

ed, but could not help thinking that the persons employed in conveying her might not find their situation as favourable to devout reading and meditation. This, I suppose, did not occur to her.

[*I do not commence my Journey on Sabbath.*]

Another person said that he would never commence a journey on the Sabbath; but when once set out, he could see no harm in proceeding. But I, for my part, could not see the mighty difference between setting out, on Sabbath, and going on, on the Sabbath. My perceptions were so obtuse that I could not discern the one to be travelling, and the other to be equivalent to rest.

[*If I stop on Sabbath, I must wait on the road.*]

Again, I was frequently met with this apology for journeying on Sabbath: "The stage was going on, and if I had laid by on the Sabbath, I should have lost my seat, and might have had to wait on the road, perhaps for a whole week, before I could regain it." This apology satisfied many. They thought it quite reasonable that the person should proceed under those circumstances. But it did not satisfy me. It occurred to me, if he had honoured the Sabbath, and committed his way to the Lord, he might not have been detained on the road beyond the day of rest.—But what if he had been? Are we under no obligation to obey a command of God, if we foresee that obedience to it may be attended with some inconvenience? Better the detention of many days, than the transgression of a precept of the decalogue.

[*We take only a small portion of the Morning, or Evening.*]

One person told me that he meant to start very early in the morning, for he wished to occupy as little of the Sabbath in travelling as possible. Another proposed to lie by all the middle of the day, and proceed in the evening, and he was sure there could be no harm in that. Ah, thought I, and has not Sunday a morning and an evening appropriate to itself, as well as any other day of the week? Is the morning of Sunday all one with Saturday, and the evening no more sacred than Monday? Did God hallow only the middle of the day? And is the day of rest shorter by several hours than any other day? I never could see how one part of the Sabbath should be entitled to more religious respect than another part. It seems to me a man may as properly travel on the noon of the Sabbath, as in the morning or evening.

[*We manage so as to attend Church.*]

One person was very particular to tell me what he meant to do after he had travelled a part of the Lord's day. He expected, by about 10 or 11 o'clock, to come across a church, and he intended to go in and worship. That, he supposed, would set all right again.

[*I journey to attend a Church Meeting, or to Preach.*]

Another, a grave-looking personage, was travelling on the Sabbath to reach an ecclesiastical meeting in season. Another, in order to fulfil an appointment he had made to preach. These were ministers. They pleaded the necessity of the case; but I could see no necessity in it. I thought the necessity of keeping God's commandments a much clearer and stronger case of necessity. The business of the meeting could go on without that clergyman, or it might have been deferred a day in waiting for him, or he might have left home

a day earlier. The appointment to preach should not have been made; or if made, should have been broken.

[*I am anxious to be home to my Family.*]

There was one apologist who had not heard from home for a good while, and he was anxious to learn about his family. Something in their circumstances might require his presence. I could not sustain even that apology, for I thought the Lord could take care of his family without him as well as with him, and I did not believe they would be likely to suffer by his resting on the Sabbath out of respect to God's commandment, and spending the day in imploring the divine blessing on them.

[*I cannot lodge at a Public House, or Country Tavern.*]

Another apologist chanced to reach, on Saturday night, an indifferent public house. He pleaded, therefore, that it was necessary for him to proceed on the next day, until he should arrive at better accommodations. But I could not help thinking that his being comfortably accommodated, was not, on the whole, so important as obedience to the decalogue.

One person thought he asked an unanswerable question, when he begged to know why it was not as well to be on the road, as to be lying by at a country tavern. It occurred to me, that if his horses had possessed the faculties of Balaam's beast, they could have readily told him the difference, and why the latter part of the alternative was preferable.

[*My Companions are going Forward.*]

There was still another person who was sure his excuse would be sustained. He was one of a party, who were determined to proceed on the Sabbath in spite of his reluctance, and he had no choice but to go on with them. Ah, had he no choice? would they have forced him to go on? could he not have separated from such a party? or might he not, if he had been determined, have prevailed on them to rest on the Lord's day? Suppose he said, mildly yet firmly: "My conscience forbids me to journey on the Sabbath. You can go, but you must leave me. I am sorry to interfere with your wishes, but I cannot offend God." Is it not ten to one such a remonstrance would have been successful? I cannot help suspecting that the person was willing to be compelled in this case.

[*Strict Sabbath-keeping is Puritanical.*]

But many said that this strict keeping of the Sabbath was an old puritanical notion, and this seemed to ease their consciences somewhat. I remarked that I thought it older than puritanism. A *Sinaitical* notion I judged it to be, rather than puritanical.

[*Pray, do not tell my Friends.*]

Many Sunday travellers I met with, begged me not to tell their pious relatives that they had travelled on the Sabbath. They thought, if these knew it, they would not think so well of them, and they would be likely to hear of it again. No one asked me not to tell God. They did not seem to care how it affected them in his estimation. It never occurred to them that they might hear from the Lord of the Sabbath on the subject.

I do not know any purpose which such apologies for Sabbath-breaking serve, since they satisfy neither God nor his people, but one, and that is not a very valuable one.—They serve only, as far as I can see, to delude those who offer them.

I love to be fair. I have been objecting lately against the Catholics, that they reduce the number of the commandments to nine. I here record my acknowledgment that some of us Protestants have really but nine. The Catholics omit the second; some of our Protestants the fourth.

[The true secret of all such apologies is to be found in an alienated heart. The heart first rebels against the Sabbath, and then the head goes forth in search of excuses. Doing right pays so well, that one can afford to be at some trouble and expense to do it. The course of sound reason, therefore, is first to ascertain what is duty; and then, we may be as sure as that there is a Moral Governor in the Universe, that it is our interest, in all places and at all times, to do what he commands.—Think of an apology for disobeying God!—Think of a man's calculating the advantages of disobeying God!]

Some talk of present gratification; but are sound health, a refreshed intellect, an approving conscience, holy feelings, the smile and blessing of heaven, things of no value? Yet all these are sacrificed by the Sabbath-breaker.]

EXAMINATION OF MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTIONS AND POPULAR FALLACIES.

BY REV. ANDREW THOMSON, B. A.

(Continued.)

5. Driven from all other shelter, the enemies of the Sabbath have been fain to take refuge under the authority of a few great names. Luther and Calvin, it is said, did not hold your rigid views. Suppose they did not. It is forgotten that their position was peculiarly unfavourable for the examination of the subject. They looked at the Lord's-day among many days of mere human appointment,—it was hidden like Saul among the stuff,—is the wonder great that they were tempted to reject all sacred days whatever? The impetuous nature of the great German Reformer led him to reject other things that were divine, such as the Epistle of James. What wonder that in removing some of the rubbish of the temple, these great men should un consciously have swept away with us, some of its purest gold. Their circumstances called more for energetic action, than for discrimination.

But we who live in these later and calmer days, have had time to discriminate, and we can now discover in the lax views which some of the leading Reformers entertained on the subject of the Sabbath, and in the laxer practices which those views introduced into the churches, one reason why the tide of the Reformation ebbed so soon. They planted a vineyard, but they forgot to place around it God's wall of defence; and thus it is that "the boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it".

But has it indeed come to this, that a duty may be held as uncertain until there is perfect unanimity among Christians regarding it, and that so long as some great name can be quoted as speaking doubtfully on the subject, the obligation is suspended. Admit this principle, and then tell us what error or folly is there, that may not borrow the sanction of some great name. Luther might then be quoted as advocating views of the Lord's Supper that savour of mysticism, if they do not border on absurdity; the name of Calvin might be used to consecrate intolerance; Milton