see occasion for it to depart from it. We know that, if we do depart from it constantly, without something to compensate the breach of Nature’s law, we shall suffer the consequences. It is God’s Law that the daytime shall be the time of labour for the *individual*, as well as the time for social *common* work, for the setting forward of those labours which concern the welfare of the whole community. And so is it with regard to the week and the weekly rest. We need—at all events, in civilized communities, where there is such continual tension of the brain, and draining of the nervous energy—the recurrence of days of rest,—rest, not to be enforced upon us, from the necessity of a positive law, but rest commended to us by the wise provisions of

our gracious Creator, and approved by universal experience to be a source of infinite blessing,—the right of the poor man as well as the rich,—as needful, in fact, for the wants of our physical, social, moral, and religious nature, as the rest by night after the toil of the day. “God has spoken this word to us,” *not* from the burning summit of Sinai, but in his Fatherly Wisdom and Goodness, and woe be to us if we refuse to heed His teachings. At the time of the French Revolution it was tried to alter every *seventh* (day of rest or ceasing to labour) to every *tenth* day, but it was found on trial not to answer, and was pronounced by scientific men and physiologists, who had studied man’s nature and natural wants, to be insufficient.

I conclude, then, with all reasonable confidence, that one day out of seven has been graciously indicated by the Creator as a day of rest for labouring and weary men;—that, although the Hebrew philosopher in Genesis had no real historical basis for inserting in his cosmogony a sacred reason for the custom, which he found already existing among his people, and the observance of which he desired to enforce among them, yet there was a deeply grounded substantial truth in his assertion,—“God blessed the Sabbath-day and sanctified it.”

Let us consider in what sense, with reference to what wants of his nature,—“*the Sabbath*”—or day of rest—“*was made for man*.”

1. It is good, first, for his *physical* nature, that his nerves may be relaxed, the pressure taken off his brain, the sweat of toil wiped off his brow. We all feel that, while regular and constant employment is upon the whole the best condition for the health and vigour of all the faculties, it may be too constant—too wearying and exhausting—for body or mind. This becomes most evident, when a break intervenes, and *after the holiday* the tasks of

daily life are renewed with a fresh spring of energy. This is felt most strongly indeed at the time of youth, when labours for the most part are carried on by compulsion, whether of parents or teachers, or of masters and employers. But it is not confined to youth alone: and, whether the muscles or the mind are at their full stretch, we know that they are the more fit for use after rest, or after such a change of action as amounts to rest. For *inaction* is not by any means always the rest of waking human creatures, and to the very young it is often irksome in the extreme,—and physically, as well as morally, injurious. Hence it is that to them the *Holy Day*—or Sunday, through the ignorance of parents and of Ministers,—is too often the very contrary of a *Holiday* (which it should be), and the notion of Heaven, as an *eternal Sabbath*, most distasteful and disheartening; while the *righteous* rebellion of all their faculties and powers against the Sabbatarian restraints imposed upon them,—which is merely *the voice of that very nature which God has given them*,—has been too often most ignorantly and cruelly interpreted into a sinful aversion of the mind from God and his Laws! or to the listenings to the suggestions of the tempter or “Devil!!” [Whose *true personality*, with or without horns and hoofs, bat’s wings and tail, has lately been so energetically preached to wondrous credulous audiences here in Napier!!! I need not say, to intelligent men, with what *serious* consequences, in too many cases, *to the whole future life of the child*. I believe, that to this cause,—perhaps as much as to any other, be traced *the fact*, that so many children of *pious*, but *unwise*, parents grow up ungodly and profane. Their whole notions of *religion* have been distorted from the first; their nature has been thwarted, their ideas of right and wrong confounded, their *true* spiritual growth dwarfed and stunted; till at length all their

views about Religion have become embittered, gloomy, and morose; *they hate the very thought of it*, and turn with distaste from all mention of that “other God,” whom they have been taught and coerced to worship in a wretched servile way according to “the letter,” *instead* of the *One* only Living and True God;—our common loving Father, whose true service is delight, and only “in spirit and in truth,” and therefore ever in accordance with reason, — God’s best gift to man.

I say, then, for our *physical* nature we all need, as a rule, the rest of Sunday; but that rest should consist of *REFRESHMENT of body and mind*,—of a recruiting of both bodily and mental strength, as well as of mere relief, or cessation, from the six days toil, That *refreshment*—we must never forget—will be found differently under different circumstances; *even as our common natural tastes differ for different kinds of food*. And let no man judge his brother in this matter; to his own Master each must stand or fall. What is really wanted in this respect,—instead of mere dull inaction, or keeping quiet within doors,—is such pleasant exercise of mind or body, as shall best relieve the burdened system, and leave best fitted for the other uses, for which the Sunday rest is needed.

— But it may be, that you have had to work hard all the week (or working days), and on the Sunday morning you still *feel too tired* to rise and go to some Church—of which you may be a member, or a regular attendant. Don’t think for a moment you are doing what is right in so rising and so going to Church, and there spend your time sleepily; if you do so, you do what is wrong before God, who wishes you to take care of your body; your first duty (in such a case) is to remain in bed and rest. *Nature tells you so*; and you dare not resist her powerful voice. Rest is sweet for the wearied jaded body, therefore use the

Sunday's rest bountifully as it is bountifully given you for your bodies. Just so, again, with others, whose minds have in their varied mental occupations during the week been fully on the stretch; if you were to go to Church you would, in all likelihood, feel that you could not attend to anything as you ought to do:—*Don't then go*, but take a walk, or a ride, or whatever kind of relaxation (which is your mind's true rest) you feel will do you the most good, and strengthen and brace your mind for the duties of the coming week.

2. It is good for our *moral* nature, which requires rest no less than our physical. It is good that men should be able—at all events, for one day in seven—to shake off their secular chains, and realise that they are not bound as slaves for ever to cash-books and ledgers, to buying and selling, to the labors of the office, the bank, the workshop, and the study,—that they have a right, the very humblest and poorest among them, to go forth on this day in the dignity of Nature's freed men, cleansed from the dust and stains of the weekly labors, released from its necessary, but often heavy, drudgery, clothed in their best, and lightened, as much as may be, of the burdens and cares of life, to enjoy the sunlight and the breeze, the sight of the broad earth, the sea, and the sky, to walk among the fields and flowers, the cornlands and pastures, and hear the song of birds, the ripple of the babbling stream, or, it may be, the mighty sound of ocean's murmurings or tossings,—and to say with child-like reverence and confidence,—“It is our Father's Hand which made them all!”

“Poor sons of toil! oh, grudge them not
the breeze
That plays with sabbath flowers; the
clouds, that play
With sabbath winds; the hum, of sabbath
bees;
The sabbath walk; the sky-lark's sabbath

lay:

The silent sunshine of the sabbath day!”

3. Thirdly, our *religious* nature needs the day of rest, that we may have time to turn our thoughts within, and see how we are ripening for Heaven; see how we are making ready for the great account, and growing in the tempers of the children of God; that we may specially commune, each with his own soul and with the Great Creator; may seek His Face may study His Word and His Works,— may “acquaint ourselves with God, and be at peace” The true child of God will, indeed, have such communion with his Heavenly Father each day of his life. But, on other days, the cares and duties of the world intervene; they must more or less distract his thoughts, and engage his time, and they must be allowed to do so: for they are part of that six days' work which God gives them to do, as He gives them also the day of rest.

On Sundays we may all meet together in the House of Him who is the Father of all! For this—Common Worship—is the highest and noblest of all the occupations of Sunday. It is true, very true, men may, and do, worship God in the closet at home,—or as they walk abroad in the depths of the forest, by the babbling stream, by the margin of the sea, or on the mountain top, or side. But in Religion, as well as in many other matters, it is not good for man to be always alone—it is not meant that he should be so. And the presence of many worshippers, joining together in common prayer and praise to the great Father of all,—feeding together on the same living bread,—drinking together freely from the same wine and milk, “without money and without price,”—bringing together their burdens of sorrow or of sin, their cares and troubles, or, it may be, their songs of deliverance, their tribute of thanksgiving, to the Adorable Source of all Light, and Life, and Blessing,

—this union of many hearts tends to strengthen and deepen the Religious feeling of all; it helps us to realise more fully the fact that our spiritual being is a glorious reality,—that Communion is possible,—is actually taking place,—between the Father of spirits and His children upon earth; that we are members together of one great Family, one Church of the Living God.—

Yes: such happy seasons have been known—both in England and in New-Zealand; such may, yea *will*, be known again. But before that can possibly take place a *great change* is needed; a change affecting almost everything connected with Public Worship as it is now; a change in which both the Minister and the Congregation are all equally concerned; and that desirable change will again be known among the Churches when those who worship therein (including those who serve) shall become—as the old Hebrews had It—WHOLE-HEARTED in the matter of God’s Service. *Then* Sundays will be as they should be—Holy days and Holidays and Happy days: days of rejoicing and of refreshment. As dear George Herbert beautifully (though quaintly) says:—

“The Sundays of man’s life
Threaded together on time’s string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King.
On Sundays Heaven’s gate stands ope;
Blessings are plentiful and ripe,
More plentiful than hope.
Thou art a day of *mirth*:
And, where the week-days trail on ground,
Thy flight is higher, as thy birth:
O let me take thee at the bound,
Leaping with thee from seven to seven.
Till that we both, being tossed from earth,
Fly hand in hand to heaven !”

4. Lastly our *social* nature needs above all the Sunday,—and for this end, we may reasonably believe, it is specially indicated. The Sun and Moon are set in the heavens to be for “signs” and for “seasons,” not to

single individuals but to *all*,—to all the human family together, and alike to all. How greatly are the joys of the Sunday-walk, of the Sunday-recreation, of the Sunday-holiday, intensified, by sharing them with others, with the members of our family, it may be, reunited from time to time; or with friends and neighbours, breathing with us the fresh air, and freedom, the cheering delights, of the day of rest! What support it also gives to the moral sense of man’s higher nature and destiny, of his dignity above the brutes that perish, when by common consent the business of daily life is broken off, that all may meet together on that day at least, cleared from the week’s defiling dust, not as masters and servants, as lords and laborers,—not as poor trembling slaves with scrupulous consciences under a “hateful” *Jewish Law* believed to be Divine!—but as fellowmen, upon the common ground of their humanity! and all alike as children of the One Great and ever loving Father.

Much has been done of late years in England towards the clearing away of some of the hindrances which prevented the larger number of the bulk of the people from enjoying to the full the Sunday rest—the Sunday *refreshment*—as He, who framed their being, has meant them to enjoy it; and it is to be hoped, that the Imperial Legislature there will soon clear away also the remaining ones. So that the people generally will no longer be debarred from access, during at least some part of the Sunday, to purer sources of delight in Gardens and Museums, in Aquariums and Galleries, where the wonders of Nature and the beauties of Art, the interesting remains of Antiquity, and the marvels of Science Discovery and Invention, are stored; and, therefore, will not be, (as heretofore) any longer impelled to seek other pleasures, of a gross and sensual kind,—more destructive to body and soul than continued honest labor; aye,

driven (as they too long have been) by sheer vacuity of mind having no power, even if they would, to devote the "whole day" to religious thought and worship, being utterly incapable of such prolonged mental exertion,—having the Sunday on their hands, and not knowing what to do with it.

From the Annual Report of the Royal Gardens at Kew (London),—which have been lately thrown open to the Public on *Sundays* as well as on week-days,—I find the Director, Sir J.D. Hooker, says,—“The number of visitors to the Royal Gardens continues to increase annually; but always very many more on the *Sunday* than on any other day of the week. Total number on Sundays during the year, 359,237: total number on week-days, 340,189: greatest Sunday attendance (June 21st) 23,117.” And yet, notwithstanding such immense crowds largely composed of working people, the greatest order prevailed, and no injury was done to the plants: all being more or less delighted at the wonderful display of Nature’s varied stores; which no doubt to some—and perhaps not a few—led on to higher and clearer Views of the Great Creator of all!

But still the glory of the Christian Sunday is Common Worship. And, whatever may be done, publicly or privately, to enlarge and to elevate the enjoyments of the working-classes on the Sunday, God forbid that it should not be done with a due regard to the Worship of Almighty God, which especially irradiates and dignifies the day, and casts a bright ray over all the week besides. For what is to be desired is, not that the Sunday should be secularised, but that the true Sunday spirit,—the spirit of Christian Trust and Hope, and Joy,—the spirit of childlike love and childlike confidence, the spirit of devout delight in the Word and in the Works of our adorable Creator,—and the spirit of brotherly love to help one another,— shall so pene-

trate our whole being, with the help afforded by the Sunday rest, that the secular six days’ work may be ennobled, purified, and sanctified.

The time is at hand, I trust, when the Heads of the Church of England both at Home and in the colonies, (to say nothing of those of other Churches,) instead of attempting with feeble hand to stay the wave of progress, will devote themselves heartily to the true work, which especially falls to their lot in the present day, and, instead of desperately clinging to that which is untenable in the traditions of the past, will endeavour “with just and firm hand” (to use the words of Mr Gladstone,) “to sever the *transitory* from the *durable*, and the *accidental* from the *essential*, in old opinions;” and, among other similar matters, will come to rest the observance of the Sunday on its *true* grounds,—physical, social, moral, and religious,—and not on the unsound, unreal basis, on which not a few of our fellow-Christians are still resting it;—will see how the happy healthful freedom of the Sunday may be best enjoyed by the working classes, without sacrificing its religious blessings,—how the great works of human genius, the works of God-gifted men, and the still greater works of creative wisdom, may be enjoyed in our Parks and Gardens, Museums and Galleries, without therefore emptying the various Churches and Chapels, or interfering with the proper rest of others. Aye, and that they will not overlook the smaller simpler matters, which largely affect the great bulk of the “lambs of their flocks” on Sundays,—to say nothing of their influence on them in after life. Such as, for instance, their being able *openly* and *honestly* to spend their Sunday holiday penny, in apples or in nuts, in lollies or in peppermint drops,—without going by a round-about and tortuous way to do it! through back-doors, and with hurried anxious glances up and down the street or

lane, and by closing the doors stealthily after them that no one may see them! such, too, being often done, on their way to or from the Sunday School. Both Ministers and Parents, I fear, have long overlooked these *sad beginnings*,—this sure *neutralising of all sound Sunday School Teaching*,—this “*weakening of morality*,” as Dr. N. McLeod truly calls it. Here is a case in point, to hand this very day while I am writing these words, in one of the latest English Papers just received by the S.F. Mail,—which I quote entire as therein given.

“GUILDFORD BOROUGH BENCH.

On Monday before the Mayor (Mr Alderman Crooke), Mr Alderman Triggs, Mr Alderman Upperton, Mr D. Haydn, Mr G. Smallpiece, Mr J. Weale, and Mr J. T. Sells, the following cases were heard:—

THE LORD’S DAY ACT.—Mrs Jane Triggs, a widow, keeping a small tobacconist and sweet-stuff shop in Northstreet, was summoned, at the instance of Mr Superintendent Law, under the Act of Charles II., for exercising her worldly calling on the Lord’s Day. It appeared that *a sergeant went into the defendant’s shop on a Sunday and purchased a penny-worth of peppermint*. A number of boys in the shop were also committing a like crime. The Mayor advised the defendant to close her shop on Sunday, but looking at the almost obsolete nature of the Act, the Bench declined to convict.

Now, while I honour and admire the noble conduct of that large and liberal Bench of English Magistrates, (who seem to have mustered strong and in a body on that occasion,)—what suitable words can I find in the English language to express my utter disgust at the conduct of those two over-officious police officers,—Superintendent Law and his fitting mate the Sergeant,—in their crusade against that poor widow! I have little doubt that they themselves, when boys, spent with much

glee in like manner their Sunday holiday penny! And here I may also briefly add, as bearing on the foregoing,—that there was only one other case before that full Bench on that day,—viz. that of a man charged by a constable as being drunk and disorderly on the Saturday night. This, however, was amply and completely disproved by several witnesses, in spite of the exertions of Superintendent Law; so that “in the end the Mayor said, the conduct of the constable would be referred to the Watch Committee, and the defendant was discharged without a stain on his character. The decision was received with loud cheers by a crowded Court. In the course of the hearing Mr White (the counsel for the defendant) took exception to the interference of Superintendent Law with one of the witnesses, and threatened if it were repeated to retire from the case.”—*Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 9th.

To return: We must never forget, that, if God has given us so freely the knowledge of Himself in the Holy Scriptures, which His Providence has “caused to be written for our learning,”—He has *also* given us in this our day most wonderful illumination by the LIGHT of the different Sciences, which all come to us from Him, who is “the Father of Lights, the Giver of every good and perfect gift.” So sudden, indeed, has been the growth of this light, that, even in the childhood of many of us, the very names of many of those Sciences were hardly known. Yet now we stand surrounded, as it were, with the blaze of their commingled radiance; and, in every well-ordered school, lessons will be taught to our young children, with respect to the age of man, the history of the earth’s formation, the distribution of animal-species upon the face of it, &c., &c., which will be seen hereafter, as they grow in years and power of thought, if they are not already seen by them, to conflict entirely with certain well-known Scripture

statements. You must not send your children to any superior school, where the elementary truths of Geological Science are taught, if you would have them kept in strict bondage to the mere letter of the Bible, and to the old traditionary system of Scripture-teaching.

But no; we dare not do this; we dare not be wiser than God. When he is pleased to give us *light* we dare not shut our eyes to its shining, and determine still to grope on in obscurity. If the light of Modern Science comes from God—and surely we believe it does—it must be as great a sin to despise or to disregard it, as to despise and disregard the Bible. And perhaps this very light of our own days, when the Bible is in every hand, may be given us in God's gracious Providence for this reason among others, that we may not make an *idol* of it;—that we may not read it with unreasoning acquiescence in every line and letter of the book, or rather that series or collection of books, written by different men in different ages, bound up in one, which we call the Bible,—but may read it with an intelligent faith, with the understanding as well as the heart. Thus we need not be disquieted though the progress of Modern Criticism should take from us much in the Scriptures, which perhaps without sufficient reason we had hitherto regarded as infallibly certain and true,—should show that the Scripture-writers were left to themselves, as men, in respect of all matters which God has meant to exercise our human industry, to be the objects of diligent, painstaking research. Our love must “abound in all judgment,” says the Apostle, in spiritual taste, discernment, insight, to “approve the things that are excellent,”—or, as the margin renders it, to “try the things that differ.” We must consider for what end the Bible is given to us, namely, to bring our spirits near to God; and we must seek, therefore, the inspiration of its writers, not

in matters of Science or History, but in those words of Eternal Life, which come to us with a power that is not of this world, and find us out in our inner being, with messages from God to the soul. And how comforting it is to know that all words of this kind, which God our Father has spoken to us, “at sundry times and in divers manners,—whether by Prophets and Apostles, or by the lips of Jesus,—whether in the Bible or out of the Bible—stand firm and sure as God Himself is—as our own being is a reality—as our own moral consciousness, to which those living words appeal, is a sign that we are made in God's image!

I repeat, then, the views of God's character and doings, which we derive from the Bible, must be corrected and modified by those which we derive from other sources, by which he is pleased to reveal himself to Man. It is our Father's Will that so it should be—that our love towards Him should abound yet more and more, in the clearer, fuller, knowledge of Himself, which the study of His Works supplies to us, no less surely than the study of His Word. We cannot be living as true men, we cannot be glorifying God, if we do not make use, according to our powers and opportunities, of each of these means of growing in this knowledge.—In the words of our great English poet—

“Let knowledge grow from more to more;
 But more of reverence in us dwell,
 That heart and mind according well,
 May make one music as before,
 But vaster. We are fools and slight;
 We mock Thee, when we do not fear ;—
 O teach Thy *foolish ones* to hear,
 Teach Thy vain world to bear *Thy Light!*”

Thus God Himself, “the Father of Lights,” by means of the facts which he has enabled us first clearly to ascertain in the present age, takes from us the Bible as an Idol which men have set up in their ignorance, to bow down to it and to worship it. But he restores it to us to be rever-

enced as the work of men in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same gracious Spirit was operating, thousands of years ago as now. In those days of old there were prophets also, "preachers of righteousness," according to their lights, as well as the lower order of priests to do the common daily task. And there are prophets still among us, raised up in this as in every age, to speak God's word, the word of truth, to their brethren, whether in the pulpit or out of it. And that Living Word, which is the Light and Life of men, is speaking now to us in all those words of our fellow-men, which have brought us in any degree to the clearer knowledge of Him "whom no man hath seen or can see." But let us be sure that, as it is GOD who teaches us by means of our fellow-men, we may expect that He will speak to us so that we can hear and understand—that He will speak to our hearts and carry

inward demonstration to our spiritual being—that *when He speaks His words will come home to us, and will be their own evidence.*

And now I will conclude my Paper with yet another suitable extract from that valuable modern work *On the Bible* by Dr Prebendary Irons, (from which I also quoted in the beginning.)—

"Above all things I earnestly request my fellow-Christians of every class, who may read these pages, to do so with patience and fearlessness, as in God's sight—*even if the course of thought at first seem to them very trying.* For, if what is said be all simply and undeniably TRUE,—then, to be angry with it, is but to 'fight against God.' — — — Bitter words, and sneers, and persecutions, however refined, will fail. Let the appeal be to facts—to conscience—to reason. Yet a little while, and we must all give our account to Him who is the Truth."

POSTSCRIPT.

When I commenced this article I did not think of its being reprinted in the shape of a pamphlet; neither did I intend it to be so long. But so many expressed their opinion as to the desirableness of having it put into the form of a little Book that I gave my consent. Could I, however, have foreseen this, I should have written more fully in several places, where (owing to its being for the columns of a newspaper—in which I could not expect to be allowed much room—) I was obliged to shorten considerably my remarks: moreover, I should also have more particularly noted the many quotations I have everywhere given from the works of far abler men than myself, of which I have made great use,—especially as to the edition, the volume, the chapter, and the page. Indeed, I am throughout more of a Compiler than an Original Author, and happy am I in having had it in my power to bring forward so many noble and independent, Christian and Scholarly authorities, Ancient and Modern,—of all ages, of all places, of all classes, and of all opinions—who are as *one* in this great and important question. May their united testimony have that *reasonable* weight with the readers of this little pamphlet which it has had with me.

Napier, Dec. 14, 1878.

SUMMARY.

I. INTRODUCTORY: the cause of this tract,—a Sermon by Rev. D. Sidey on “Sabbath observance,” published in the *Hawke’s Bay Herald* of September 9th; reasons assigned for my writing on this subject; a family newspaper believed to be the proper vehicle for all such matters; this view strengthened by the precedents of the Great Teacher and of his disciples; Ebn Ezra’s profound saying respecting the law; particular statement concerning myself and what I venture to deem my peculiar fitness for coming before the public on this occasion; the reasons stated, somewhat analogous to what obtains among Surgeons; Canon Perowne’s comment on Ps. 119. vi. 99, 100, quoted; manner of taking-up the subject proposed; Emerson’s beautiful saying on Persuasion or sacred courage quoted.

II. HISTORICALLY—1. *Before the birth of Jesus* the Bible, what it really is,—not one complete whole in itself; this point long contested (mentally) by me, but found untenable; a few needful facts to be borne in mind respecting the Bible, —its several books not always written by the very persons whose names they bear;—written at various times throughout many years, and often added to and altered; other books of Scripture held by the Greek and Roman Churches as equally Canonical, which contain much of Divine instruction; the Jewish Sacred books (or rather writings, “books” being then unknown), all burnt by Nebuchadnezzar 600 years B.C.; how said to be afterwards reproduced; this strange story allowed by some of the early Christian Fathers; Dr. Prebendary Irons’ opinion respecting this story, worthy of serious consideration; the extreme danger of believing the Bible to be Gods only Revelation of Himself to man; happily no necessity for this; *First* mention of the Sabbath as a rule to man,—afterwards found as a Law among “10

Commandments”; *two* conflicting versions of these, both equally authoritative; question proposed—Did Moses really write the 5 books called the Pentateuch?; highly doubtful; solid reasons shown for disbelieving it; the great advantage arising from Modern Biblical Criticism, in clearing the character of our God and Heavenly Father; Sabbaths, as laid down in the so-called Mosaic Laws, not observed by the Jews *before* the Captivity; proofs given; of the writer of the Chronicles; these books fully shewn not to be historically true; Dr. Irons’ plain statement concerning them of their containing monstrous tales as to numbers; the relative sizes of the Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel—or the holy land, altogether a small tract extending (say) from Napier to Cape Palliser! the writer of the Chronicles probably a Levite himself, and so intent (like too many priests) on magnifying his Office and class; *After* the Captivity great stress was laid by the Jews upon Sabbath observance; the reader’s attention drawn to *two* “Isaiahs,”—widely different persons who lived 200 years apart, and whose writings are included under the *one* book of Isaiah; the ancient Jewish book—the *Talmud*—adduced; several quotations given from it, shewing the great probability of its having been well-known to Jesus, who also used many of its beautiful sayings, which have been commonly supposed to be original with him; the day of the New Moon, or *first* Sabbath of each month, of greater importance than the following common Sabbaths; Levitical law prescribes far greater sacrifices for the feast of the New Moon, or the first monthly Sabbath, which naturally ruled the other and commoner Sabbaths of the lunar month; the septenary division of time, or week, was known and observed by other nations—as Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, Peruvians, Greeks, and Romans; quotations from Dr.

Kalisch, the celebrated modern Jewish Commentator on Genesis and Exodus; the Talmud on the weekly division of time,—how it originated with many different nations; Professor Baden Powell on the lunar month; so, also, Dr. Hesse in his Bampton lectures; the Hebrews, like most other Oriental nations, had 13 (lunar) months in their year; of two remarkable modern discoveries,—(1) the *Moabite Stone*, and (2) the engraved *Assyrian tablets*,—both wonderfully assisting Modern Biblical Criticism; from the Assyrian tablets we gain much light,—we already know much of their astronomy, which proves to be marvellously correct and agreeing with own; also, of the holiness of the number 7, as held by them and by the Jews,—cases in point adduced from the New Testament and, also, of the origin among the Jews of their modern notion of a “Devil,” and of demons, which they brought away with them from Assyria; from the Moabite Stone, well engraved in plain grammatical Hebrew, we learn the *truth* of the last war between Moab and Israel,—widely differing from the vamped-up legendary tale of the same war in the Book of Kings; this stone similar to that one raised by Samuel 230 years before and called Ebenezer; a word to Ministers and to Sunday School Teachers, will they hear it? reasons assigned for preferring the Moabitish to the Jewish story; of the yearly tribute of sheep, said, by the Jewish writer, to have been paid by Moab to Israel; the size of the petty kingdom of Moab, only a tract 40 x 10 miles!

2. *Time of Jesus and his Apostles:* Jesus with his followers kept the Sabbath in a free and liberal manner, and not according to the so-called Divine Mosaic laws, nor in accordance with the Pharisees of his day; ample proofs given from the New Testament,—and by other authorities,—shewing his doings and his teachings respecting the Sabbath; more also, on this

head, to be gained incidentally from many of his other teachings and doings; in all which Jesus ever shewed himself as the true and faithful servant of the only true GOD; his apposite introduction of the sublime war-cry of his nation noticed; reasonable deduction from the premises, that Jesus did not acknowledge any Divine law from Sinai respecting the observance of the Sabbath.

3. *Time of the Apostles:* Paul, who had been a zealous Pharisee, evidently kept the Sabbath much as Jesus did; proofs of this from the N.T.; first Council held at Jerusalem gave no “burdens” to the Gentile converts respecting the keeping of the Sabbath, hence the Sabbath could not have been of Divine origin; proofs given; Paul, in all his many and varied rules and instructions to several Christian Churches, says nothing about Sabbath observance; and in his Epistles to the Romans and to the Colossians he positively states the Sabbath-day to be no better than any other day; Dean Alford’s remark thereon in his Greek Testament; Paul’s depreciatory language to the Galatian Church concerning the Sabbath; Wheatly’s plain and truthful comment thereon.

III. ECCLESIASTICAL:—1. *Primitive:* for a time the Jewish Christian converts continued to assemble on the seventh (or Sabbath) day; soon, however, fell into neglect, through not having any Apostolical appointment; Bingham’s instructive statement thereon; early Ecclesiastical and Imperial laws wholly against the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; hence the sect of the Ebionites, and others, who observed the Jewish Sabbath, were condemned by the Council of Laodicea; Pope Gregory the Great’s statement concerning Antichrist and Sabbath observance; no Christian writers of the 1st and 2nd centuries ever attributed the keeping of Sunday to any Apostolical authority; ample proofs given; also, quota-

tions from Justin Martyr, from St. Cyril, and from St. Jerome, all against the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; Jerome, also, incidentally shows how the Sunday was kept in his time,—a day of church service, of joy, and of common work; no Sunday league, no Sabbatarians then!

2. *Time of the Reformation:* quotations from the most eminent of the Reformers,—from Tyndal, from Luther, from Melancthon, from Calvin, and from others,—shewing their liberal views of the Christian Sunday; quotation from Mr Sidey's published sermon, showing his many errors in a small compass,—Historically (both Civil and Ecclesiastical), and Chronologically, also in his severe and informal deductions therefrom; of King James and his "Declaration, or Book of Sports;" quotation from the King's "Declaration;" quotations from the old Church historian, Fuller, shewing how all that was brought to pass by the superstitious Sabbatarians, with Fuller's quaint and homely remarks thereon; fifteen years after that King Charles republished his father's "Declaration," but in a still milder form; obliged to do so through the opposition of the meddlesome Sabbatarian party; of a charge against Archbishop Laud on his trial, and his defence; the Church of Geneva (John Knox's Own) allowed of Archery on Sundays, and Calvin there played at Bowls on that day.

3. *Modern:*—On the phrase used by Mr Sidey—"the right keeping of the Sabbath;" Mr Sidey's views believed to be the very opposite of those of the Reformers and the Primitive Christian Church, of the Apostles and of Jesus; shewn (1) from the "shorter Catechism" (Presbyterian Church),—(2) Decrees of Kirk Sessions, and Acts of General Assembly Scotch Church,—(3) orders of Edinburgh Town Council,—and (4) statements of some Ministers of the Scotch Kirk, about their severe and "hateful" Sabbath observance laws, made in session before their brother

Ministers—particularly those of Dr. Norman McLeod, who spoke truly, bravely, thrillingly, as a true servant of God his remarks in part allowed by the Presbyterian ministers at that gathering, but of course, opposed; their peculiar Sabbath observance system has the dangerous effect of "*weakening morality*;" wretched (sanitary) state of Edinburgh, particularly on the Sunday under that old Kirk system of obsolete Jewish superstition; Dr McLeod's excellent little work called "*The Starling*," noticed; the late Sir Donald McLean's favourable opinion upon it; of the *present* "Sabbath Alliance" party in Scotland, and their insufferably impudent Annual Report, containing language highly disrespectful against Queen Victoria,—a long quotation therefrom; how truly their words are in accordance with those of the Pharisees of the time of Jesus; they ought to have the Queen's ancestor (James I.) to deal with them in his rough and ready way; reference to the Conference at Hampton Court, A.D. 1604 from all such "right keeping of the Sabbath" may Napier (and all N.Z.) ever be free; better, of the two, to have King James' "Book of Sports" republished here; curious, that, through out all Christendom, only the church of three petty highland countries, Ethiopia, Armenia, and Scotland,—cling to the Sabbatarian superstition; all three churches, too, being wholly discordant as to dogmas; Steam—the iron horse, the steam ship, and the press—will do wonders, and help to cure; but Sabbatarianism also in England, although only a small insignificant clique; Wilberforce's truthful remarks on the melancholy comfortless British Sunday, quoted; a few English Bishops (some years ago) sought by letter to the Directors of the English Railway Companies to put a stop to excursion trains on Sundays! the Directors did not deign to reply—but wisely put it on the shelf; a selfish lot those English Bishops; apt remarks on their conduct; better had

some in Napier not unwisely come forward with their letter to the Directors of the N.Z. Steam Navigation Company, to prevent the calling of our Mail steamers at Napier on Sunday; suitable quotations on *true* Religion from our English poets—Southey, and Tennyson; the Sabbatarian error largely bolstered up or supported by the two national British Churches—of England and of Scotland; already shown as to Scotland, by her Catechism and Church decrees,—and as to England, by her Ministers repeatedly reading from the Communion Table [“Altar,” *sic!*] the old worn-out theory of God having ordered the Jewish keeping of the Sabbath-day, and that because he made all things in six days! Of the carelessness, or thoughtlessness, or “happy ignorance” of such Ministers; pious lies “the weakening of morality”; the Bishop of Oxford’s admission respecting the creation of the world in six days; the Writer could not (if now ministering to a congregation) allow his congregation to be so deceived, as to the constant using of those old Church phrases without due explanation; a word to Napier Sabbatarians, as to their Sunday letters from England, and their Sunday milk from the country; a word, additional, as to the possible zealous looking after regular Church attendance on the Sabbath, on account of the “bawbees” —or the horrid unchristian and novel Sunday money gatherings, now never omitted! the Writer’s particular reasons and right to call attention to this,—from the fact of his having *always* opposed it, and that, too, when single-handed, and at no little cost to himself; the same fully explained; the Writer would not minister in any church where such Mammon worship was carried on; how easily Napier congregations may escape such sordid traffic; how the “Devil” laughs at it! the Gospel is *not* now preached to the *poor*; no room in the church for them any more than in the theatre; come with *money*, or stay away! Of Church reform, of its *sure*

approach, yet not likely to begin from within; another word to Ministers; of *Light* breaking all around, the happy result of modern Biblical Criticism; shewn, especially to members of the Church of England, in three great works,—(1) the *New Lectionary*;—(2) the *new Bible Commentary*;—and (3) the *new and Corrected Version of the Bible*; remarks thereon several striking quotations from the Bible Commentary on the Mosaic laws, largely supporting what has been herein written; noticeable remark by a learned English Bishop in Convocation respecting the new translation of the Bible; three small matters all lately occurring here in New Zealand in favour of Christian Sunday freedom noticed,—*viz.* opening of the Napier Athenæum on Sundays—running of 18 trains to and from the advanced town of Dunedin on that day—and the Presbyterians formally setting aside their Sacramental fast-day; also, a fourth and a greater one,—that of the State schools, wherein *true* Religion will be taught; the absolute necessity of reforming the Catechisms of the Churches; solemn veracious words of a modern English Archbishop on teaching only the Truth; a home question to all Ministers and Sunday School Teachers—that is, to those with living tender consciences; the writer’s serious conviction respecting the age of the Pentateuch, after more than 20 years’ study of this matter, showing its Divine authority as utterly untenable.

IV. *Reasonably*,—including *theological*ly and *humanly*: ever hold to this— “the Sabbath was made FOR man;” first seek to be delivered from the old slavish Jewish superstition respecting the Sabbath, then we may begin to understand it; the Sunday (or seventh day’s rest) should be a day of *refreshing*; day given for general labour and night for rest ; remarks thereon and reasonable deductions drawn; (1) Sunday’s rest good for man’s physical nature; inaction alone not always rest, shown power-

fully in children; Sunday often anything but a day of refreshment to them, owing to injudicious Ministers and parents; the righteous and natural rebellion of children against all restraint set down to their “sinful hearts,” or to “the Devil,” to the great and lasting injury of the poor child; plain remarks on the *personality* of “Old Nick”—recently preached up here in Napier to credulous hearers! the true rest of Sunday, is *refreshment of body and mind*; the ways of obtaining this are various, differing almost with everyone, so that each must choose for himself; (2) the Sunday’s rest is good for our *moral* nature; shewn by its necessity, and by the effect the beauties of Nature and the Works of God have upon us; (3) the Sunday’s rest is needed for our *religious* nature; remarks thereon; Common Worship the highest and noblest of all Sunday occupations; men may and do worship God when alone; worship strengthened when done in fitting company; true child of God has constant communion with his Father; truly happy strengthening and sanctified Sunday seasons of Religious worship have often been experienced both in England and in NZ; such will be known again, when Ministers and Congregations become WHOLE-HEARTED In that matter; then Sundays will again become days of rejoicing and refreshment; quotation from G. Herbert’s beautiful poem on Sunday; (4) our social nature needs above all the Sunday’s rest; the joys of the Sunday walk, the Sunday recreation, the Sunday holiday depicted; the great benefit arising from Sunday visits to Gardens—Museums—Aquariums—Galleries of Art and Science; quotation from official Annual Report of the Royal Gardens at Kew,— shewing the immense number of Sunday visitors, outnumbering those on *all* the other *six* days

of the week taken together; of the great benefits to them; the Imperial Legislature should do all things possible in that direction, as such mental pleasures save from the grosser kinds; also the heads of the various Churches should act together for this purpose, both at home and in the Colonies; apt quotation from Mr Gladstone; both the State and the Churches should not overlook the smaller matters affecting the little wee folk,—who should be helped, honestly and openly, with an innocent face—to spend their well-earned Sunday holiday Id,—and so avoid the “weakening of morality”; a case in point given; a large Bench of liberal English Magistrates praised; over-officious Police condemned; Common Worship the Glory of the Christian Sunday; God has given us the knowledge of Himself in the Scriptures, and now in our day has also given us most wonderful and daily-increasing knowledge in many Sciences, which all alike come from one source—God; as great a sin to despise and disregard these gifts as to despise or to disregard the Bible; possibly all this Modern Light is intended (among other things) to teach us *not to make an IDOL of the Bible*, — towards which there long has been, and still is a tendency; comforting assurance—that all words of truth, whether in the Bible or out of the Bible, must ever stand—as sure as God himself; we should receive all that is TRUE; quotation from Tennyson; God still speaks in many ways to man,— whether by prophets (preachers and teachers)—in the pulpit or out of the pulpit,—or by priests; when He speaks His words will both be heard and known:

Conclusion, Dr. Irons’ good and Christian advice,—not to be angry,—not to speak or write bitterly against the Truth,—and so be found fighting against God.

