

A Critical History Of The Sabbath And Sunday

In The Christian Church

www.CreationismOnline.com

(SECOND EDITION, REVISED) BY A. H. LEWIS D. D., LL.D.,

Author of

Biblical Teachings concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday,

History of Sunday Legislation,

Paganism Surviving In Christianity, etc., etc.

THE AMERICAN SABBATH TRACT SOCIETY, PLAINFIELD, N. J., 1903.

Preface

REFORMS, like apples, have their time to ripen. When they are ripe, the harvest must be gathered. Wishing cannot hasten that time, nor fear delay it. The Sabbath question is ripe for re-examination and restatement. It is at the front. It has come to stay. We must grapple with it. The first key to its solution is the authority of God's Word. The facts of history are the second key. Eternity is an attribute of God, and time is one measured part of eternity. Results in history are the decisions of God. In testing theories and practices, the historic argument is ultimate. It is the embodiment of Christ's words: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Theorizing can never go back of this test, nor set aside its decisions.

No department of church history has been less thoroughly worked than the history of the Sabbath and the Sunday. They both antedate Christianity and Judaism. As the question is presented to us now, the chief interest centers in the New Testament and in the Patristic period. The former is usually treated polemically, while the latter is almost an unknown region to the average Christian. It is also true that few people have more than a confused knowledge of the Sabbath question since the Puritan movement of three hundred years ago.

That movement was forced to seek some support for itself in early church history. In seeking this, many quotations have been claimed from the Fathers which subsequent investigations have shown to be notoriously incorrect. These have been passed from hand to hand, apparently without examination or question. Forged writings have been treated as genuine. Unknown dates have been assumed to be definite. Important expressions, such as "Christian Sabbath" and "Dominicum servasti," have been manufactured and interpolated. In this way history has been perverted and good men have been misled. Few American writers have attempted any careful survey of this field, and the early English works on the Sabbath question and its history are out of print. Most of the books in defense of Sunday, within the last fifty years, have been hastily written to meet the demands of some convention, or some emergency, created by the decline of the Puritan theory, and the secularization of Sunday. This has forbidden patient and efficient original research. Still stronger reasons have sat at the elbow of every writer in defense of the Puritan, or the American Sunday. The facts of the first four centuries destroy the foundation on which Puritanism rested its "Sunday Sabbath."

Because these things are so, this book has been written. It is written in the interest of the church universal, and of the preservation of the Sabbath, without which Christianity is shorn of one of its chief elements of power, and humanity is robbed of one of its chief blessings. We have given our authorities, with copious references, that who will may follow and test our work. These pages are not the product of yesterday, nor are they written for to morrow alone. We know that they must meet the prejudice of creed and the power of popular custom. They must take their way between the upper and nether millstones of eternal verities. Nothing less than sifted facts can abide as the foundation for hope, or faith, or practice. Men build pleasant theories and indulge in glowing fancies concerning what they think ought to be, but the relentless hand of history gathers all that is not in accord with eternal verity for the dust heaps of the past. Conscious that every page must die which is not born of verity, and equally conscious that every page thus born will live in spite of creed or custom, this book goes forth, willing to await the broader knowledge, the calm judgment, and the verdicts of history in coming years.

Introductory

HISTORY is an organic development. The phenomena which appear on the surface are the result of underlying principles, true or false. Nothing in history comes by chance. If human choices did not lead men to disobedience of God's laws, and to disregard for truth, there would be no discord, but rather a continuous, straight forward advancement. What men call the power of truth, the logic of events and the guiding hand of Providence, is but another way of saying that truth - God's eternal ideas concerning right and wrong is stronger than all human choices, and will ultimately prevail. It is the unfolding of God's ideas in history that gives it organic power and irresistible force. Human disobedience may check or deflect the progress of truth temporarily. Disobedience is the conflict of the lesser with the greater. It may go so far as to destroy the less, but it can never attain a permanent triumph in God's moral government.

It is the dam of rushes across the swollen stream; the barricade of straw. Evil and error have limited lease of life. Truth is mighty and will prevail, is an adage which voices the deeper philosophy of history. Every page of the past confirms this truth. The invisible hand of Jehovah touches the current of evil, and it flows backward like the parting waters of the Red Sea. As the granite sea-wall says to the waves, Thus far and no farther, so, in the fullness of God's time, right and righteousness prevail. The times when God thus vindicates himself and his cause we call great epochs in history. But the greatest epoch is only the result of silent forces which are constantly at work. The currents of good often run deep, are sometimes wholly out of sight for a long time. The thoughtless and faint-hearted say, They are gone forever. Those who listen more carefully are always assured that Truth still lives.

In view of these facts, the history of a great question, like that of which the following pages treat, is of vital importance. We can never judge correctly concerning the present except in the light of the past. To-day is the product of one or all of the yesterdays. Things are neither right nor wrong because they exist. Human majorities, as such, are not right. They are likely to be thoughtless and self-reliant and wrong.

The Sabbath question has had a prominent place in the religious history of our race. The week, measured by the Sabbath as its closing day, is the oldest division of time. It is found wherever history reaches. The Sabbath question comes close to human life. Social life, business life, religious worship and culture are all blended with it and are dependent on it. It is a question that has never been kept in abeyance for any great length of time, however much it may have been ignored. It was prominent in the Jewish church. It claimed early attention in the history of Christianity. It came to the front in the Reformation. It was prominent in the earlier years of our national life. It is today, though much ignored by some, and treated vigorously with narcotics by others, one of the questions which still demands recognition and solution. The actual history of the Sabbath is not well understood. The earlier centuries have not been carefully explored even by religious teachers. Much has been taken for granted, where the facts are unknown. We ask a full and careful reexamination of the whole question. Final results may be ignored for a time, but they will compel recognition.

Scripture Testimony.

IT does not seem needful that the passages in the Bible which refer to the Sabbath and the Sunday should be reproduced here. Every reader has the Bible at hand, and all it says concerning these days can be studied from that original source. It is said sometimes that "The Sabbath finds no place in the New Testament. The other commands of the Decalogue are recognized, but the fourth is not." Over against these and similar incorrect statements we offer the following facts:

The Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament fifty-eight times, and always in its specific character as a sacred day for rest, worship and deeds of mercy. These references are all in the historical portions of the New Testament, the Gospels and the Acts. They are distributed as follows: Matt. 10, Mark 11, Luke 18, John 10, Acts 9.

All these references are to the Sabbath as a definite and distinct day, the last day of the week, now called with great impropriety "Saturday." Forty-eight of these references are in the Gospels. These show how Christ, the Creator and Lord of the Sabbath, observed it, and what he taught concerning it. New Testament history centers around Christ. His life and teachings created that book. Those who honor Christ more than they do their own choices, or the theories and practices which men have invented, will settle the Sabbath question by his teachings and example. Less than this is disloyalty to him. Theories, speculations, customs, church authority and civil law, if at variance with Christ and his example, should be set aside. The honest man who is not blinded by false conceptions of what it is to obey Christ will not hesitate to make him and his practice the standard in the matter of Sabbath-keeping.

When Christ's public ministry began, the Sabbath was burdened by numberless unnatural requirements which neither the letter nor the spirit of the fourth command demanded. As a consequence it became a prominent point of attack and defense between Christ and the Pharisees. He openly ignored these abnormal growths, and discarded many things which tradition had fixed upon Sabbath-observance;

hence they charged him with "Sabbath-breaking." What he did was to restore the Sabbath to its true place, and thus fit it for service and acceptance in his kingdom. When his work is understood, every point which has been or can be claimed for a "Christian Sabbath" is fully met in the Sabbath thus freed from the unjust restraints which the Judaism of that time had imposed. This work of pruning was so necessary that in it we find the reason for so many references to the Sabbath in the Gospels. As compared with the references made to other laws of the Decalogue, the references to the Sabbath, and Christ's example concerning it, are more than all the others put together. Remembering then that Christ's aim was not the destruction nor removal of the Sabbath, but rather to set it free from Judaistic misconceptions, we shall be able to comprehend the real nature of the incidents which form its history in the Gospels.

If the reader will take the New Testament and, beginning with Matt. 12:1-13, will follow through what is said regarding the Sabbath and the position which Christ and his apostles took concerning it, he cannot fail to learn that the church of the New Testament period was a Sabbath-keeping church, according to the example and teachings of a Sabbath-keeping Christ. The "Lord of the Sabbath" taught its true place and character in his kingdom.

SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The first day of the week is mentioned in the New Testament but eight times. Six of these references are found in the Gospels, and the same day is referred to in each case. There is but one reference to Sunday in the Book of Acts, and one in the Epistles. For a full discussion of these passages, historically and theologically, see my "Biblical Teachings Concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday," published by the American Sabbath Tract Society, pp. 50-89.

The Apostolic Fathers.

MATERIAL for the history of Christianity during the century immediately succeeding the apostolic period is meager and imperfect. The earlier post-apostolic writings are fragmentary. In many instances neither the date of the treatise nor the name of the author are known. Forgeries abound. Apocryphal Gospels and Epistles meet the investigator at every step, leading the unwary and over-credulous astray. The stream of written Christian history which runs through the Gospels and the Book of Acts drops out of sight like a "lost river" for a time, and when it reappears is not a little polluted by what has been gathered in its underground wanderings. The best products of the sub-apostolic age are known as the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. A comparison of these with the New Testament shows that they fall infinitely below the apostolic standard. There is a great gulf between them. Since Sunday has no history in the New Testament, its advocates in modern times have labored strenuously to find some support for it in the earlier post-apostolic productions. We will examine these in their order, and at length, in order to correct the wrong conclusions and the perversion of facts which come from such loose writing.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF CLEMENT OF ROME, TO THE CORINTHIANS.

This was probably written about the year 97 A.D. A few defenders of Sunday have referred to or quoted from this Epistle, seeking inferential argument in favor of their theories. The passages are as follows:

"These things therefore being manifest to us, and since we look into the depths of the divine knowledge, it behooves us to do all things in [their proper] order, which the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times. He has enjoined offerings [to be presented] and service to be performed [to Him], and that not thoughtlessly or irregularly but at the appointed times and hours. Where and by whom He desires these things to be done, He Himself has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things being piously done according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable unto Him. Those, therefore, who present their offerings at the appointed times, are accepted and blessed; for inasmuch as they follow the laws of the Lord, they sin not. For His own peculiar services are assigned to the high priest, and their own proper place is prescribed to the priests, and their own special ministrations devolve on the Levites. The layman is bound by the laws that pertain to laymen.

Let every one of you, brethren, give thanks to God in his own order, living in all good conscience, with becoming gravity, and not going beyond the rule of the Ministry prescribed to him. Not in every place, brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered, or the peace-offerings, or the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem only. And even there they are not offered in any place, but only at the altar before the temple, that which is offered being first carefully examined by the high priests and the ministers already mentioned. Those, therefore, who do anything beyond that which is agreeable to His will, are punished with death. Ye see, brethren, that the greater the knowledge that has been vouchsafed to us, the greater also is the danger to which we are exposed. (Clement to the Corinthians, chapters 40, 41. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. I., pp. 35, 36. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)

The foregoing evidently refers to the temple worship. Certainly it contains nothing relative to any change of the Sabbath, abrogation of the Sabbath law, or introduction of Sunday. Neither is there any reference or hint relative to any such thing in any other part of the

epistle. A writer who is thus particular concerning the ceremonies of an outgoing system could not fail to note so prominent a feature of the new system as Sunday-observance would have been.

HERMAS.

Next in order is a long allegory, which is attributed to the Hermas, who is mentioned in Romans 16:14. This allegory makes no allusion to the Lord's-day or to the Sunday. Its date is placed by the editors of Clark's edition of 1879, during the reign of Hadrian or Antonius Pius, i.e., between 117 and 161 A. D.

POLYCARP.

Next comes the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, which has been attributed by some to a disciple of St. John, but the best authorities give its probable date as about the middle of the second century. This is also silent concerning Sunday.

PAPIAS.

Fragments of writings attributed to Papias, who is said to have been martyred about 163 A.D. contain no reference to Sunday. Thus three out of five of these Fathers," Clement, Hermas and Papias, are found to be wholly silent concerning the question at issue. The two remaining ones we shall find to be spurious productions which possess no value as authorities."

BARNABAS.

First of these two comes the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas. This has been attributed to the companion of St. Paul in his missionary labors, and dated as early as A.D. 71. The following from standard authorities will show that such claims are false. Neander speaks as follows:

The writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers are, alas! come down to us, for the most part, in a very uncertain condition; partly, because in early times writings were counterfeited, under the name of these venerable men of the church, in order to propagate certain opinions or principles; partly, because those writings which they had really published were adulterated, and especially so to serve a Judao-hierarchical party, which would fain crush the free evangelical spirit. We should here, in the first place, have to name Bamabas, the well known fellow traveler of St. Paul, if a letter, which was first known in the second century, in the Alexandrian church, under his name, and which bore the inscription of a Catholic epistle, was really his composition. But it is impossible that we should acknowledge this epistle to belong to that Barnabas who was worthy to be the companion of the apostolic labors of St. Paul, and had received his name from the power of his animated discourses in the churches. We find, also, nothing to induce us to believe the author of the Epistle was desirous of being considered Barnabas. But since its spirit and its mode of conception corresponded to the Alexandrian taste, it may have happened, that as the author's name was unknown, and persons were desirous of giving it authority, a report was spread abroad in Alexandria, that Barnabas was the author. (History of the Christian Church of the First Three Centuries, pp. 407, 408, Rose's Trans.) Mosheim says:

The Epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew, who most probably lived in this [the second] century, and whose mean abilities and superstitious attachment to Jewish fables, show, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions, that he must have been a very different person from the true Barnabas who was St. Paul's companion.

(Church History, Vol. 1, p. 113, Maclaine's Trans.)

Also from the same author:

For what is suggested by some of its having been written by that Barnabas who was the friend and companion of St. Paul, the futility of such a notion is easily to be made apparent from the letter itself. Several of the opinions and interpretations of Scripture which it contains, having in them so little, either of truth, or dignity, or force, as to render it impossible that they ever could have proceeded from the pen of a man divinely inspired. (Historical Commentaries, Century 2, See. 53.)

Eusebius says:

Among the rejected writings must be reckoned also the Acts of Paul, and the so-called Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter, and in addition to these the extant Epistle of Barnabas, and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles. (Church History, Book III., chap. 25, Sec. 4. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., p. 156

Prof. Hackett says:

"The letter still extant, which was known as that of Bamabas, even in the second century, cannot be defended as genuine. (Commentary on Acts, p. 251.)

Millner says:

Of the Apostle Barnabas, nothing is known, except what is recorded in the Acts. There we have an honorable encomium of his character, and a particular description of his joint labors with St. Paul. It is a great injury to him, to apprehend the Epistle which goes by his name to be his."" (Vol. I., p. 126, Church History. Boston, 1809.)"

Kitto says:

The so-called Epistle of Barnabas, probably a forgery of the second century. (Cyclopedia Biblical Literature, article Lord's-day.)

Sir William Domville, after an exhaustive examination of the whole question, concludes as follows:

But the Epistle was not written by Barnabas; it is not merely unworthy of him," it would be a disgrace to him, and, what is of much more consequence, it would be a disgrace to the Christian religion, as being the production of one of the authorized teachers of that religion in the time of the apostles, which circumstance would seriously damage the evidence of its divine origin." (An Examination of the Six Texts, p. 233.)

Prof. W.D. Killen, a prominent representative of the Presbyterian church in Ireland, bears testimony as follows: "The tract known as the "Epistle of Barnabas" was probably composed in A.D. 135. It is the production, apparently, of a convert from Judaism, who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretation of Scripture." (History of the Ancient Church, p. 367. New York, 1859. See also The Old Catholic Church, pp. 8, 13. T. & T. Clark, 1871.) Rev. Lyman Coleman says:

"The Epistle of Barnabas, bearing the honored name of the companion of Paul in his missionary labors, is evidently spurious. It abounds in fabulous narratives, mystic allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, and fanciful conceits; and is generally agreed by the learned to be of no authority. Neander supposes it to have originated in the Alexandrian school; but at what particular time he does not define. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified. chap. 2, sec. 2, p. 47. Philadelphia, 1852.)

Dr. Schaff rejects the theory that the Epistle is genuine, and says:

The author was probably a converted Jew from Alexandria (perhaps by the name Barnabas, which would easily explain the confusion), to judge from his familiarity with Jewish literature, and, apparently, with Philo, and his allegorical method in handling the Old Testament. In Egypt his Epistle was first known and most esteemed, and the Sinaitic Bible which contains it was probably written in Alexandria or Caesarea in Palestine. The readers were chiefly Jewish Christians in Egypt, and the East, who overestimated the Mosaic traditions and ceremonies."" (History Christian Church, Vol. II., p. 677. New York, 1883.)"

The Encyclopedia of Religious knowledge (article Barnabas' Epistle), speaking of Barnabas the companion of Paul, says: "He could not be the author of a work so full of forced allegories, extravagant and unwarrantable explications of Scripture, together with stories concerning beasts, and such like conceits, as make up the first part of this Epistle." In the presence of the foregoing evidence, but one conclusion is possible, viz., the Epistle of Barnabas is a vague, fanciful production of some unknown author, forged at an uncertain date in the second century. The passage quoted in favor of Sunday observance reads as follows:

Further, also, it is written concerning the Sabbath in the Decalogue which [the Lord] spoke, face to face, to Moses on Mount Sinai, And sanctify ye the Sabbath of the Lord with clean hands and a pure heart." And he says in another place, "If my sons keep the Sabbath, then will I cause my mercy to rest upon them." The Sabbath is mentioned at the beginning of the creation [thus]: "And God made in six days the works of His hands, and made an end on the seventh day, and rested on it, and sanctified it." Attend, my children, to the meaning of this expression, "He finished in six days." This implieth that the Lord will finish all things in six thousand years, for a day is with Him a thousand years. And He Himself testifieth, saying "Behold, to-day will be as a thousand years." Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. "And He rested on the seventh day." This meaneth: When His Son, coming [again], shall destroy the time of the wicked man, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall He truly rest on the seventh day. Moreover, He says, "Thou shalt sanctify it with pure hands and a pure heart." If, therefore, any one can now sanctify the day which God hath sanctified, except he is pure in heart in all things, we are deceived. Behold, therefore: certainly then one properly resting sanctifies it, when we ourselves, having received the promise, wickedness no longer existing, and all things having been made new by the Lord, shall be able to work righteousness. Then we shall be able to sanctify it, having been first sanctified ourselves. Further, He says to them, "Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure." Ye perceive how he speaks: Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made, [namely this,] when, giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead. And when He had manifested Himself, He ascended into the heavens." (Epistle of Barnabas, chapter 15. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. I., pp. 127, 128.)

It is to be regretted that many writers in favor of Sunday have quoted only the last clause of the foregoing beginning with the words, "For which cause," etc. They have thus perverted the meaning and sought to make it appear that the "resurrection" was the main reason assigned for "observing the eighth day with gladness." Whereas, the fanciful notions concerning the creation and the millennium constituted the main reason for such notice of the eighth day. Hence, another conclusion must be added, viz.: If any

persons joined with the forger of this Epistle in observing the eighth day, their action was predicated on grounds very far removed from common sense, and from the Word of God.

IGNATIUS.

One production which is classed with the "Apostolic Fathers" remains to be examined - the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians. This production, like that attributed to Barnabas, is a forgery, and the passage adduced in favor of Sunday is caricatured into a seeming reference only by interpolating the word day. In support of these statements, we offer the following testimony. First, the passage in full, with its contexts. This Epistle exists in two forms, a longer and a shorter; both are given here:

LONGER FORM.

If, then, those who were conversant with the ancient Scriptures came to newness of hope, expecting the coming of Christ, as the Lord teaches us when He says, If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me;" and again, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad; for before Abraham was, I am;" how shall we be able to live without Him? The prophets were His servants, and foresaw Him by the Spirit, and waited for Him as their teacher, and expected Him as their Lord and Saviour, saying, "He will come and save us." Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for "he that does not work, let him not eat." For say the [holy] oracles, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread." But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's-day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, "To the end, for the eighth day," on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ, whom the children of perdition, the enemies of the Saviour, deny, "whose god is their belly, who mind earthly things," who are "lovers of pleasure, and not lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." These make merchandise of Christ, corrupting His word, and giving up Jesus to sale: they are corrupters of women, and covetous of other men's possessions, swallowing up wealth insatiably; from whom may ye be delivered by the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ!"

SHORTER FORM.

If, therefore, those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's-day, on which also our life has sprung up again by him and by his death -whom some deny, by which mystery we have obtained faith, and therefore endure, that we may be found the disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Master - how shall we be able to live apart from Him, whose disciples the prophets themselves in the Spirit did wait for Him as their teacher? And therefore He whom they rightly waited for, being come, raised them from the dead. (Ignatius to the Magnesians, chapter 9. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 1., pp. 180-182.)

Without noting the grammatical construction of the sentence, the reader will see that the passage as it reads is untruthful, since it asserts that the "most holy prophets" ceased to keep Sabbaths, and kept the Lord's day. The discussion concerning this passage in Kitto's Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature (article Lord's day) is so full that it is here quoted somewhat at length as follows:

"But we must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's-day, though it certainly contains no mention of it. It occurs in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about A.D. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. It has, however, been understood in a totally different sense, and as referring to a distinct subject; and such we confess appears to us to be the most obvious and natural construction of it. Then follows an analysis of the Greek text, showing that interpolating the word day"" does violence to the Grammatical construction, and to the obvious meaning of the passage. After such an analysis the Encyclopedia adds the following translation of the passage:"

If those who lived under the old dispensation have come to the newness of hope, no longer keeping Sabbaths, but living according to our Lord's life, (in which, as it were, our life has risen again, through him, and his death, [which some deny], through whom we have received the mystery, etc., . . .) how shall we be able to live without him? etc. In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view, the passage does not refer at all to the Lord's-day; but even on the opposite supposition, it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term "Lord's-day" (for which it is often cited) since the material word it hemera – day - is purely conjectural. It however offers an instance of that species of contrast, which the Early Fathers were so fond of drawing between the Christian and Jewish dispensations, and between the new life of the Christian and the ceremonial spirit of the law, to which the Lord's-day (if it be imagined to be referred to) is represented as opposed." The foregoing rendering and interpretation are fully sustained by a late writer of high authority concerning Sunday, James Augustus Hessey, D. C. L. Relative to the passage under consideration he says:

"Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, is the first writer whom I shall quote. Here is a passage from his Epistle to the Magnesians, containing, as you will observe, a contrast between Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of it, an opposition between sabbatizing and living the life of the Lord If they, then, who were concerned in old things, arrived at a newness of hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living according to the Lord's life, by which our life sprung up by him, and by his death, (whom certain persons deny,).. . how can we live without him, whose disciples even the prophets were, and in spirit waited for Him as their teacher? Wherefore, He whom they justly waited for, when He came, raised them up from the dead. . . . We have been made His disciples, let us live according to Christianity. (Bampton Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1860, p. 41.)

Sir William Domville makes the following just criticism:

It seems not a little strange that the Archbishop should so widely depart from the literal translation, which is this: "'No longer observing Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord's life, in which also our life is sprung up.'" For there is no phrase or word in the original which corresponds to the phrase, "'the Lord's day,'" or to the word "'keeping.'" In a note referring to this word, the Archbishop says: "'Or living according to;'" so that he acknowledges this translation would be correct, but the consequence of his throwing it into a note is to lead the reader to suppose that, though the original may be so translated, the preferable translation is that which is given in the text, when in truth, so far from being a preferable translation it is no translation at all. (Sabbath, etc., p. 242.)"

This examination of the passage has been made thus full in order to show that there is no reference to Sunday-keeping except by a fraudulent and unscholarly translation, and by interpolation. The examination has also proceeded upon the supposition that the Epistle is genuine. That it is not genuine will fully appear from the following testimony:

Dr. Killen gives the following history of the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius:

"In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the hoary mantle of antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused to receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered form, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was aroused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real Epistles. Greece, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were ransacked in search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general gratulation; it is confessed that four of the Epistles, so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal, and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and sternly disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three Epistles abundantly attests that, like the last three books of the Sibyl, they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture. (Ancient Church, sec. 2, chap. 3.)

In a note, Doctor Killen adds that Bunsen rather reluctantly admits that the highest literary authority of the last century, the late Dr. Neander, declined to recognize even the Syriac version of the Ignatian Epistles. ""

Rev. Lyman Coleman testifies in the following words:

"Certain it is that these Epistles, if not an entire forgery, are so filled with interpolations and forgeries as to be of no historical value with reference to the primitive Christians and the apostolic churches. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 1, sec. 2, p. 48.)

John Calvin says:

Nothing can be more absurd than the impertinences which have been published under the name of Ignatius. (Institutes, Book 1, chap. 13.)"

Rev. Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D., late Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, in an article on the "Origin and Growth of Episcopacy," sums up the case as follows:

"1. Killen, the Irish Presbyterian, thinks these Ignatian Epistles all spurious, but is of the opinion that the Syriac three were the first to be forged in the time of Origen [185 - 254 A. D.], soon after which they were translated into Greek, and others were added before the time of Eusebius, who is admitted to have had the seven.

2. Baur and Hilgenfeld think them all spurious, but are of the opinion that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after 150 A.D., and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek.

3. Cureton, Bunsen, Ritschel, and Lipsius contend for the Genuineness of the Syriac three. This as the matter now stands, appears to be the weakest position of all.

4. A strong array of the ablest and soundest critics, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, such is Moehler and Gieseler, Hefele and Uhlhorn, may still be found on the side of the shorter Greek recension. (American Presbyterian and Theological Review, January, 1867.)"

The following conclusions seem to be just and imperative:

1. The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians is a forgery, made long after the death of Ignatius.

2. It makes no mention of the Sunday or Lord's-day.

3. To interpolate the word "day" in the oft quoted passage perverts the meaning, and destroys the grammatical arrangement of the sentence. Whatever opinion any one may adopt concerning the Ignatian Epistles, the fact remains that a correct rendering of the text gives no support to Sunday-observance.

Thus it appears that there is absolutely no explicit testimony in favor of Sunday, or the Lord's-day as referring to Sunday, by any of the "Apostolic Fathers".

Pliny's Letter To Trajan, And A Famous Falsehood.

EARLY in the second century, Pliny the Younger, then governor of Bythnia, wrote to the Emperor Trajan (about 107 A.D.) asking advice concerning the complaints which were made to him relative to the Christians in his province. After stating the points on which he desired counsel, he says:

"In the meanwhile, the method I have observed toward those who have been brought before me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were Christians? If they confessed, I repeated the question twice again, adding threats at the same time; when, if they still persevered, I ordered them to be immediately punished; for I was persuaded, what ever the nature of their opinions might be, that a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved correction. There were others also brought before me possessed with the same infatuation, but being citizens of Rome, I directed them to be carried thither.

But this crime spreading (as is usually the case), while it was actually under prosecution, several instances of the same nature occurred. An information was presented to me without any name subscribed, containing a charge against several persons, who upon examination denied they were Christians, or ever had been. They repeated after me an invocation to the gods, and offered religious rites with wine and frankincense before your statue (which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought, together with those of the gods, an even reviled tile name of Christ; Whereas there is no forcing, it is said, those who are really Christians, into a compliance with any of these articles; I thought proper, therefor, to discharge them. Some among those who were accused by a witness in person, at first confessed themselves Christians, but immediately after denied it; while the rest owned indeed that they had been of that number formerly, but had now (some above three, others more, and a few above twenty years ago) forsaken that error. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the gods, throwing out imprecations at the same time against the name of Christ.

They affirmed that the whole of their guilt or error was, that they met on a certain stated day before it was light, and addressed themselves in a form of prayer to Christ, as to some God, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery; never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to eat in common a harmless meal. From this custom, however, they desisted after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your orders, I forbade the meeting of any assemblies. (Pliny's Letters, Book X., Epistle 97, Melmoth's Translation.,)

The claim which is made concerning this extract is that the certain stated day"" was Sunday. But when it is remembered that the Bythnian churches were probably organized by Peter at a time when the observance of the Sabbath was a common practice of the apostles, it is practically certain that the ""stated day"" was the seventh day. This view is supported by natural inferences and general facts relative to the observance of the seventh day, which continued in the church for some centuries after the date of Pliny's letter. Bohmer (as quoted by Holden, p. 292) takes this view. Gesner, in his notes on Pliny, concurs with this view. (See Hessey, Sunday, p. 370, and Cox, Sabbath Literature, Vol. I., p. 297.)"

DOMINICUM SERVASTI?

Such use has been made of a certain spurious claim concerning the questions put to the early martyrs that it demands special attention at this point. Mr. Gilfillan, Mr. Gurney, and other writers of the early part of the last century have used the claim to support the idea that the "stated day" of Pliny was the Sunday, or that Sunday-keeping was a cause for martyrdom at that early period. Mr. Gilfillan asserts that the enmity between the early Christians and the Jews arose from the change of the "sabbatic day." This assertion is followed by these words:

"The Romans, though they had no objection on this score, punished the Christians for the faithful observance of their day of rest, one of the testing questions put to the martyrs being, *Dominicum servasti?* -Have you kept the Lord's-day? Such, however, was the success of truth, and of the example of these good men, that the Lord's-day soon passed from being an object of opprobrium into a law of a

great empire. And Julian himself was so impressed with the power of its arrangement of rest and instruction as to contemplate the adoption of a similar provision for reviving and propagating heathen error. (Sabbath, etc., p. 7.)

This statement has been termed justly a famous falsehood."" We are not ready to assume that Mr. Gilfillan, and others who have repeated the statement, so understood, or designed to make a misstatement, but the facts given below show that anxiety to find support for Sunday in early times, and incomplete knowledge, or both, have led them into a great error. Mr. Gilfillan gives as authority ""Baron, An. Eccles., A.D. 303. Num. 35,"" etc., which will be examined below. Mr. Gurney shapes his statement as follows:"

"But what was the stated day when these things took place? Clearly, the first day of the week; as is proved by the very question which it was customary for the Roman persecutors to address to the martyrs, viz., *Dominicum servasti?* – Hast thou kept the Lord's-day?" To which the answer usually returned was, in substance, as follows: *Christianus sum, intermittere non possum* – "I am a Christian, I cannot omit it. (Brief Remarks on the History, etc., of the Sabbath, p. 36.)

In a foot-note Mr. Gurney gives his authority as follows: "Acts of Martyrs in Bishop Andrews on the Ten Commandments p. 264." Concerning this reference we have made careful examination, and found the following facts. The full title of the work to which Mr. Gurney evidently refers is as follows: "The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine at Large; or a Learned and Pious Exposition of the Ten Commandments." In this work, at the place cited, there is made an effort to prove that the term "Lord's-day" (Rev. 1: 10) means Sunday. In connection with that discussion the following passage appears:

A thing so notorious, so well known even to the heathen themselves, as it was (in the Acts of the Martyrs) ever an usual question of theirs (even of course) in their examining what? *Dominicum servasti?* – Hold you the Sunday" and their answer known; they all aver it. *Christianus sum, intermittere non possum* - "I am a Christian; I cannot intermit it, not the Lord's-day in any wise." These are examples enough.

Thus we reach the exact words referred to by Mr. Gurney. But we find also another important fact. This "Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine" was a posthumous work. The manuscript was not complete when Bishop Andrews died, and the editor made such additions as he deemed best from material left by the Bishop. The passage above is taken from a printed speech made by the Bishop against Thraske, an English Seventh-day Baptist, who was tried before the Star Chamber Court for maintaining that Christians were bound to keep the Seventh-day Sabbath, etc. The Bishop died in 1626, and his speech against Thraske was not published until 1629. It was, therefore, as well as the "Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine," a posthumous publication. It is probable that it was printed from some rough outline of his speech, found among his papers; for it is one of several tracts attributed to the Bishop, and collected in a small volume entitled, *Opuscula quaedam posthuma*.

On pages 131 and 132 of a work in favor of Sunday, written by William Twisse, D. D., of the English church, and published at London in 1641, about ten or twelve years after the publication of Bishop Andrews' work, is the same quotation, which Twisse says is from Andrews' speech against Thraske in the court of the Star Chamber. In the history of the trial of Thraske as given by a contemporary (Paggit Herisiography, p. 20, London, 1661), the same passage is quoted from Bishop Andrews' speech.

In this speech, the Bishop labors to prove that the seventh day was early changed for the first by Christians. In the course of that discussion, he makes the statement quoted above. The passage from the speech against Thraske and hence the reference to *Dominicum servasti* does not appear in the Parker Edition of Andrews' "Works,"- Oxford 1846 - nor in the Revised Catechetical Doctrine published in 1852. Thus does the myth vanish which has been so long used as a foundation for the claim that the "stated day" of Pliny was Sunday.

But the case is made still more unsatisfactory when we search for the authority on which Bishop Andrews made his loose statement. He refers to the Acts of the Martyrs only in a general way, citing no instance wherein such a question was asked. Careful search reveals the fact that no such question is anywhere recorded. Domville states the result of his researches as follows: (For Domville's entire discussion, see Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 261–273.)

The most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs is that by Ruinart, entitled, *Acta primorum Martyrum, sincera et selecta*." I have carefully consulted that work, and I take it upon myself to affirm, that among the questions there stated to have been put to the martyrs, in and before the time of Pliny, and for nearly two hundred years afterwards, the question, *Dominicum servasti?* does not once occur, nor any equivalent question, such, for instance, as *Dominicum celebrasti?*

It cannot be expected that I should quote in proof of my assertion all the questions put to the martyrs in all the martyrdoms (above one hundred in number) recorded in Ruinart; but I will do this, I will state all the questions that were put to the martyrs in and before Pliny's time.

Having stated these questions, Domville continues: "This much may suffice to show that *Dominicum servasti?* was no question in Pliny's time, as Mr. Gurney intends us to believe it was. I have however still other proof to offer of Mr. Gurney's unfair dealing with the subject, but I defer stating it for the present, that I may proceed in the inquiry, what may have been the authority on which Bishop Andrews relied when stating that *Dominicum servasti?* was ever a usual question put by the heathen persecutors. I shall with this view pass over the martyrdoms which intervened between Pliny's time and the fourth century, as they contain nothing to the purpose, and shall come at once to that martyrdom, the narrative of which was, I have no doubt, the source from which Bishop Andrews derived his question, *Dominicum servasti?* "Hold you the Lord's-day" This martyrdom happened A.D. 304. [Baronius puts it one year earlier. - A.H.L.] The sufferers were Saturninus and his four sons, and several other persons. They were taken to Carthage and brought before the proconsul Amulinus. In the account given of their examinations by him, the phrases "*Celebrare dominicum.*" and "*agere dominicum,*" frequently occur, but in no instance is the verb *servare* used in reference to *dominicum*. I mention this chiefly to show that when Bishop Andrews, alluding, as no doubt he does, to the narrative of this martyrdom, says the question was *Dominicum servasti?* it is very clear he had not his author at hand, and that, in trusting to his memory, he coined a phrase of his own.

After quoting the questions put at this trial, in which the term *Dominicum* is used, and the answers which were made by the martyrs, Domville adds:

The narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus and his fellow sufferers being the only one which has the appearance of supporting the assertion of Bishop Andrews that *Hold you the Lord's-day?* " was a usual question to the martyrs, what if I should prove that even this narrative affords no support to that assertion. Yet nothing is more easy than this proof; for Bishop Andrews has quite mistaken the meaning of the word *dominicum*, in translating it "*the Lord's-day.*" It had no such meaning. It was a barbarous word, in use among some of the ecclesiastical writers in and subsequent to the fourth century, to express, sometimes a church, and at other times the Lord's Supper; but never the Lord's-day. My authorities on this point are: 1. Ruinart [the compiler of the work entitled, "*Acts of the Martyrs,*" etc.,] who, upon the word *dominicum*, in the narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus, has a note in which he says it is a word signifying the Lord's Supper (*Dominicum vero designat sacra mysteria,*) and he quotes Tertullian and Cyprian in support of this interpretation. [This testimony from Ruinart is conclusive concerning the meaning of the term *dominicum*. In another note upon a passage in which the word occurs, he also says that some manuscripts have *Dominica sacramenta*] 2. The editors of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine's works. They state that the word *dominicum* has the two meanings of a church and the Lord's Supper. For the former they quote among other authorities a canon of the council of Neo-Caesarea. For the latter meaning they quote Cyprian, and refer also to St. Augustine's account of his conference with the Donatists in which allusion is made to the narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus. (Vol. 5, pp. 116, 117. Antwerp Ed., 1700.) 3. Gesner who, in his *Latin Thesaurus* published in 1749, gives both meanings to the word *dominicum*. For that of the Lord's Supper he quotes Cyprian; for that of a church he quotes Cyprian and also Hillary."

In addition to the foregoing it may be added that *dominicum* is not an adjective of which *diem* is the understood substantive. In the narrative of the trial of Saturninus it is used as a neuter substantive as the following sentence shows: *Quia non potest intermitti dominicum.*

From the foregoing facts, the following conclusions are legitimately drawn:

1. Bishop Andrews, in his speech against Thraske before the court of the Star Chamber in 1618, made a general reference to the "*Acts of the Martyrs,*" as authority for a loosely-made statement relative to the question *Dominicum servasti?* A careful examination of the best edition of that work shows that no such question was ever used; that one somewhat similar was used at a trial long after the time when Pliny wrote his statement concerning a "*stated day,*" in which quotation the Lord's Supper and not the Lord's day is referred to.

2. Mr. Gurney, Dr. Dwight, and others have referred to Bishop Andrews' speech and to Pliny's letter in such a way as to lead their readers into a very grave error concerning the whole matter.

We now come to Mr. Gilfillan's statements which, be it remembered, have been published since Sir Domville made such a complete exposure in regard to the passage. Cardinal Baronius was a Romish Annalist, who wrote about the beginning of the seventeenth century. Bingham, in *Antiquities of the Christian church*, refers to an edition published at Antwerp in 1610. Thus by a change of tactics, Mr. Gilfillan attempts to evade the force of the exposure made by Sir Domville, relative to Bishop Andrews' reference to the "*Acts of the Martyrs,*" and so to save the much loved *Dominicum servasti?* By noting the date, A.D. 303, the reader will see that he is obliged to admit the main item, namely, that the question was not put until the fourth century, and hence can have no bearing upon the "*stated day,*" referred to by Pliny. But worse than this is the fact that Baronius does not support Mr. Gilfillan's claim, and so leaves him liable to very grave charges as to honesty or carefulness. The account given by Baronius shows that he copied from the "*Acts of Martyrs,*" from which abundant testimony has been given, showing that *Dominicum* was used to indicate the Lord's Supper. Baronius, in the place referred to by Gilfillan, and its contexts, gives the history of the martyrdom of Saturninus and his companions, evidently the same account which Domville has so carefully sifted. Baronius gives the representative questions which were put to the prisoners, whose arrest was made because they had celebrated the Lord's Supper against the command of the Emperor. *Dominicum* and *Collectam* are used as equivalent in these questions, and always in such connections as indicate a rite performed in Christian

assemblies. But the case is rendered still plainer by the fact that Baronius defines these terms when he records the account of this trial, in which they were used. He says: "By the words, Collectam, Collectionem, and Dominicum, the author always understands the sacrifice of the Mass." (Baronius, Tome 2, A.D. 303, No. 39, p. 884. Venetii, 1738.) In concluding the account of the martyrdom of this company, he says:

"It has been shown above, in relating these things, that the Christians were moved, even in the time of severe persecution, to celebrate the Dominicum. Evidently, as we have declared elsewhere in many places, it was a sacrifice without bloodshed, and of divine appointment. (Ib, Id., No. 82, p. 897.)

We should not have discussed this extract from Pliny at such length except for the necessity of exposing the mistake into which many writers have fallen in seeking to prove that the stated day"" mentioned was Sunday. The only positive knowledge that can be obtained is found in the text itself, which shows that in Bythinia the Christians met on some ""stated day,"" weekly or otherwise, and that on the order from the governor they desisted from the practice."

TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES.

We must here note the "Teaching of the Apostles." When it appeared in 1884, a few proclaimed triumphantly that the early observance of the "Lord's-day" was now settled. The facts do not support any such conclusion. After a careful study of it and its surroundings, at that time we spoke of it as follows:

Some general facts need to be remembered as a preface to the investigation concerning the Teaching."

(a) The few meager references to it by early writers, and the long obscurity which has covered it, show that it was never widely known, and never held a prominent place in the post-apostolic period.

(b) So far as genuineness is concerned, it is found in bad company. Its associations are against it. By genuineness we mean a compilation of real Scripture teachings made by a competent hand, previous to 120 or 160 A.D.

(c) It claims neither date nor author. "Leon, Notary and Sinner," June, 6564, i.e., 1056 A. D., is the only clue we have to any one connected with it. All conclusions must therefore be based upon internal characteristics and collateral testimony. Taking up the matter of internal evidence, we venture a theory which will form at least a working hypothesis for farther investigations. It is this:

The Teaching" consists of two distinct parts. The first, which is earliest and more nearly pure, consists of the first six chapters, which are wholly didactic. These represent the genuine "Teaching." The second portion, chapters 7-16, are made up of fragments from other writings, and of references to practices and notions of later and indefinite date, and not necessarily contemporaneous. The grounds on which we base this hypothesis are as follows:

1. The work has two titles. The first appears to be an abridgment of the second, and from another hand. Even the second refers not to the whole book, but to the first six chapters. This fact alone must continue to constitute a definite argument against the unity of the book, and against the genuineness of the second part. Comparison of the two portions with each other and with the New Testament will also show certain interpolations in the earlier portions, made to bring it into more apparent harmony with the latter.

2. The internal evidence is strongly in favor of this theory. The first six chapters are purely didactic. They are made up almost wholly of truths which are drawn directly from the Gospels and the Decalogue, the latter, and its summary by Christ, being very prominent. Dr. Smyth says of it as a catechism:

How supreme its law of righteousness, and pure its standard of morals. Like all sound catechisms, this one goes back to the Decalogue. It takes the form of precept and injunction. It prohibits absolutely. There can be no evangelical training of the young with the law omitted. (Andover Review, April, 1884, p. 435.)

These six chapters are also complete within themselves. They stand related to practical Christian life, and to the rest of the chapters, like a high fertile plateau of rich pasture land, swept by the pure breezes of heaven. If these had come to us alone, with their appropriate title, no one would have thought of them as fragmentary or incomplete. They would have shone amid the Patristic writings like a single rare diamond among less precious stones.

3. The additions which follow the sixth chapter are such as a later and more corrupt age would naturally make. Undoubtedly the catechism was designed as and understood to be the antecedent to baptism, not as a "confession of faith," but as a guide to life. Apostolic and sub-apostolic Christianity consisted of a life, not a creed. To do, not to believe, was the absorbing thought. As ritualism became more prominent and the church passed into the transition period wherein apostolic Christianity was changed to Patristic, in which philosophy did much abound -under such circumstances compiling fingers would itch to add to the simple catechism the developing notions and theories concerning Christian life. Naturally, therefore, the seventh chapter opens with baptism, the event for

which the catechism was the preparation. The change between the sixth and subsequent chapters is more than the change from the simple didactic to the ritual. The didactic portion is mainly Scriptural; the ritualistic is not. Inferences aside, the second part of the Teaching will not bear comparison with the New Testament on many points. Baptism, fasting, the eucharist, and forms of prayer form the themes for four chapters - 7-10; none of these are treated with reference to

their higher and spiritual significance, but rather from the standpoint of a growing ritualism. The Lord's Prayer, with the Doxology in part is ordered "three times" in each day. This certainly marks a point later than the middle of the second century.

The 11th and 12th chapters give directions for the reception and treatment of apostles and prophets, such as indicate a period decidedly post-apostolic. Christ directed his disciples to abide where they first entered during their indefinite stay in any city. Paul labored weeks, months, and years in specific fields, as the work demanded. But this 11th chapter forbids an apostle to remain more than one day unless necessity compels; in that case he may stay two days. "But if he remain three days he is a false prophet." It also orders that when he departs he shall be given only bread enough to last until he lodge again, and assures us that if he asks for money he is a false prophet. This is puerile. The same chapter has the following unmeaning sentence: "And no prophet who orders a meal in the spirit, eateth of it, unless indeed he is a false prophet." This is as senseless as some of the vagaries of Barnabas, and points to a date much later than 120 A.D., or to a degeneracy so rapid as to challenge credulity," etc. (Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly, July, 1884, pp. 17, 18.)

A little later the opinion of Hilgenfeld appeared as follows:

I seem to myself to have found the original Teaching of the Apostles" in chapter 1:1 to 6:2, (that is, from the beginning to the words "But concerning food," etc.) but here and there a little altered, and with a second title ("The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles") conformed to the example of the Apostolic Constitutions. But the matters that we read therein savor of a certain Montanism rather than oppose it. That which follows, the original "Teaching of the Apostles" (chapters 6:3 to 16:6), which is directed not to the catechumens but to the "faithful," (even to clergy, 7:2) seems to be a later addition, ultimately shaped for the use of Montanism. (The Independent, June 26, 1884.)

A few months later the following appeared, which is sufficient to settle the question in the mind of every one not blinded by prejudice or incapacitated by ignorance:

Bryennios on the "Teaching."

BY PROF. E. A. GROVERNOR, ROBERT COLLEGE, CONSTANTINOPLE.

I have recently enjoyed two interviews with Bishop Bryennios. The first interview lasted more than two hours, the second not so long. Both were devoted almost entirely to conversation concerning the "Teaching."

The Bishop expressed himself very freely. With interesting minuteness, he dwelt upon his discovery of the manuscript and upon its subsequent history in his connection with it.

The subject which he evidently deemed the most important, he discussed with special emphasis. This was concerning the relative value of different portions of the "Teaching." What he said concerning it will be of interest to the reader.

Everybody knows that the "Teaching," as published in the Constantinople edition of Bryennios contains sixteen short chapters. The first six comprise enforcement of duties and prohibition of sins and crimes; the last ten, commencing with the seventh, consist mainly of liturgical and ecclesiastical prescriptions and ordinances. Now the Bishop says the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is limited entirely to those first six chapters and, inasmuch as it is derived through them from the Lord, each word therein is of binding force.

But, he says, the last ten chapters are entirely distinct, and have no authority whatever, except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunctions. How far he was correct in these injunctions the Bishop says we cannot know. Their only weight is found in the fact that they are the expression of opinion of one person who was presumably a good man. To quote as exactly as I can the Bishop's language: "In the year 100, 120, 140,- we are not sure what year -a man says to himself, 'I will write down just what the apostles have taught and what they learn from the Lord. I will write down what they said about special duties and sins. I will write down just what they said about the two ways of virtue and vice.' So he goes to work and writes it down just as well as he can remember, and, doubtless, he has in it the aid of God's Spirit. All he has written down is from Christ; it is just what the apostles said; it is addressed only to Christians, and this is what should bear the inscription of 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.' All this occupies just six exceedingly brief chapters. But when he has done that, the writer is not satisfied. All he has done is that he has been a sort of amanuensis in writing down teachings for the practical guidance of the saints. But the heathen are being converted and pouring into the church. In the manner of receiving them vastly different customs exist. There is no manual of directions on the subject. In one place they do this; in another place they do that. The variety of procedure is becoming a scandal. Christ did not formulate a system. He

gave only a faith and the apostles did hardly more. 'Now,' says the man, whom we will call the transcriber, inasmuch as nothing in the six chapters was original to him, 'I will do something more. I will write what shall be good for those coming into the church, and what shall be a sort of guide or manual to the clergy in dealing with them.' We may suppose that, after great study and investigation and reflection, or, possibly, with but little of such study, investigation, and reflection, the man makes up his mind as to what ought to be the course of procedure, or as to what is the course of procedure in the majority of cases, and then, without inspiration, he writes it down. It is possible, even, that his opinion may be in opposition to that of the vast majority of other believers. Hence the last ten chapters, as authority, have no value whatever. (den echoun oudemian axion) Possibly the tois ethnesin was then put here at the beginning of the seventh chapter, and preceded by the words: "Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles," thus making it in the original as distinct, and yet the writer honestly believing it the Teaching of the Lord because it seemed so wise and so clear to him.

Possibly the inscription was simply (tois ethnesin) and, at last, with the title, 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' prefixed, all was transported to the beginning of the book. But the sum of it is, these ten chapters have no authority save as the opinion of the unknown writer. There may have been a hundred men more capable than he of expressing an opinion, only he wrote down his opinion, and others did not. The first six chapters have upon us the binding force of the word of God. The didache is, properly speaking, the first six chapters and no more."

How would Your Holiness prove this distinction of the sixteen chapters into two distinct parts of unequal authority and obligation? I asked.

First, he replied, "by reading the first six chapters by themselves, and then the last ten chapters by themselves. There is all the difference between them of inspiration on the one side, and of human compilation and contrivance on the other."

Then the learned Bishop, who is profoundly versed in all the intricacies and subtleties of apostolic and ecclesiastical history, made a remark which, for its ingeniousness and ingenuousness. I must quote. "We know that many of these rules and directions had no authority save in the mind of the writer, from the fact that during the first and second centuries after Christ, the observance and customs of the church, in many respects, were different from what the writer approves and lays down in the last ten chapters. At the same time, we know that the teachings of the first six chapters are exactly the same as those of Christ and his apostles."

It is also a fact, he said, "that, in the Epistle of Barnabas, no quotation is made from the 'Teaching' except from the first six chapters. Possibly there may be from the sixteenth chapter; but it seems rather like a coincidence than quotation. Now if the writer of that Epistle recognized all the 'Teaching' as equal, why does he quote only from the first six chapters?"

But, said I, "is this fully in harmony with Your Holiness's discussion of the writer of the didache on certain pages of last years Constantinople edition?"

He replied: "It is at variance with nothing which I said then, and it is in accordance with, and fortified by, my constant study of the didache ever since it was published, and it is all to be set forth in the book I am now writing. There are other considerations, too, which I shall there bring out fully. Altogether it amounts to this: Six chapters, divine and obligatory; ten chapters, human, possibly good, but resting on one individual man's individual judgment of what was best." (The Independent, Oct. 15, 1884.)

We have treated of this document thus at length for the sake of many readers who may not have had the opportunity to become familiar with it, and also to show that the second portion, in which occurs the reference that is claimed in support of Sunday, is of a later date, and of less worth than the earlier. This reference is in the fourteenth chapter, and is translated by Hitchcock and Brown as follows:

But on the Lord's-day do we assemble and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure.

This passage, like the one from Ignatius, lacks the very important word day. The Greek is as follows:

Kata kuriaken de Kuriou sunachthentes klasate arton kai eucharistesate prosexomologesamenoi ta paraptomata humov, hopos kathara he thusia humov ei.

It will be seen that the structure of the opening clause is more than "pleonastic;" it is awkward. If the word day be supplied, or if the adjective be used for the substantive, we should have, "On the Lord's (day) of the Lord," etc. Whatever meaning may be given to the imperfect clause, nothing is gained for the cause of Sunday-observance. The portion of the "Teaching" in which it occurs is certainly later than the time of Justin Martyr, and likely to be contemporaneous with the Apostolic Constitutions. The words of Justin show how and why Sunday was observed as an eucharist day in the latter half of the second century. The history of "Sunday," as the resurrection festival, begins there. "Lord's-day" comes in later. It does not appear in legislation concerning Sunday, which began 321 A.D., until well toward the close of the fourth century.

Justin Martyr, The First Direct Reference To Sunday

AND THE RISE OF NO-SABBATHISM.

THE middle of the second century marks the beginning of a new era in the Sabbath question. The first direct and indisputable reference to any form of Sunday-observance by Christians is made at this time, and simultaneously and by the same man the no-Sabbath theory is propounded. Up to this time, the Scriptures had held the better part of the church to the Sabbath as taught in the Decalogue. Polytheism and heathen philosophy ignored this idea, and openly proclaimed a type of no-lawism and absolute no-Sabbathism. It was a part of the fruitage which came from the corrupting of the church and the gospel by admixture with heathen fancies and speculations. Under the sway of these loose ideas, Sunday, already a festival among the heathen, found gradual welcome at the hands of the semi-Christianized leaders in the church, and final recognition by a still less Christianized form of civil government during the third and fourth centuries. Justin Martyr stands as a prominent representative of this no-Sabbathism, and also as an apologist for Christianity, who sought to soften the fury of the heathen persecutors by claiming a similarity between Christianity and heathenism. The entire passage concerning Sunday is as follows; only a part of it is usually quoted by writers who claim that Sunday is the Sabbath:

And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgiving, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday), and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration. (The First Apology of Justin, chapter 67. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 2, pp. 65, 66.)

The foregoing extracts will be better understood if the reader remembers that the author was a Grecian philosopher who accepted - we dare not say was converted to Christianity, after reaching the age of manhood, and who retained many of his heathen notions and sympathies through life. The days referred to, Saturn's and the Sun's, are

designated only by their heathen names, and the reasons which are given for meeting on Sunday are at once fanciful and unscriptural. The passage shows Justin in his true place is an Apologist, who sympathized with both parties, and sought to soften the feelings of the Emperor by indicating those points in which Christianity and heathenism agreed. The following extracts from the same author show that he could not entertain any idea of the Sun's day as being in any sense the Sabbath, or even a Sabbath. In his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, the differences between Justin's theories of Christianity and Judaism are strongly set forth, and the Sabbath is frequently referred to. In the 23d section of the Dialogue he says:

You have no need of a second circumcision, though you glory greatly in the flesh. The new law requires you to keep perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God. If any one has impure hands, let him wash and be pure. (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 2. Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 12, p. 101.) In another place he says:

"But if we do not admit this, we shall be liable to fall into foolish opinions, as if it were not the same God who existed in the times of Enoch and all the rest, who neither was circumcised after the flesh, nor observed Sabbaths, nor any other rites, seeing that Moses enjoined such observances; or that God has not wished each race of mankind continually to perform the same righteous actions; to admit which, seems to be ridiculous and absurd. Therefore we must confess that He who is ever the same, has commanded these and such like institutions on account of sinful men, and we must declare Him to be benevolent, foreknowing, needing nothing, righteous and good. But if this be not so, tell me, sir, what you think of those matters which we are investigating. And when no one responded:

Wherefore, Trypho, I will proclaim to you, and to those who wish to become proselytes, the divine message which I heard from that man. Do you see that the elements are not idle, and keep no Sabbaths Remain as you were born. For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or of the observance of Sabbaths, of feasts, and sacrifices, before Moses; no more need is there of them now, after that, according to the will of God, Jesus Christ the Son of God has been born without sin, of a virgin sprung from the stock of Abraham."" (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 2. Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 23, pp. 115, 116.)"

Be it here remembered that the Sabbath is often referred to in Justin's Dialogue, and that in the passage just quoted he is answering a charge which Trypho brings against Christians, who, he declares, "differ in nothing from the heathen in their manner of living, because they neither observe festivals, nor Sabbaths, nor the rite of circumcision. (Dialogue, chap. 10.)

Justin's reply seeks to defend himself against the charge by showing that such things were not required of men under the gospel. In this way, Justin shows that he did not predicate any observance of Sunday upon the Fourth Commandment, or upon any transfer of the "Jewish" to the "Christian" Sabbath. He does not link Sunday with the former dispensation by any such claims. In the forty-first section of the Dialogue he gives another fanciful reason in addition to those given in the Apology for giving Sunday a religious preeminence. This reason he expresses in the following words:

The command of circumcision, again, bidding [them] always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath, [namely through] our Lord Jesus Christ. For the first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called, however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and [yet] remains the first." (Ante- Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 2, p. 139.)

Thus it appears that Justin is at once the first of the "Fathers" who makes any authentic mention of the preeminence of Sunday among Christians, and the first exponent of absolute no-Sabbathism. It is also pertinent to note, as Dr. Hessey has done, (Sunday, p. 43, sec. 11,) that Justin always uses sabbatizeiv "with exclusive reference to the Jewish law," and that "he carefully distinguishes Saturday [Sabbath], the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday upon which he rose from the dead." In the face of these facts, it is manifestly unjust to claim Justin as an advocate of the sacredness of Sunday in any sense. It were better to let him stand in his true place as the exponent of semi-pagan no-Sabbathism. What we do learn from Justin, inferences and suppositions aside, is this: At the middle of the second century, certain Christians held some form of religious service on Sunday. All that Justin says is compatible with the idea that the day was not regarded as a Sabbath, and his silence concerning any sabbatic observance is strong negative proof, of the absence of any such idea. His no-Sabbathism is added proof of this. It is further apparent that since he undertook to describe the things which were done on Sunday, and to give the reasons therefor, that had anything like the modern theory of a Sunday Sabbath then obtained, he must have mentioned the fact. Domville sums up the case as follows:

"This inference appears irresistible when we further consider that Justin, in this part of his Apology, is professedly intending to describe the mode in which Christians observed the Sunday. . . . He evidently intends to give all information requisite to an accurate knowledge of the subject he treats upon. He is even so particular as to tell the Emperor why the Sunday was observed; and he does, in fact, specify every active duty belonging to the day, the Scripture reading, the exhortation, the public prayer, the Sacrament, and the alms-giving: why then should he not also inform the Emperor of the one inactive duty of the day, the duty of abstaining from doing in it any manner of work?

If such was the custom of Christians in Justin's time, his description of their Sunday duties was essentially defective. ... But even were it probable he should intend to omit all mention of it in his Apology to the Emperor, it would be impossible to imagine any sufficient cause for his remaining silent on the subject in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew; and this whether the Dialogue was real or imaginary, for if the latter, Justin would still, as Dr. Lardner has observed, chose to write in character."" The testimony of Justin, therefore, proves most clearly two facts of great importance in the Sabbath controversy; the one, that the Christians in his time observed the Sunday as a prayer day, the other that they did not observe it as a Sabbath-day. (Sabbath, Examination of the Six Texts: p. 274, seq. London, 1849.)"

Such is the summary of the case at the year 150 A.D. No-Sabbathism, and a form of Sunday-observance were born at the same time. Trained in heathen philosophies until manhood, Justin accepted Christianity as a better philosophy than he had found before. Such a man, and those like him, could scarcely do other than build a system quite unlike apostolic Christianity. That which they did build was a paganized rather than an apostolic type.

Other Writers, And The Development Of No-Sabbath

THE advocates of Sunday scan the pages of history, subsequent to Justin's time, for every trace which refers to Sunday in any way. Tracing in chronological order the writers that are quoted we find

DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF CORINTH.

The passage quoted is said to be from a letter addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome. Only a fragment of the letter is extant, being found in Eusebius. (Ecc. Hist., Book 4, chap. 23.) A Latin volume of Eusebius, published in 1570, gives chap. 22. The passage is usually translated liberally as follows:

To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we read your letter, which we shall hereafter read continually, as we do that of Clemens, that we may be replenished with precepts and wholesome instructions. The passage as found in the Latin edition of Eusebius, noted above, is as follows: "Sanctam hodie Dominicam diem peregrimus, in una vestram legimus epistolam, quam semper admonitionis gratia legemus, sicut et priorem nobis per Clementem scriptam." Routh (*Reliquiae Sacrae*, Vol. 1, p. 180) gives "transegimus" instead of "peregrimus," and in the Greek text gives "diegagomen."

Such a fragment, if genuine, cannot be made the foundation of an argument or a theory. It is dated A.D.

170. Allowing that "Lord's-day" refers to Sunday, it only shows a slight growth of the idea and practice referred to by Justin in his Apology twenty or thirty years before. It does not show a Sabbatic observance; "have passed" or "gone through" the day is all that the text can be made to express; and to say "have kept," as Mr. Gilfillan does in a parenthesis, is a perversion.

MELITO.

Testimony in favor of Sunday is also sought from Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who wrote a book "on the Sabbath," some say; "on the Lord's day," say others. The basis on which these and similar statements rest is this: None of the books written by him are extant. Eusebius (Ecc. Hist. Book 4, chap. 25) pretends to give a list of works written by him. Routh (*Reliquiae Sacrae*, Vol. 1, p. 120) gives the title of this one as *Ho Peri Kuptiakes Logos*. Thus we have simply a book or discourse "Concerning the Lord's ---- ." Evidently an imperfect title, with no clue concerning the important word to be supplied. There were many other themes concerning which one might write besides the Lord's day. It is not surprising that Eusebius should supply the ellipsis with the word "day." He wrote one hundred and fifty years after the time of Melito, and evidently had no authority except a mutilated catalogue, or tradition. He was a great admirer of Constantine, and an earnest supporter of his Sunday legislation. His comments upon some of the Psalms evince an unwarrantable effort to give a religious character to Sunday. With such tendencies and under such circumstances, Eusebius would naturally be tempted to claim Melito as a Sunday author. In the same chapter, Eusebius states that Melito wrote a discourse concerning "Easter," in the preface to which he says that it was written at a time when "there was a great stir at Laodicea concerning the Sabbath, which in those days, by reason of the times, was broken up." (*Mota est Laodiceae magna quaestio Sabbato, quod in diebus illis pro ratione temporis, inciderat.*) In this statement there is clearly a reference to the flood of no-Sabbathism, which found its first prominent advocate in Justin a quarter of a century before the time of Melito. It also shows that the distinctively Christian element in the church withstood this semi-Pagan apostasy, and hence a "great stir was made."

IRENÆUS.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, flourished during the last quarter of the second century. Positive dates concerning him and his writings are wanting. Probably the most of his writings which have come down to us were written after 180 A.D. One brief passage ascribed to him has been quoted and paraphrased by several modern writers in such a way as to indicate inexcusable carelessness, to say the least. Dr. Justin Edwards says:

"Hence Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the Apostles, A.D. 167, says that the Lord's-day was the Christian Sabbath. His words are, On the Lord's-day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.'" (*Sabbath Manual*, p. 114.) Mr. Gurney and others among English writers have used similar language. Gilfillan is somewhat more guarded in his use of Irenaeus, though not less deceptive as to his real teachings and the facts relative to the foregoing quotation. The important fact to be considered is this: The writings of Irenaeus contain no such passage. In support of this statement we offer the following testimony from the pen of Sir William Domville:"

Mr. Gurney, in speaking of the Christians of the second century, says: Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 167, expressly asserts that the Lord's-day was their Sabbath. "On the Lord's-day, every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God." In a note, Mr. Gurney adds, as his authority,

Quoted by Dwight, *Theology*, Vol. 4, p. 26.

Who is Dwight? And why should Mr. Gurney in this case, and, as I believe, in this case only, quote one of the Fathers at second hand? For Mr. Gurney, it is evident from his "Brief Remarks," is well versed in the original writings of the Fathers; and if so, he ought not to rely on any person but himself for faithful quotations from them. Now I find, by a biographical memoir prefixed to Dwight's

Theology, that the author, Dr. Dwight, was a minister of the gospel in America, and President of a college there, and that he was born in 1752, and died in 1817. He had the misfortune to be afflicted with a disorder in his eyes from the early age of twenty-three; "a calamity," says his biographer, "by which he was deprived of the capacity for reading and study. . . . During the greater part of forty years, he was not able to read fifteen minutes in the twenty-four hours. . . . The knowledge which he gained from books after the period above mentioned, [by which the editor must mean his age of twenty-three] was almost exclusively at second hand by the aid of others." (pp. 84,85.) Having been driven by necessity to pursue his many avocations without the use of his eyes his memory naturally strong, acquired a power of retention unusual and surprising. It was not the power of recollecting words, or dates, or numbers of any kind, it was the power of remembering facts and thoughts, especially his own thoughts. (p. 86.) . . . His work consists of a series of sermons in five volumes, published after his death from the manuscript of an amanuensis, to whom he had dictated them."

The quotation from Irenaeus occurs in one of these sermons (Vol. 4, p. 28, ed. 1819.) The original passage in Irenaeus is not given by Dr. Dwight in the edition which I have seen; we have only his English version of it, nor is the place where it is to be found in the works of Irenaeus pointed out. (Sabbath, Examination of the Six Texts, p. 127, et., seq.)

We have quoted from Domville thus because of his recognized authority as an historian. (Robert Cox, Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, supports Domville on this point.) We have also verified his statements by comparing them with the American edition of Dr. Dwight's Theology. It may be well also to remark here that the original sources of information concerning the writings of Irenaeus are very meager, and hence the greater difficulty which one afflicted as Dr. Dwight was would labor under in quoting from him. This will appear in the following statement from Lardner:

There is nothing now remaining of Irenaeus besides his five books against heresies, and fragments of some other pieces; and those five books, which were written by him in Greek, are extant only in an ancient Latin version, excepting some fragments preserved by Eusebius, and other Greek writers who have quoted them. (Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, Vol. 2, pp. 292, 293. London, 1847.)

Careful research shows that these writings of Irenaeus contain no such passage as the one referred to by Dr. Dwight, and quoted with such confidence by Mr. Gurney, Dr. Edwards, and others. In support of this statement, we quote again from Domville:

"But although not found in Irenaeus, there are in the writings ascribed to another Father, namely, in the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, and in one of its interpolated passages, expressions so closely resembling those in Dr. Dwight's quotation, as to leave no doubt of the source from which he quoted. . . . Unwilling to rely merely upon the identity of the passage in Ignatius, with the quotations made as from Irenaeus by Drs. Dwight and Paley, I have carefully searched through all the extant works of Irenaeus, and can, with certainty, state that no such passage, or any one at all resembling it, is there to be found. The edition I consulted was that by Massuet (Paris, 1710) but to assure myself still further, I have since looked to the editions by Erasmus (Paris, 1563) and Grabe (Oxford, 1702) and in neither do I find the passage in question. (Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 130-132; also Cox. Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, supplement, p. 329.)

We have carefully verified the statement made above by Sir William Domville, and do not hesitate to repeat that Irenaeus contains no such passage as the one attributed to him. Nor is the passage from the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius given in full; why we do not know, unless it be that when the whole passage is given it overthrows the claim which is made concerning a part of it when standing alone. That our readers may see the whole, we insert the passage, which is as follows:

Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness: for ""he that does not work, let him not eat."" For, say the [holy] oracles, ""In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread."" But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's-day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared,"

To the end, for the eighth day, on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ, etc." (Chapter 9.) (Those wishing to examine this passage will find that it is excluded from Wakes' edition of the Fathers. It is given in the "Longer" form of the Epistle, in Ante-Nicene Library - Apost. Fathers, p. 181.

Thus it is shown that the oft-quoted passage from Irenaeus must be placed upon the list of things which are not, and its use by those who have thus incorrectly predicated an argument upon it must be called, putting it mildly, a serious mistake. A single passage from the more authentic writings of Irenaeus and the only one in which he discusses the Sabbath question at length will show the reader his theory concerning the matter of Sabbath-keeping:

It is clear, therefore, that he loosed and vivified those who believe in him as Abraham did, doing nothing contrary to the law when he healed upon the Sabbath-day. For the law did not prohibit men from being healed upon the Sabbaths; [on the contrary] it even circumcised them upon that day, and gave command that the offices should be performed by the priests for the people; yea, it did not disallow the healing even of dumb animals. Both at Siloam and on frequent subsequent occasions, did he perform cures upon the Sabbath; and for this reason many used to resort to him on the Sabbath-days. For the law commanded them to abstain from every servile work, that is, from all grasping after wealth which is procured by trading and by other worldly business; but it exhorted them to attend to the exercises of the soul, which consist in reflection, and to addresses of a beneficial kind for their neighbor's benefit. And therefore the Lord reproveth those who unjustly blamed him for having healed upon the Sabbath-days. For he did not make void, but fulfilled the law, by performing the offices of the high priest, propitiating God for men, and cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and himself suffering death that exiled man might go forth from condemnation, and might return without fear to his own inheritance. And again, the law did not forbid those who were hungry on the Sabbath-days to take food lying ready at hand: it did, however, forbid them to reap and to gather into the barn. (Against Heresies, Library of the Fathers, B. 4, chap. 8; Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 5, pp. 397, 398.)

In another place Irenaeus declares the binding nature of the Decalogue in these words:

"They (the Jews) had therefore a law, a course of discipline, and a prophecy of future things. For God at the first, indeed warning them by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning he had implanted in mankind, that is, by means of the Decalogue (which if any one does not observe, he has no salvation) did then demand nothing more of them. (Against Heresies, B. 4, chap. 15. Anti-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 5, p. 419.

Tertullian And His Followers.

THE following, from the pen of Neander, will fairly introduce the next writer to be examined: Quintus Septimus Tertullianus was born in the later years of the second century, probably at Carthage, and was the son of a centurion in the service of the Proconsul at Carthage. He was at first an advocate or rhetorician, and arrived at manhood before he was converted to Christianity; and he then obtained, if the account given by Jerome is correct, the office of a Presbyter. . . . He was a man of ardent mind, warm disposition, and deeply serious character, accustomed to give himself up with all his soul and strength to the object of his love, and haughtily to reject all which was uncongenial to that object. He had a fund of great and multifarious knowledge, but it was confusedly heaped up in his mind without scientific arrangement. His depth of thought was not united with logical clearness and judgment; a warm ungoverned imagination that dwelt in sensuous images was his ruling power." (Church History, First Three Centuries," p. 425.)

Tertullian wrote extensively concerning almost all points of Christian doctrine. The following extracts will show what his opinions were relative to the Sunday:

"It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is being demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is being demonstrated to have been temporary.

For the Jews say, that from the beginning God sanctified the seventh day, by resting on it from all His works which He made; and that thence it was, likewise, that Moses said to the people: Remember the day of the Sabbaths, to sanctify it: every servile work ye shall not do therein, except what pertaineth to life." Whence [we Christians] understand that we still more ought to observe a Sabbath from all "servile work" always, and not only every seventh day, but through all time. And through this arises the question for us, what Sabbath God willed us to keep? For the Scriptures point to a Sabbath eternal and a Sabbath temporal. For Isaiah the prophet says, "Your Sabbaths my soul hateth;" and in another place he says, "My Sabbaths ye have profaned." Whence we discern that the temporal Sabbath is human, and the eternal Sabbath is accounted divine; concerning which He predicts through Isaiah: "And there shall be," He says, "month after month, and day after day, and Sabbath after Sabbath, and all flesh shall come to adore in Jerusalem, saith the Lord;" which we understand to have been fulfilled in the times of Christ, when "all flesh" - that is, every nation - "came to adore in Jerusalem" God the Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, as was predicted through the prophet; "Behold, proselytes through me shall go unto Thee." Thus, therefore, before this temporal Sabbath, there was withal an eternal Sabbath foreshown and foretold; just as before the carnal circumcision there was withal a spiritual circumcision foreshown. In short, let them teach us [as we have already premised] that Adam observed the Sabbath; or that Abel, when offering to God a holy victim, pleased Him by a religious reverence for the Sabbath; or that Enoch, when translated, had been a keeper of the Sabbath; or that Noah the ark-builder observed, on account of the deluge, an immense Sabbath; or that Abraham, in observance of the Sabbath, offered Isaac his son; or that Melchizedek in his priesthood received the law of the Sabbath."

But the Jews are sure to say, that ever since this precept was given through Moses, the observance has been binding. Manifest accordingly it is, that the precept was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporal, which would one day cease. In short, so true is it that it is not in the exemption from work of the Sabbath - that is, of the seventh day - that the celebration of this solemnity is to consist, that Joshua, the son of Nun, at the time that he was reducing the city of Jericho by war, stated that he had received from God a precept to

order the people that priests should carry the ark of the testament of God seven days, making the circuit of the city; and thus, when the seventh day's circuit had been performed, the walls of the city would spontaneously fall. Which was so done; and when the space of the seventh day was finished, just as was predicted, down fell the walls of the city. Whence it is manifestly shown, that in the number of those seven days there intervened a Sabbath-day. For seven days, whence soever they may have commenced, must necessarily include within them a Sabbath-day; on which day not only must the priests have worked, but the city must have been made a prey by the edge of the sword by all the people of Israel. Nor is it doubtful that they 'wrought servile work,' when in obedience to God's precept, they drave the preys of war. For in the times of the Maccabees, too, they did bravery in fighting on the Sabbaths, and routed their foreign foes, and recalled the law of their fathers to the primitive style of life by fighting on the Sabbaths. Nor should I think it was any other law which they [thus] vindicated, than the one in which they remembered the existence of the prescript touching "the day of the Sabbaths."

Whence it is manifest that the force of such precepts was temporary, and respected the necessity of present circumstances; and that it was not with a view to its observance in perpetuity that God formerly gave them such a law." (Tertullian, "An Answer to the Jews," chapter 4. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 18, pp. 211-213.) The foregoing shows that Tertullian was a warm advocate of the no-Sabbath theory. His views reveal a fuller development of that no-lawism which appeared fifty years before, in the writings of Justin. Tertullian's ardent nature accepted and proclaimed the full fruitage of this theory, as is shown by the following from another work:

The Holy Spirit upbraids the Jews with their holydays. Your Sabbaths and new moons, and ceremonies," says he, "my soul hateth." By us to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals formally beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New Year's and Midwinter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented - presents come and go - New Year's gifts - games join their noise -banquets join their din. Oh, better fidelity of the nations to their own sect, which claims no solemnity of the Christians for itself. Not the Lord's-day, not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians. We are not apprehensive lest we seem to be heathens. If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the heathens each festive day occurs but once annually; you have a festive day every eighth day. Call out the individual solemnities of the nations, and set them out in a row, they will not be able to make up a Pentecost. (Tertullian on Idolatry, chapter 14. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 11, pp. 162, 163.) Here we have the native character of the Sunday truly set forth. "If thou must needs have some indulgence to the fiesh, thou hast it every eighth day." Such was the unavoidable fruitage of this semi-pagan festivalism, a fruitage which poisoned the church as fast as it ripened.

Certain other passages from Tertullian are much sought after by writers in favor of Sunday; among them is the following, only a part of which is usually given:

Even in pleading tradition, written authority you say, must be demanded. Let us inquire, therefore, whether tradition, unless it be written, should not be admitted. Certainly we shall say that it ought not to be admitted, if no cases of other practices which, without any written instrument, we maintain on the ground of tradition alone, and the countenance thereafter of custom affords us any precedent. To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the President, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel. Then, when we are taken up [as new-born children] we taste first of all a mixture of milk and honey, and from that day we refrain from the daily bath for a whole week. We take also, in meetings before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the Presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist. which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at mealtimes, and enjoined to be taken by all [alike]. As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honors. We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's-day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday. We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground. At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign [of the cross]. (Tertullian, De Corona, chapter 13. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 11, p. 336.)

Again Tertullian says:

"In the matter of kneeling, also, prayer is subject to diversity of observance, through the act of some few who abstain from kneeling on the Sabbath; and since this dissension is particularly on its trial before the churches, the Lord wilt give his grace that the dissentients may either yield, or else indulge their opinion without offense to others. We, however, (just as we have received), only on the day of the Lord's resurrection ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude; deferring even our business, lest we give any place to the devil. Similarly too, in the period of Pentecost; which period we distinguish by the same solemnity of exultation. But who would hesitate every day to prostrate himself before God, at least in the first prayer with which we enter on the daylight. At fasts, moreover, and Stations, no prayer should be made without kneeling, and the remaining customary marks of humility; for [then] we are not only praying, but deprecating [wrath], and making satisfaction to God our Lord. Touching times of prayer nothing at all has been prescribed, except clearly to pray at every time and place." (Tertullian On Prayer, chapter 23. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 11, p. 199.)"

In order to understand the foregoing, the reader will need to remember that "kneeling" was deemed an expression of sorrow not suited to the joyful festivals, but rather befitting to the sorrowful fasts. The suggestion relative to "deferring even our business" is made to impress the idea that nothing should be allowed to interrupt the joys of the day. The expression is far from denoting a sabbatic rest, especially since the whole "season of Pentecost" was to be spent in this manner, with the same immunity from kneeling and from care.

Bishop Kaye sums up the testimony of Tertullian concerning the question before us in the following statements: "From incidental notices scattered over Tertullian's works, we collect that Sunday, or the Lord's-day, was regarded by the primitive Christians as a day of rejoicing and that to fast upon it was unlawful. The word Sabbatum is always used to designate, not the first, but the seventh day of the week, which appears in Tertullian's time to have been also kept as a day of rejoicing. . . . The custom of observing every Saturday as a fast, which became general throughout the Western church, does not appear to have existed in Tertullian's time. That men who like our author, on all occasions contended that the ritual and ceremonial law of Moses had ceased, should observe the seventh day of the week as a festival, is, perhaps, to be ascribed to a desire of conciliating the Jewish converts. (Eccl. Hist. of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the writings of Tertullian, p. 388. London, 1845.)

The foregoing suggestion of Bishop Kaye concerning the consistency of Tertullian's positions and statements leads us to say in passing that consistency was not Tertullian's strong point. He often contradicts himself, asserting in one treatise that which he denies in another. The first quotation which have presented to the reader is full of no-Sabbathism. In other places he asserts the perpetuity of the Sabbath, at least in a spiritual sense. Note the following: "Similarly on other points also, you reproach him with fickleness and instability for contradictions in his commandments, such as that he forbade work to be done on Sabbath-days, and yet at the siege of Jericho ordered the ark to be carried round the walls during eight days; in other words, of course, actually on the Sabbath. You do not, however, consider the law of the Sabbath; they are human works, not divine, which it prohibits. For it says, 'Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.' What work? Of course your own. The conclusion is, that from the Sabbath-day he removes those works which he had before enjoined for the six days, that is your own works; in other words, human works of daily life. Now, the carrying around of the ark is evidently not an ordinary daily duty, nor yet a human one; but a rare and a sacred work, and, as being then ordered by the direct precept of God, a divine one. And I might fully explain what this signified, were it not a lengthy process to open out the forms of all the Creator's proofs, which You would, moreover, probably refuse to allow. It is more to the point, if you be confuted on plain matters by the simplicity of truth rather than curious reasoning. Thus, in the present instance, there is a clear distinction respecting the Sabbath's prohibition of human labors, not divine ones. Accordingly, the man who went and gathered sticks on the Sabbath-day was punished with death. For it was his own work which he did; and this the law forbade. They, however, who on the Sabbath carried the ark around Jericho, did it with impunity. For it was not their own work, but God's which they executed, and that, too, from his express commandment. (Against Marcion, book 2, chapter 21. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 7, pp. 100, 101.)

The late J. N. Andrews aptly describes the position and character of Tertullian in the following words: "This writer contradicts himself in the most extraordinary manner concerning the Sabbath and the law of God. He asserts that the Sabbath was abolished by Christ, and elsewhere emphatically declares that he did not abolish it. He says that Joshua violated the Sabbath, and then expressly declares that he did not violate it. He says that Christ broke the Sabbath, and then shows that he never did this. He represents the eighth day as more honorable than the seventh, and elsewhere states just the reverse. He asserts that the law is abolished, and in other places affirms its perpetual obligation. He speaks of the Lord's-day as the eighth day, and is the second of the early writers who makes an application of this term to Sunday, if we allow Clement to have really spoken of it. But though he thus uses the term like Clement he also like him teaches a perpetual Lord's-day, or, like Justin Martyr, a perpetual Sabbath in the observance of every day. And with the observance of Sunday as the Lord's-day he brings in "offerings for the dead" and the perpetual use of the sign of the cross. But he expressly affirms that these things rest, not upon the authority of the Scriptures, but wholly, upon that of tradition and custom. And though he speaks of the Sabbath as abrogated by Christ, he expressly contradicts this by asserting that Christ "did not at all rescind the Sabbath," and that he imparted an additional sanctity to that day which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father. This strange mingling of light and darkness plainly indicates the age in which this author lived. He was not so far removed from the time of the apostles but that many clear rays of divine truth shone upon him; and he was far enough advanced in the age of apostasy to have its dense darkness materially affect him. He stood on the line between expiring day and advancing night. Sometimes the law of God was unspeakably sacred; at other times tradition was of higher authority than the law. Sometimes divine institutions were alone precious in his estimation, at others he was better satisfied with those which were sustained only by custom and tradition. (Testimony of the Fathers, pp. 63, 64.)

Mr. Andrews evidently refers to book 4, chap. 12 of "Against Marcion," in which Tertullian, with many strange twistings and turnings, discusses the question as to whether Christ broke or annulled the Sabbath. As the passage makes no reference to Sunday, our pages do not yield it space. It will be found in Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 7, pp. 215-220.

The lesson which is taught in the writings of Tertullian, and which is especially pertinent to our present inquiry is this. Under the influence of no-Sabbathism, at the close of the second century, the observance of the Sabbath was declining, and the Sun's day had become a festival for "indulgence to the flesh."

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Clement of Alexandria comes next in the order of our examination. He died about the beginning of the third century. The quotations from this author are generally made from fragmentary writings called *Stromata*, *Miscellaneous Discourses*. By ingenious paraphrasing and by interpolating here and there a word, careless and prejudiced authors have attempted to draw evidence from Clement in favor of a transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. (M.A.A. Phelps's "Perpetuity of the Sabbath," Boston, 1841; and Mr. James' "Four Sermons," London, 1830, are prominent examples of misuse of Clement's words.) An eminent critic and commentator upon the writings of Clement confutes this claim in the following words:

I deem it scarcely necessary to observe that Clement never applies the name Sabbath to the first day of the week, which he calls the Lord's-day. (Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria, by John, Bishop of Lincoln, p. 413. London, 1835.)

We select a passage or two from the mystical references which Clement makes to the Sabbath and Sabbath-keeping to illustrate his theories. Of the Fourth Commandment he says:

"And the fourth word is that which intimates that the world was created by God, and that he gave us the seventh day as a rest, on account of the trouble that there is in life. For God is incapable of weariness, and suffering, and want. But we who bear flesh need rest. The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest - abstraction from ills - preparing for the Primal Day, our true rest; which, in truth, is the first creation of light, in which all things are viewed and possessed. From this day the first wisdom and knowledge illuminate us. For the light of truth, a light true, casting no shadow, is the Spirit of God indivisibly divided to all, who are sanctified by faith, holding the place of a luminary, in order to the knowledge of real existences. By following him, therefore, through our whole life, we become impassible; and this is rest.

Wherefore Solomon also says, that before heaven and earth, and all existences, Wisdom had arisen in the Almighty; the participation of which - that which is by power, I mean, not that by essence - teaches a man to know by apprehension things divine and human. Having reached this point, we must mention these things by the way; since the discourse has turned on the seventh and the eighth. For the eighth may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the latter properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work. For the creation of the world was concluded in six days. For the motion of the sun from solstice to solstice is completed in six months in the course of which, at one time the leaves fall, and at another plants bud and seeds come to maturity. And they say that the embryo is perfected exactly in the sixth month, that is in one hundred and eighty days in addition to the two and a half as Polybus, the physician, relates in his book *On the Eighth Month*," and Aristotle, the philosopher, in his book: "'On Nature.'" Hence the Pythagoreans, as I think, reckon six the perfect number, from the creation of the world, according to the prophet, and call it Meseuthys and Marriage, from its being the middle of the even numbers, that is often and two. For it is manifestly at an equal distance from both.'" (Clement of Alexandria, "'The Miscellanies,'" Book 6, chapter 16. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 12, p. 386.)"

His theory concerning the observance of days and times is clearly set forth in the following:

Now we are commanded to reverence and to honor the same one, being persuaded that he is Word, Saviour and Leader, and by him, the Father, not on special days, as some others, but doing this continually in our whole life, and in every way. Certainly the elect race justified by the precept says, Seven times a day have I praised thee." Whence not in a specified place, or selected temple, or at certain festivals and on appointed days, but during his whole life, the Gnostic in every place, even if he be alone by himself, and wherever he has any of those who have exercised the like faith, honors God, that is, acknowledges his gratitude for the knowledge of the way to live.

And if the presence of a good man, through the respect and reverence which he inspires, always improves him with whom he associates, with much more reason does not he who always holds uninterrupted converse with God by knowledge, life and thanksgiving, grow at every step superior to himself in all respects - in conduct, in words, in disposition? Such an one is persuaded that God is ever beside him, and does not suppose that he is confined in certain limited places; so that under the idea that at times he is without him, he may indulge in excesses night and day.

Holding festival, then in our whole life, persuaded that God is altogether on every side present, we cultivate our fields, praising; we sail the sea, hymning; in all the rest of our conversation we conduct ourselves according to rule. The Gnostic, then, is very closely allied to God, being at once grave and cheerful in all things, grave on account of the bent of his soul toward the Divinity, and cheerful on account of his consideration of the blessings of humanity which God has given us." (Clement of Alexandria, "The Miscellanies," Book 7, chapter 7. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 12, p. 431.)

In another place Clement sets forth his idea of days in which it appears that he discards the observance of any specific day, and teaches that the observance of both the Sabbath and the Sunday is accomplished by living as the true Gnostic ought to live. Speaking of the Gnostic, the name Clement applies to a Christian, he says:

He knows also the enigmas of the fasting of those days – I mean the Fourth and the Preparation. For the one has its name from Hermes, and the other from Aphrodite. He fasts in his life, in respect of covetousness and voluptuousness, from which all the vices grow. For we have already often shown above the three varieties of fornication, according to the apostle - love of pleasure, love of money, idolatry. He fasts, then, according to the law, abstaining from bad deeds, and according to the perfection of the Gospel, from evil thoughts. Temptations are applied to him, not for his purification, but, as we have said, for the good of his neighbors, if, making trial of toils and pains, he has despised and passed them by. The same holds of pleasure. For it is the highest achievement for one who has had trial of it, afterwards to abstain. For what great thing is it, if a man restrains himself in what he knows not? He, in fulfillment of the precept, according to the Gospel, keeps the Lord's-day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the Gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself. Further also, when he has received the comprehension of scientific speculation, he deems that he sees the Lord, directing his eyes toward things invisible, although he seems to look on what he does not wish to look on; chastising the faculty of vision, when he perceives himself pleasurably affected by the application of his eyes; since he wishes to see and hear that alone which concerns him. (Clement of Alexandria, "The Miscellanies," Book 7, chapter 12. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 12, p. 461.)

Thus the reader finds Clement teaching the same no-Sabbathism, and making the same analogies and contrasts between the old and new dispensations, and between sin and holiness, which abound in the representative writings of his time. We have already quoted from Clement a passage in which, as Bishop Kaye remarks, Clement is trying to bring out the properties and virtues of the numbers 6, 7, and 8, the hidden meanings of which numbers he frequently speaks of. Some writers have paraphrased and interpolated that passage trying to make it appear that he is drawing a contrast between the seventh and eighth day. In connection with what we have quoted, Clement's discussion concerning the numbers 7 and 8 becomes too gross to be fit for this page. Further quotations from him are not necessary to show that he belongs to the extreme school of no-Sabbathists, and that his teachings were destructive of all true Sabbath-observance.

ORIGEN.

Origen was born A.D. 185, died A.D. 253. He was a pupil of Clement of Alexandria, the effects of whose teachings are clearly seen in his ideas concerning the question under consideration. Neander says that "the influence which Clement had exerted on his theological development is undeniably shown most conspicuously. We find in him the predominant ideas of the latter systematically developed." The passage which is most frequently quoted from Origen by writers in favor of Sunday is from his Twenty-third Homily on Numbers. Concerning the authenticity of this Homily, Robert Cox speaks as follows:

"That the Sabbath was kept by the Jewish members of the church is not only probable in itself, but would be certain from a passage in Origen's Twenty-third Homily on Numbers, if we could confidently assume that Homily to be a genuine record of one of his discourses. Not only have Origen's writings been more than usually corrupted, but his Homilies having been taken down from his mouth by reporters, and there being no certainty that he ever revised them, our confidence in the accuracy of any particular passage cannot be very great. Of the Twenty-third Homily, moreover, only a Latin translation is extant. (Sab. Lit. Vol. 1, p. 348.)

The passage as usually translated is as follows:

Leaving the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see how the Sabbath ought to be observed by a Christian. On the Sabbath-day all worldly labors ought to be abstained from. If, therefore, you cease from all secular works, and execute nothing worldly, but give yourselves up to spiritual exercises, repairing to church, attending to sacred reading and instruction, thinking of celestial things, solicitous for the future, placing the judgment to come before your eyes, not looking to things present and visible but to those which are future and invisible, this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath. (Tome ii., p. 358, seq.)"

The special phrase "Christian Sabbath" as it is rendered is applied to Sunday. The remarks of Dr. Hessey concerning it are subjoined as the first evidence against it. He says:

In quoting as Origen's opinion, in the text, As for the Sabbath it has passed away as a matter of obligation [as every thing else purely Jewish has passed away,] though its exemplary and typical lessons are evident still," I had in mind his Twenty-third Homily on Numbers. (Tome ii., p. 358, seq.) I did not cite it in the first and second editions, because I conceived it impossible that any one could so far mistake its meaning as to imagine that Origen's words Sabbati Christiani were to be taken as equivalent to what has sometimes been termed the Christian Sabbath, viz., the Lord's-day. But as this mistake has occurred, I now give a sort of Analysis of the Homily. (Bampton Lectures on Sunday, Note 125, p. 287. London, 1866.)

Mr. Hessey goes on to show that Origen in this Homily is seeking to explain nine different Jewish festivals (festivitates) as being symbols of the Christian life, according to the style of allegorical interpretation, which was then prevalent. The Sabbath (Festivitas Sabbati) is the second on the list, and is made a type of holy living under the Gospel. In the words of Dr. Hessey:

It is perfectly evident that Origen is here drawing a transcendental picture of the life of a Christian, which he sets forth under the allegory of the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath. He who lives in the manner which is described, realizes the Sabbatismus mentioned in the Hebrews, and by thus embracing the exemplary meaning of the Jewish Sabbath, Christianizes it, or draws a Christian moral from it. So Sabbati Christiani does not mean Christian Sabbath," or Lord's-day, a phrase not in use until the twelfth century, but the Jewish Sabbath with a Christian moral or meaning deduced from it. No one who has read the whole of the Homily can attach any other meaning to the passage. I may add that if Origen is not symbolizing the Sabbath, but advocating its literal continuance in the Lord's-day, he must be supposed to be advocating the literal continuance of the other Festivitates also. . . . In all this there is not the remotest allusion to the Sabbath being either identical with, or continued in the Lord's-day. The passage is intended to exhibit the form in which the "Sabbatismus" which remaineth for the people of God may be realized here, and Origen goes on to intimate, will be more perfectly realized hereafter." (Lectures on Sunday, pp. 288, 289. London, 1866.)

We were at first inclined to dissent from the foregoing exegesis by Dr. Hessey, but after carefully examining the whole chapter as found in the Original, (Origensis Opera Omnia, etc., Liber second, p. 358, Paris, 1733,) we are certain that such is the meaning, and that Origen is contrasting a life-rest in well-doing, with the weekly Sabbath rest. In full keeping with this view are his words in another place, where he is trying to evade the charge that Christians were not consistent, since by observing festivals they ignored the teachings of Paul in Gal.4: 10. He says: "If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as for example the Lord's-day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words and deeds serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's-day. He also who is unceasingly preparing himself for the true life, and abstaining from the pleasures of this life which lead astray so many - who is not indulging the lust of the flesh, but "keeping under his body, and bringing it into subjection," such a one is always keeping Preparation-day. Again he who considers that "Christ, our passover, as sacrificed for us," and that it is his duty to keep the feast by eating of the flesh of the Word, never ceases to keep the paschal feast; for the pascha means a "passover," and he is ever striving in all his thoughts, words and deeds to pass over from the things of this life to God, and is hastening toward the city of God.

And, finally, he who can truly say, "We are risen with Christ," and "He hath exalted us, and made us to sit with him in heavenly places in Christ," is always living in the season of Pentecost; and most of all, when going up to the upper chamber, like the apostles of Jesus, he gives himself to supplication and prayer, that he may become worthy of receiving "the mighty wind rushing from heaven," which is powerful to destroy sin and its fruits among men, and worthy of having some share of the tongue of fire which God sends. (Origen against Celsus, Book 8, chapter 22. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 23, p. 509.)

There were many phases of the no-Sabbath theory which appear in Origen's writings. In his Commentary on John, number 24, he sets forth a speculative theory that Christ was born at the end of the "Sabbatic Period," announcing which he says:

Hence it is not possible that the rest after the Sabbath should have come into existence from the seventh of our God; on the contrary, it is our Saviour who, after the pattern of his own rest, caused us to be made in the likeness of his death, and hence, also of his resurrection. (Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 9, p. 342.) In the same Commentaries (10th Book, Section 11) Origen represents all the festivals as belonging to God rather than to sinful men and as not being binding upon Christians, but that they only in a general way prefigured The heavenly festivals of which those on earth are typical."

Thus does Origen surpass his predecessors, opposing even the idea of any specific time for public worship. He teaches a mixture of no-Sabbathism and of higher spiritual Sabbathism, which ignores specific time as sacred, and makes all time sacred in a certain degree. Judging by the then present state of the church and the subsequent results, Origen's teachings helped to swell the tide of practical no-Sabbathism.

CYPRIAN.

Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage. He died A. D. 258. His views concerning the Sunday were patterned after those of Tertullian. Neander states that "the study of the writings of Tertullian had plainly a peculiar influence on the doctrinal development of Cyprian. Jerome relates, after a tradition supposed to come from the secretary of Cyprian, that he daily read some part of Tertullian's writings, and was accustomed to call him by no other name than that of Master." The passage usually quoted in favor of the Sunday is from his Epistles. He is considering the proper time for the baptism of infants, and says:

"For in respect of the observance of the eighth day in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh, a sacrament was given beforehand in shadow and in usage; but when Christ came it was fulfilled in truth. For because the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, was to be that on which the Lord should rise again, and should quicken us, and give us circumcision of the spirit, the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's-day, went before in the figure; which figure ceased when by and by the truth came, and spiritual circumcision was given to us. (Cyprian, Epistle 58, section 4. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 8, p. 198.)

Such vague, unmeaning mysticism needs no comment. Instead of showing that these writers deemed Sunday to be either a Sabbath, or the Sabbath, it rather shows how much the works of these leading men of the third century are marred by their efforts to find a hidden meaning in all ceremonies, numbers, and days.

CONCLUSIONS.

The foregoing are all of the important witnesses in favor of the Sunday for the first three centuries. Collating their testimony, the following conclusions are unavoidable:

1. No traces of the observance of the Sunday are found until about the middle of the second century. Those appear first in Justin Martyr's First Apology. The leading reason assigned by him for its observance is founded on a mystical interpretation of certain passages supposed to refer to the millennium. The supposed resurrection of Christ on that day is mentioned incidentally as a secondary reason. About the close of the second century, the idea of commemorating the resurrection by the observance of the Sunday increases, and the term Lord's-day"" begins to be applied to it."

2. During the third century, no-lawism and the no-Sabbath theory gain the ascendancy in the theories of the leaders. The representative writers of that century teach that there is no sacred time under the gospel dispensation. That no days are holy, and no observance of specific times religiously binding. That the true idea of the Sabbath consists in rest from sin. The fancies of Cyprian concerning circumcision as a type of the eighth day appear toward the close of the third century.

3. The observance of the Sunday which then prevailed was not sabbatic. In the second century there is no trace of the sabbatic idea connected with it. It is a day, some part of which is used for the purpose of public religious instruction. In the third century the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Sunday seems to have become quite general. This was also celebrated regularly on the Sabbath. The interdiction of business and kneeling on that day which appears during the last half of the third century, was made because business cares interrupted the festal enjoyment of the day, and not because any true idea as of a Sabbath was entertained. This is shown from the language of those passages in which such interdiction appears, and in the fact that these same writers plead strenuously for the Sabbath as a life-rest from sin, and not as a weekly rest from labor. Dr. Hessey, in speaking of the Sunday at this period, says:

"It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but was carefully distinguished from it as an institution under the law of liberty, observed in a different way and with different feelings, and exempt from the severity of the provisions which were supposed to characterize the Sabbath. (Lectures on Sunday, p. 49. London, 1866.)

Robert Cox, speaking of the close of the third century, gives the following:

But although Christian theology had not at this time assumed the systematic form which it afterward attained, there is no ground for saying that the Fathers, or ""the Church,"" represented by them, had formed no theory, Sabbatarian or dominical of the Lord's-day. Often did the question occur to them, Why do we honor the first day of the week and assemble for worship upon it? And to this question not one of them who lived before the reign of Constantine has either answered, with Mr. Gilfillan, ""Because the Fourth Commandment binds the Christian Church as it did the Jews, and the Sabbath-day was changed by Christ or his apostles from Saturday to Sunday,"" or replied with Dr. Hessey, ""Because the apostles, who had a divine commission, appointed the Lord's-day to be observed as a Christian festival."" On the contrary, they give sundry other reasons of their own, fanciful in most cases, and ridiculous in some. The best of them is that on the first day the Saviour had risen from the dead; and the others chiefly are, that on the first day God changed darkness and matter, and made the world; that on a Sunday Jesus Christ appeared to and instructed his disciples; that the command to circumcise children on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision, by which we were circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week; and that manna was first given to the Israelites on a Sunday. From which the inevitable inference is, that they neither had found in Scripture any commandment - primeval, Mosaic or Christian - appointing the Lord's-day to be honored or observed, nor knew from tradition any such commandment delivered by Jesus or his apostles. (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 353."

Other Days.

BEFORE considering the next era in the Sabbath question, which was ushered in through civil legislation, it is well to notice certain other days to which some religious regard was paid previous to the fourth century.

WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY.

The fourth and the sixth days of the week, Wednesday and Friday were made prominent among the public days of the church during the third century. Joseph Bingham speaks of them as follows:

However, it was not long after Justin Martyr's time, before we are sure the church observed the custom of meeting solemnly for divine worship on Wednesdays and Fridays which days are commonly called stationary days, because they continued their assemblies on these days to a great length, till three o'clock in the afternoon. . . . Tertullian assures us, that on these days they always celebrated the communion, from whence we may infer, that the same service was performed on these days as on the Lord's-day, unless, perhaps, the sermon was wanting. Some there were, he says, who objected against receiving the communion on these days, because they were scrupulously afraid they should break their fast by eating and drinking the bread and wine in the Eucharist; and therefore they chose rather to absent themselves from the oblation prayers, then break their fast, as they imagined, by receiving the Eucharist. Whom he undeceives by telling them that to receive the Eucharist on such days would be no infringement of their fast, but bind them closer to God; their station would be so much the more solemn for their standing at the altar of God; they might receive the body of the Lord and preserve their fast too, and so both would be safe, whilst they both participated of the sacrifice and discharged their other obligation. Since, therefore, they received the Eucharist on these days, we may conclude they had all the prayers of the communion office, and what other offices were wont to go before them, as the psalmody and reading of the Scriptures, and prayers for the catechumens and penitents, which, together with the sermons, were the whole service for the Lord's-day.

But, because even all this could not take up near so much time, as must needs be spent in these stations, it seems most probable, that in two particulars, they much enlarged their service on these days, that is, in their psalmody, and private prayers and confession of their sins. The Psalms, as we shall see hereafter, were sometimes lengthened to an indefinite number, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more, as the occasion of a vigil or a fast required, and between every psalm they had liberty to meditate and fall to their private prayers; and by these two exercises, so lengthened and repeated, it is easy to conceive how the longest station might be employed. . . . St. Basil agrees with Tertullian, in making these days not only fasts, but communion days; for, reckoning up how many days in the week they received the communion, he makes Wednesday and Friday to be two of the number. Yet, still it is hard to conceive what business they could have to detain them so long in the church; since their collects and public prayers were but few in comparison, and therefore it seems most probable that a competent share of this time was spent in psalmody, and as I find a learned person (Stillingfleet, Orig., Britan, p. 224,) inclined to think, in private devotion, which always had a share in their service, and was generally intermixed with their singing of psalms, as shall be showed in their proper places. (Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 13, chap. 9. See also Book 14, chap. 1, and Book 15, chap. 1, see. 1.)

A careful study of the foregoing will show that religious worship was more fully attended to on the Wednesday and Friday than on the Sunday, and an extended comparison between the "Fasts" and the "Festivals" of the second and third centuries, demonstrates that the former contributed more to the religious life of those times than the latter did. This was especially true in the Western Church. It is certain, from Tertullian and others, that the Sunday was the great weekly festival of "Indulgence for the flesh." As such, it was more popular, but less conducive to spiritual growth and Christian development. There is further testimony, which, though it carries us over into the next century, serves to corroborate what has already been said concerning Wednesday and Friday. Eusebius, after speaking of the laws which Constantine made relative to Sunday, adds:

He also ordered that they should reverence those days which immediately precede the Sabbath, because, as it seems to me, of the memorable acts of our Saviour upon those days. [Richardson's translation of the passage uses the singular number "day."] (De Vita Consantini, Liber 4, chap. 18.)

Sozomen, who wrote about 450 A. D., speaking of Constantine, says:

"He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's-day which the Jews call the first day of the week and which the Pagans dedicate to the sun, as likewise the day before the seventh, and commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on those days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications. He honored the Lord's-day because on it Christ arose from the dead, and the day above mentioned because on it he was crucified. He regarded the cross with peculiar reverence, on account both of the power which it conveyed to him in the battles against his enemies, and also of the divine manner in which the symbol had appeared to him. (Ecc. Hist., Book 1, chap. 8.)

Heylyn, having quoted Eusebius and Sozomen as above, adds:

For I do not conceive that they met every day in these times to receive the Sacraments. Of Wednesday and Friday it is plain they did (not to say anything of Saturday until the next section). S. Basil (Epist. 289) names them all together. "'It is,'" saith he, "'a profitable and pious thing, every day to communicate and to participate of the blessed body and blood of Christ our Saviour, he having told us in plain terms, that whosoever eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, hath eternal life. We, notwithstanding, do communicate but four times weekly, on the Lord's-day, the Wednesday, the Friday, and the Saturday, unless on any other days the memory of some martyr be perhaps observed. Epiphanius goeth a little further and deriveth the Wednesday's and the Friday's service even from the Apostles, ranking them in the same antiquity and grounding them upon the same authority that he doth the Sunday. Only it seems the difference was, that whereas formerly it had been the custom not to administer the Sacrament on these two days (being both of them fasting days, and so accounted long before) until toward evening; it had been changed of late, and they did celebrate in the mornings, as on the

Lord's-day was accustomed. Whether the meetings on these days were of such antiquity as Epiphanius saith they were, I will not meddle. Certain it is, that they were very ancient in the church of God, as may appear by that of Origen and Tertullian before mentioned."" (Hist. Sab." Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 4.)

The words of Basil the Great, Archbishop of Caesarea from 370-379 A.D., referred to by Heylyn, are these:

It is good and beneficial to communicate every day and to partake of the holy body and blood of Christ. For He distinctly says, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." And who doubts that to share frequently in life, is the same thing as to have manifold life. I, indeed, communicate four times a week, on the Lord's-day, on Wednesday, on Friday and on the Sabbath, and on the other days if there is a commemoration of any saint. (Letter 93, the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 8, p. 179.)

Coleman says:

It appears, however, from his (Origen's) observations, that at Alexandria, Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as fast days, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the church at the end of the fourth century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: In the whole Christian church, the following fast days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour, (i.e., three o'clock in the afternoon,) except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, in which it is usual neither to kneel nor to fast at all."" (Ancient Christianity, etc., pp. 552, 553.)

Neander says:

And further, two other days in the week, Friday and Wednesday, particularly the former, were consecrated to the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, and of the circumstances preparatory to them, congregations were held on them, and a fast till three o'clock in the afternoon. But nothing was positively appointed concerning them; in respect to joining in these solemnities every one consulted his own convenience or inclinations. Such fasts, joined with prayer, were considered as the watches of the Millites Christi," on their part as Christians (who compared their calling to a warfare - the Militia Christi, and they were "stationes" - and the days on which they took place were called dies stationum. (Hist. Church, First Three Cen., p. 186.)

Similar testimony might be continued were it necessary. But that already adduced is sufficient to establish the conclusion that the weekly "fasts," Wednesday and Friday, and the Sabbath were each devoted more to worship and spiritual culture than the Sunday was. The foregoing testimony also shows that when men assert that Sunday was the only day for public religious worship and rest after the resurrection of Christ, they are either ignorant or careless or dishonest. Sunday was more popular than either Wednesday or Friday, or the Sabbath, because it was more festal, "a day of indulgence for the flesh." Indeed, the Sunday at the close of the third century stood related to the lives of the people much as it now stands in those European lands where no-Sabbathism has long held sway and borne its legitimate fruit.

Before passing to the next chapter, it will be well to recapitulate the facts already gathered concerning the rise of no-Sabbathism and Sunday. This is important lest the reader be led into the mistaken idea that the stream of Apostolic Christianity came down the centuries unpolluted, and developed no-Sabbathism and the Sunday festival as Christian institutions. The facts show that they were the product of Pagan influences. We have seen that there is no definite

and authentic mention of Sunday until the middle of the second century, by Justin Martyr, and also that he is the first to promulgate a broad unscriptural no-Sabbathism. We have seen that the first mention of Sunday by him is in an "apology" to a Pagan Emperor whom he is seeking to placate toward Christians. These facts cannot appear in their true light unless we know the general state of the church west of Palestine at this time.

It is well known that in the Apostolic Age there was no distinct organization nor specific separation of those who accepted Christ from the Jewish church. They were still held as members, or at least as a party in that church. The first converts were Jews, and a sharp struggle took place before the gospel could be carried to the Gentiles, or Gentile converts admitted to the fellowship of the believers in Christ. Even as late as the time of the earlier persecutions, the followers of Christ were considered as a sect of the Jews. There was no definite line of distinction, organically, between the Christian and the Jewish churches until the opening of the second century. We offer the following testimony from high modern authority:

"With the beginning of the second century there came a great change in the situation of the Christians. The separation of Christianity from Judaism was completed so as to be recognized even by heathen eyes. The destruction of Jerusalem put an end to the outward existence of the Jewish nationality. The temple fell, the sacrifices ceased.... Spread abroad over the earth, without a local center, or the bond which had existed hitherto in the temple service, Judaism henceforth was united only by the common law, and by the common doctrine contained in the newly collected Talmud. Thus it became completely separated from Christianity. Talmudic Judaism severed all the connections which had hitherto bound it to Christianity. Henceforth three times every day in the synagogues was invoked the

awful curse on the renegades, the Christians. It came to be a rare exception for a Jew to go over to Christianity, while the heathen thronged into the church in ever increasing numbers. The remainder of the Jewish Christians dwindled away or disappeared entirely in the churches of heathen Christians, or turned heretics and were cut off from the church. The church now found the field for its work and growth almost exclusively in the heathen world, and became composed entirely of Gentile Christians. It was, therefore, no longer possible to confound the Christians with the Jews. (Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, by Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, Hanover, Germany, pp. 253. 254. New York, 1879.)

These facts referred to by Dr. Uhlhorn have a much deeper bearing on the question of Sunday-observance than may appear at first. There is no mention of any form of Sunday-observance in the church until nearly or quite fifty years after the time when the church was thus crowded with what he calls the heathen Christians. Even Pliny's letter, so often quoted for the sake of its stated day,"" was written after that time; and Justin's Apology was not written until these ""heathen Christians"" had held possession of the Western church for more than a generation. It was this influx of Pagan converts which brought in Sunday, their ""venerable day"" and gradually though slowly displaced the Sabbath. The changes which followed during the second and third centuries strengthened this heathen element in the church, and revived sun worship at Rome. Religious syncretism prevailed, and the Egyptian and Oriental gods were much honored. Speaking of this, Uhlhorn says:"

"Even the Persian Mithras, the last in the series of the gods who constantly migrated to Rome from farther and farther east, now had numerous worshippers. He was a god of light, a sun-god; as god of the setting sun, he was also god of the nether world; also as the invincible god, (the invincible companion, as he was often called,) he became the patron of warriors, and as such thoroughly fitted for those times in which the whole world was filled with war. His worship was always held in a cave. In Rome the cave penetrated deep into the Capitoline Hill. Emperors were numbered among his adorers, and everywhere where Roman armies came (on the Rhine for instance) there images and caves of Mithras have been found. This religious syncretism reached its culmination when Elagabalus, a Syrian priest of the sun, becoming Emperor, had the sun god, after whom he was named, brought from Emesa to Rome, in the form of a conical black stone. In Rome a costly temple was built, and great sacrifices were offered to him. (Conflict, etc., pp. 314, 315.)

This was A. D. 218-222. It shows how, by the growth of sun worship, Sunday was naturally exalted in the Roman Empire, and necessarily in the church which was being steadily crowded by heathen converts, many of whom, like Justin Martyr, accepted Christianity as a superior philosophy in keeping with the prevailing tendency to religious syncretism. This same Elagabalus made room for a chapel for Christianity in his temple for all the gods, and offered Christ a place in the Roman Pantheon, by the side of Jupiter, Isis, and Mithras."" (Uhlhorn, p. 334.) During the last half of the third century the influx of the Pagan converts was still greater, and although Christianity was thus steadily preparing for the political victory under Constantine during the first quarter of the next century, yet that was gained at great cost to the purity of the church. The truths of Christianity could not be destroyed wholly, but the church became so corrupted by the Pagan influences that it was no longer the counterpart of the apostolic model. So the third century closes with the Western branch of the Christian church filled with ""Pagan Christians."" Its literature abounds with undisguised and unscriptural no-Sabbath theories. The Sunday has become a popular weekly festival, which forms a sort of common ground for all, by uniting the Pagan elements of popular sun worship with the idea of a resurrection festival, at the time when festivals of all kinds formed a characteristic feature of the age. Up to this time not a word appears in any of the literature to indicate the transference of the Sabbath to the Sunday, or the making of Sunday a Sabbath according to the Fourth Commandment. On the contrary, we have found so noted a man as Tertullian seeking to draw Christians away from other Pagan festivals by reminding them that they had, in the Sunday, a day of ""indulgence for the flesh."" Well does Uhlhorn call the leading men of these times ""Pagan Christians.""

Before entering upon the fourth century, we stop to note the history of the Sabbath from the close of the New Testament period to that century.

Post-Apostolic History Of The Sabbath

TO THE 4TH CENTURY.

IN former chapters we have seen that the current of Sabbath history runs full and clear through the Gospels and the book of Acts. Those post-apostolic writings which are assigned the earliest place show no trace of any practice or teaching opposed to the doctrine and practice of Christ and his apostles on this point. The first mention of any form of Sunday-observance, or of no-Sabbathism, appears simultaneously, and in the same man, Justin, about the middle of the second century. These theories, so antagonistic to the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, did not and could not appear until the heathen element gained control of the church.

Since the Sabbath was a prominent feature in Judaism, the bitter prejudice which grew up between the heathen and the Jewish elements in the church bore heavily upon it; and when the heathen element gained control of the church, it set about the development of theories and practices which would efface, if possible, this so-called feature of Judaism from the church. The fact that Justin and his

successors pressed their no-Sabbath philosophy shows that the Sabbath was yet vigorous in its hold upon the church, even after the Jewish element had been driven out. The strongest weapon with which no-Sabbathism fought the Sabbath during the last half of the second century, and the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, was that the observance of the Sabbath was Judaistic. It is clear that if the Sabbath had died during the new Testament period, as some claim, it could not have been resurrected and restored to such vigor by the Pagan element in the church as to make it necessary for that same element to introduce its no-Sabbath philosophy as a weapon against the Sabbath. The urgency with which no-Sabbathism was pressed from the time of Justin forward shows that the Sabbath had a hold even on Gentile Christians, which could not be broken except by continued appeal to man's natural desires for a weekly festival of "indulgence to the flesh," as Tertullian calls Sunday. Viewed in the light of the philosophy of history, the fact that the Sabbath was so persistently opposed, and at length legislated against, in that portion of the church which had been for several generations under the control of the Gentile Christians, is more than an answer to the assertion that the Sabbath ceased to be observed during the apostolic period.

Another important fact must be remembered here. The authors of no-Sabbathism which began with Justin were men of Pagan rather than Apostolic culture. The doctrine was a residuum of Pagan philosophy. There was a modicum of Christian truth in that part of the theory which some propounded that the true Christian made every day a Sabbath. But that statement is rather a description of certain results in high spiritual culture which can never be attained except through the agency of the Sabbath in lifting men to that high standard. Another element of truth was that the Sabbath should not be kept by idleness, as the Jews were charged with keeping it. But the fundamental misconception lay in teaching that the law was abrogated, that men were free from restraint. These elements of truth gilded the theory to eyes which looked with bitter prejudice on all things associated with Judaism, while the fundamental, practical lawlessness of the theory was regarded as its great merit by the prevailing Paganism.

Men whose gods were only enlarged editions of themselves, reveling on Olympus, and delighting in sensuous indulgences, were not ready to embrace the new religion until the rigidness of the Fourth Commandment had been so softened that the Sabbath could be put aside, and a weekly festival put along side of it, and at length in its place. But the facts show that in spite of this abrogation of the Sabbath in the theories of the philosophers, the influence of Apostolic Christianity was so strong that the people continued to keep the Sabbath long after the philosopher had condemned it. Keep in mind the fact that neither the Sunday festival nor the doctrine of no-Sabbathism appear in history until a half century after the time when Uhlhorn says the Western wing of the church was ruptured from the Jewish element, and filled with Pagan converts.

But evidence is not wanting to show that the no-Sabbathism of Justin and his successors was not universally accepted, and that it was opposed by some whose theories were far more apostolic than Justin's philosophic vagaries were. Irenaeus, who was Bishop of Lyons, France, during the latter part of the second century, wrote his noted work *Against Heresies* about 185 A.D., about twenty years after the death of Justin. He treats the idea that Christ abolished the Sabbath as a heresy, as it was, from the apostolic standpoint. These are his words:

For the Lord vindicated Abraham's posterity by loosing them from bondage and calling them to salvation, as he did in the case of the woman whom he healed, saying openly to those who had not faith like Abraham, ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath-days loose his ox or his ass, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-days?" It is clear, therefore, that he loosed and vivified those who believed in him as Abraham did, doing nothing contrary to the law when he healed upon the Sabbath-day. For the law did not prohibit men from being healed upon the Sabbaths: [on the contrary,] it even circumcised them upon that day, and gave command that the offices should be performed by the priests for the people; yea it did not disallow the healing even of dumb animals.

Both at Siloam and on frequent subsequent occasions, did he perform cures upon the Sabbath; and for this reason many used to resort to him on the Sabbath-days. For the law commanded them to abstain from every servile work, that is from all grasping after wealth which is procured by trading and by other worldly business; but it exhorted them to attend to the exercises of the soul, which consist in reflection, and to addresses of a beneficial kind for their neighbor's benefit. And, therefore, the Lord reproveth those who unjustly blamed him for having healed upon the Sabbath-days. For he did not make void, but fulfilled the law, by performing the offices of the high priest, propitiating God for men, and cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and himself suffering death, that exiled man might go forth from condemnation, and might return without fear to his own inheritance." (Irenaeus *Against Heresies*, Book 4, chapter 8, Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 5, p. 397.

We have also certain "Remains" of one Archelaus, a Bishop who also wrote against Heresies. His *Disputation with Manes* dates probably from 280 A.D. In this he speaks as follows: (Sec. 42.)

"Again as to the assertion that the Sabbath has been abolished, we deny that he has abolished it plainly (plane). For he was himself also Lord of the Sabbath. And this, the law's relation to the Sabbath, was like the servant who his charge of the bridegroom's couch, and who prepares the same with all carefulness, and does not suffer it to be disturbed or touched by any stranger, but keeps it intact against the time of the bridegroom's arrival; so that when he is come, the bed may be used as it pleases himself, or as it is granted to those to use it whom he has bidden enter along with him. (Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 20, p. 373.)

Tertullian is more noted as a voluminous writer than as a consistent one. He sometimes advocates no-Sabbathism undisguisedly; but at other times he taught a more Scriptural doctrine. The exact date of his writings against Marcion is unknown, although the first book is fixed at 208 A.D. The fourth book came at a later period. Bishop Kaye supposes his death to have occurred about 220 A.D. We may safely conclude that the fourth book against Marcion appeared during the first quarter of the third century. Chapter 12 of that book is Concerning Christ's authority over the Sabbath,"" etc. His conclusions are as follows:"

Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath. He kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of his disciples (for he indulged them with the relief of food when they were hungry), and in the present instance cured the withered hand, in each case intimating by facts, I came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it"; although Marcion has gagged his mouth by this word. For even in the case before us he fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition. [Moreover.] He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath, [and] while imparting to the Sabbath-day itself, which from the beginning, had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by his own beneficent action. For he furnished to this day divine safeguards - a course which his adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honoring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it. Since, in like manner, the prophet Elisha, on this day restored to life the dead son of the Shunammite woman, you see, O Pharisee, and you, too, O Marcion, how that it was [proper employment] for the Creator's Sabbaths of old to do good, to save life, not to destroy it; how that Christ introduced nothing new, which was not after the example, the Gentleness, the mercy, and the prediction also of the Creator. For in this very example he fulfills the prophetic announcement of a specific healing: "The weak hands are strengthened," as were also, "the feeble knees," in the sick of the palsy. (Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 7, pp. 219, 220.)

If Tertullian, in the above, contradicts his own words in other places, the ultimate test is not between his inconsistencies, but between his theories and the facts of the Bible. Judged by this standard, the foregoing is essentially correct. Incidental proof that the Sabbath, in its proper character, and under its proper name, continued through the centuries, while no-Sabbathism was developing, is found in the fact that Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, who was a mathematician of repute, prepared a Chronology of Easter, evidently to aid in the settlement of that much-discussed question. The date of that work is placed in the latter part of the third century. This "Easter table" uses the terms Sabbath and Lord's-day in their regular order, showing how the names and the days were then held. (Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 14, p. 423.)

The foregoing extracts show that no-Sabbathism did not come in unchallenged, but that it was opposed as a heresy, and that the truth was defended on good and Scriptural grounds. There is no reason to believe that Sunday gained any pre-eminence over the Sabbath, even though it did appeal to the lower elements of men's nature by its festal character, until after the time of Constantine, when it was exalted through civil legislation.

No one claims that the "Longer" form of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians is genuine. Its date is unknown; but we deem it to belong to the last half of the fourth century, or to the fifth. But we are willing, for sake of the argument, to grant it an Ante-Nicene place, that is, before 325 A.D. Whenever it was written, it shows that at that time the writer taught a just and Scriptural view of Sabbath-observance, and asked for Sunday only a festal character. It was to him the "Queen" of the days because it was a feast as opposed to the Sabbath, the Friday, and the Wednesday, which were held to be sorrowful fasts. In chapter 9

- Long Form - speaking of Christ, the writer says:

The prophets were his servants, and foresaw him by the Spirit, and waited for him as their Teacher, and expected him as their Lord and Saviour, saying, He will come and save us." Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for "he that does not work, let him not eat." For say the [holy] oracles, " In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread." But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord'sday as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. (Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 3, p. 181.)

The foregoing from authors who wrote previous to the fourth century is fully sustained by the statements of both earlier and later historians. Socrates, whose work was brought down to 439 A.D., in his Ecclesiastical History (Book 5, chap. 22) tells of the various practices respecting the celebration of Easter, baptism, fasting, marriage, public assemblies and other rites and ceremonies. The references to the Sabbath in this chapter as related to public assemblies and the observance of Easter show that it still held a prominent and in many respects its proper place in the Christian church. He says:

Such is the difference in the churches on the subject of fasts. Nor is there less variation in regard to religious assemblies. For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, hold their religious assemblies on the Sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in

the manner usual among Christians in general: for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their offerings they partake of the mysteries. (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 2, p. 132.)

In another place Socrates, speaking of the conflict between the Orthodox Christians and the Arians as to their services and public assemblies, says:

"The Arians, as we have said, held their meetings without the city. As often, therefore, as the festal days occurred - I mean Saturday [Sabbath] and Lord's-day - in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in the churches, they congregated within the city gates about the public squares, and sang responsive verses adapted to the Arian heresy. This they did during the greater part of the night; and again in the morning, chanting the same songs which they called responsive, they paraded through the midst of the city, and so passed out of the gates to go to their places of assembly. (Ecc. History, Book 6, chap. 8. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 2, p. 144.)

Sozomen, a contemporary of Socrates, writing probably ten or fifteen years later (about A.D. 460), has the following:

Assemblies are not held in all churches on the same time or manner. The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usage established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath evenings, and, although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited nor the same lections read on the same occasions in all churches."" (Ecc. History, Book 7, chap. 19. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 2, p. 390.)"

The reader will readily see why the Sabbath was not observed at Rome and Alexandria. Sozomen wrote nearly one hundred and fifty years after the passage of the first "Sunday Law" by Constantine, and the subsequent enactments against the Sabbath.

Thus men living in the fifth century, and having access to all the existing material, bear testimony to the fact that it was the almost universal custom of the church at that time to observe the Sabbath. Corresponding with the foregoing is the testimony of modern writers.

Lyman Coleman says:

"The observance of the Lord's-day, as the first day of the week, was at first introduced as a separate institution. Both this and the Jewish Sabbath were kept for some time; finally, the latter passed wholly over into the former, which now took the place of the ancient Sabbath of the Israelites. But their Sabbath, the last day of the week, was strictly kept, in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing; until it was wholly discontinued. . . . Both were observed in the Christian church down to the fifth century, with this difference, that in the Eastern church both days were regarded as joyful occasions; but in the Western, the Jewish Sabbath was kept as a fast. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 26, sec. 2.)

Heylyn, after giving the words of Ambrose, that he fasted when at Rome on the Sabbath, and when away from Rome did not, adds: Nay, which is more, St. Augustine tells us, that many times in Africa, one and the self church, at least the several churches in the self-same province had some that dined upon the Sabbath, and some that fasted. And in this difference it stood a long time together, till, in the end, the Roman church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast almost through all the parts of the Western world. I say of the Western world, and of that alone; the Eastern churches being so far from altering their ancient custom, that, in the sixth Council of Constantinople, Anno, 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day, upon pain of censure."" (Hist. of the Sabbath, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 3.)"

King, discussing the passage from Ignatius, of which we have spoken, on page 16 ff, says:

So that their not Sabbatizing did not exclude their keeping of the Lord's-day, nor the Christian, but only the Judaical observance of the Sabbath, or seventh day; for the Eastern churches, in compliance with the Jewish converts, who were numerous in those parts, performed on the seventh day the same public religious services that they did on the first day, observing both the one and the other, as a festival. Whence Origen enumerates Saturday as one of the four feasts solemnized in his time, though, on the contrary, some of the Western churches, that they might not seem to Judaize, fasted on Saturday. So that, besides the Lord's-day, Saturday was an usual season whereon many churches solemnized their religious services. (Primitive Church," first published 1691, pp. 126, 127.) An old work on the "Morality of the Fourth Commandment," by William Twisse, D. D., has the following: "Yet, for some hundred years in the primitive church, not the Lord's-day only, but the seventh day also, was religiously observed, not by Ebion and Cerinthus only, but by pious Christians also, as Baronius writeth, and Gomarus confesseth, and Rivert also. (P. 9, London, 1641.)

A Learned Treatise of the Sabbath, by Edward Brerewood, Professor in Gresham College, London, has the following:

And especially because it is certain (and little do you know of the ancient condition of the church if you know it not) that the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed (together with the celebration of the Lord's-day) by the Christians of the East Church, above three hundred years after our Saviour's death. (P. 77, London, 1630.) The learned Joseph Bingham, says:

"We also find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish Sabbath. It is not easy to tell either the original of this practice, or the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin churches [excepting Milan] it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek churches, as a festival; I consider it here only as a day of public divine service, on which, as the authors who mention it assure us, all the same offices were performed as were used to be on the Lord's-day. For Athanasius, who is one of the first that mentions it, says: They met on the Sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. And Timotheus, one of his successors in the See of Alexandria, says, the communion was administered on this day, as on the Lord's-day. Which were the only days in the week that the Communion was received by the Christians of his time at Alexandria. Socrates is a little more particular about the service; for he says:

In their assemblies on this day they celebrated the communion; only the churches of Egypt and Thebais differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbors at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place, speaking of the churches of Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday and Lord's-day, the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church assemblies. And Cassian takes notice of the Egyptian churches that among them the service of the Lord's-day and the Sabbath, was always the same; for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament only, one out of the Gospels; and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles; whereas, on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament, and partly out of the New. In another place he observes that in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord'sday, when they met at, three o'clock, that is, nine in the morning, to celebrate the Communion. (Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 13, chap. 9, see. 3.)

William Cave, D. D., in a work entitled Primitive Christianity, "" testifies as follows:"

Next to the Lord's-day, the Sabbath, or Saturday, for so the word Sabbatum is constantly used in the writings of the fathers when speaking of it as it relates to Christians, was held by them in great veneration, and especially in the Eastern parts, honored with all the public solemnities of religion. For which we are to know, that the Gospel in those parts mainly prevailing amongst the Jews, they being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath, as that which had been appointed by God himself (as the memorial of his rest from the work of creation) settled by their great master Moses and celebrated by their ancestors for so many ages as the solemn day of their public worship, and were therefore very loth that it should be wholly antiquated and laid aside. . . . Hence they usually had most parts of divine service performed upon that day; they met together for public prayers, for reading the Scriptures, celebration of the Sacraments, and such like duties. This is plain, not only from some passages in Ignatius, and Clemens, his Constitutions, but from writers of more unquestionable credit and authority. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria tells us that they assemble on Saturdays, not that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath; and Socrates speaking of the usual times of their public meeting, calls the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, the weekly festivals on which the congregation was wont to meet in the church for the performance of divine services. Therefore the council of Laodicea amongst other things decreed (Can.16), that upon Saturdays the gospels and other scriptures should be read. . . . Upon this day also, as well as upon Sunday, all fasts were severely prohibited (an infallible argument they counted it a festival day) one Saturday in the year only excepted, viz.: that before Easter day, which was always observed as a solemn fast; things so commonly known as to need no proof.... Thus stood the case in the Eastern church; in those in the West we find it somewhat different. Amongst them it was not observed as a religious festival, but kept as a constant fast. The reason whereof (as it is given by Pope Innocent, in an epistle to the Bishop of Eugubium, where he treats of this very case) seems most probable. If (says he) we commemorate Christ's resurrection, not only at Easter, but every Lord's-day, and fast upon Friday because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy; the apostles themselves spending those two days, (viz.) Friday and the Sabbath, in great sorrow and heaviness; and he thinks no doubt ought to be made, but that the apostles fasted upon those two days; whence the church had a tradition, that the sacraments were not to be administered on those days, and therefore concludes that every Saturday, or Sabbath, ought to be kept a fast. To the same purpose the council of Illiberis ordained that a Saturday festival was an error that ought to be reformed, and that men ought to fast on every Sabbath. But, though this seems to have been the general practice, yet it did not obtain in all places of the West alike. In Italy itself, it was otherwise at Milan, where Saturday was a festival; and it is said in the life of Saint Ambrose, who was bishop of that See, that he constantly dined as well upon Saturday as the Lord's-day, and used also upon that day to preach to the people. (P. 117-119, Oxford, 1846.)

Dr. Charles Hase says:

"The Roman church regarded Saturday as a fast day in direct opposition to those who regarded it is a Sabbath. (History of the Christian Church, p. 67, paragraph 69, New York, 1855.)

Rev. James Cragie Robertson states that:

In memory of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion the fourth and sixth days of each week were kept as fasts, by abstaining from food until the hour at which he gave up the Ghost, the ninth hour, or 3 P.M. In the manner of observing the seventh day the Eastern church differed from the Western. The Orientals, influenced by the

neighborhood of the Jews, and by the ideas of Jewish converts, regarded it as a continuation of the Mosaic Sabbath, and celebrated it almost in the same manner as the Lord's-day; while their brethren in the West - although not until after the time of Tertullian, extended to it the fast of the preceding day. (History of the Church, p. 158, London. 1854.)

Rev. Philip Schaff bears the following testimony:

"The observance of the Sabbath among the Jewish Christians gradually ceased. Yet the Eastern church to this day marks the seventh day of the week (excepting only the Easter Sabbath) by omitting fasting, and by standing in prayer; while the Latin church, in direct opposition to Judaism, made Saturday a fast day. The controversy on this point began as early as the end of the second century. Wednesday, and especially Friday, were devoted to the weekly commemoration of the sufferings and death of the Lord, and observed as days of penance, or watch days, and half fasting, (which lasted till three o'clock in the afternoon.) (History of the Christian Church, Vol. 2, p. 205. New York 1883.)

Neander recognizes the observance of the Sabbath by the church in general during the first three centuries:

In the Western churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day. This difference in customs would of course be striking where members of the Oriental church spent their Sabbath-day in the Western church."" (History of the Christian religion and church, during the first three centuries, p. 186, Rose's translation. Nearly the same language is used in his General History, Vol. 1, P. 298, Torrey's translation.)"

Gieseler bears the following testimony:

"While the Christians of Palestine, who kept the whole Jewish law, celebrated of course all the Jewish festivals, the heathen converts observed only the Sabbath, and, in remembrance of the closing scenes of our Saviour's life, the Passover though without the Jewish superstitions. Besides these, the Sunday, as the day of our Saviour's resurrection, was devoted to religious worship. (Church History, Apostolic Age to A. D. 70, sec. 29.)

In the prolegomena to the Institutes of John Cassian,"" which were written about 420 A.D., we find an incidental reference to the practice of the Monks of that time which shows the observance of the Sabbath up to the end of the first quarter of the fifth century even in the Western church. These are the words:"

"He was an aged priest who had lived for years the life of an Anchorite, only leaving his cell for the purpose of going to the church, which was five miles off, on Saturday and Sunday, and returning with a large bucket of water on his shoulders to last him for the week. (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 11, p. 187.)

Gregory the Great gives us a glimpse of the position which the Sabbath and Sunday occupied at Rome when he was Pope. He was ordained Sept. 3, 590 A.D., and held the office about fifteen years. The Epistle quoted below dates from the year 602-3 A. D. The first Epistle of Book 13 is addressed To the Roman Citizens"" as follows:"

"Gregory, servant of the servants of God, to his most beloved sons the Roman citizens. It has come to my ears that certain men of perverse spirit have sown among you some things that are wrong and opposed to the holy faith, so as to forbid any work being done on the Sabbath-day. What else can I call these but preachers of Antichrist, who, when he comes, will cause the Sabbath-day is well as the Lord's-day to be kept free from all work. For, because he pretends to die and rise again, he wishes the Lord's-day to be kept in reverence; and, because he compels the people to Judaize that he may bring back the outward rite of the law, and subject the perfidy of the Jews to himself, he wishes the Sabbath to be observed.

For this which is said by the prophet, ye shall bring in no burden through your gates on the Sabbath-day (Jer. 17:24), could be held to as long as it was lawful for the law to be observed according to the letter. But after that the grace of Almighty God, our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, the commandments of the law which were spoken figuratively cannot be kept according to the letter. For, if anyone says that this about the Sabbath is to be kept, he must needs say that carnal sacrifices are to be offered; he must say too that the

commandment about the circumcision of the body is still to be retained. But let him hear the Apostle Paul saying in opposition to him. If ye be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing. (Gal. 5: 2.)

We therefore accept spiritually, and hold spiritually this which is written about the Sabbath. For the Sabbath means rest. But we have the true Sabbath in our Redeemer Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ. And who so acknowledges the light of faith in Him, if he draws the sins of concupiscence through his eyes into his soul, he introduces burdens through the gates on the Sabbath-day. We introduce, then, no burden through the gates on the Sabbath-day if we draw no weights of sin through the bodily senses to the soul. For we read that the same our Lord and Redeemer did many works on the Sabbath-day, so that he reproveth the Jews, saying, Which of you doth not loose his ox or his ass on the Sabbath-day, and lead him away to watering. (Luke 13:15?) If, then, the very Truth in person commanded that the Sabbath should not be kept according to the letter, whoso keeps the rest of the Sabbath according to the letter of the law, whom else does he contradict but the Truth himself?

Another thing also has been brought to my knowledge; namely that it has been preached to you by perverse men that no one ought to wash on the Lords-day. And indeed if anyone craves to wash for luxury and pleasure, neither on any other day do we allow this to be done. But if it is for bodily need, neither on the Lord's-day do we forbid it. For it is written, No man ever hated his own flesh but nourisheth it and cherisheth it. (Ephe. 5: 29.) And again it is written, Make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof. (Romans 13:14.) He, then, who forbids provision for the flesh in the lusts thereof certainly allows it in the needs thereof. For, if it is sin to wash the body on the Lord's-day, neither ought the face to be washed on that day. But if this is allowed for a part of the body, why is it denied for the whole body when need requires? On the Lord's-day, however, there should be a cessation of earthly labor, and attention given in every way to prayers so that if anything is done negligently during the six days, it may be expiated by supplications on the day of the Lord's resurrection. (Epistles, Book 13, Epistle 1, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 13, p. 92.)

Thus appears an unbroken chain of evidence, showing that the Sabbath was generally observed by the Christian church for centuries after Christ. Its decline was more rapid in the Western or Romanized branch of the church, where it was made a sorrowful fast, and where no-Sabbathism was pushed to the front. The Eastern church, less corrupted by Romish influences, retained the Sabbath more nearly after the New Testament conception. Let it be borne in mind also that the writers quoted in this chapter wrote after the rupture between the Jewish and the Pagan elements in the church, which began to occur at the opening of the second century. The evidence here presented shows that even in the West the Sabbath continued to hold its place as late as the seventh century, although condemned by the Catholic church and legislated against. With such facts within the reach of every student of the Sabbath question, it is difficult to understand how men can repeat the assertion so frequently made, that the Sabbath was not observed by Christians after the resurrection of Christ. Inexcusable ignorance, or worse, is the only explanation in such a case.

Constantine And The Beginning Of Legislation.

THE fourth century opens a new era in the history of the church and of the Sabbath question. In the West, through a union of church and state, the disastrous work of civil legislation concerning religion begins. Constantine the Great is the representative man during the first quarter of the century. At the death of his father, in the year 306, he became an associate ruler in the Roman Empire, and gained full power in the year 323. He died at Constantinople A.D. 337. Constantine first began to favor Christianity as an element of social and political power. He shrewdly seized upon it as the most vigorous element in the decaying Empire. He neither appreciated nor loved the truth for its own sake. A modern historian speaks of him in these words:

He reasoned, as Eusebius reports from his own mouth, in the following manner: My father revered the Christian God, and uniformly prospered, while the emperors who worshiped the heathen gods died a miserable death; therefore, that I may enjoy a happy life and reign, I will imitate the example of my father and join myself to the cause of the Christians who Lire. growing daily, while the heathen are diminishing."" This low utilitarian consideration weighed heavily in the mind of an ambitious captain, who looked forward to the highest seat of power within the gift of his age. (Philip Schaff Church History, Vol. 3, p. 19.)"

Dr. Schaff says again:

"He was distinguished by that genuine political wisdom, which, putting itself at the head of the age, clearly saw that idolatry had outlived itself in the Roman Empire, and that Christianity alone could breathe new vigor into it, and furnish it moral support... But with the political, he united also a religious motive, not clear and deep, indeed, yet honest and strongly infused with the superstitious disposition to judge of a religion by its outward success, and to ascribe a magical virtue to signs and ceremonies. . . . Constantine adopted Christianity first as a superstition, and put it by the side of his heathen superstition, till, finally, in his conviction, the Christian vanquished the Pagan, though without itself developing into a pure and enlightened faith.

At first, Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of the Neo-Platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321, he enjoined regular consultation of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he

placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the god of the Martyrs, and the heathen goddess of Fortune, and down to the end of his life, he retained the title and the dignity of a Pontifex Maximus, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. . . . With his every victory over his Pagan rivals, Galerius, Maxentius, and Licinius, his personal leaning to Christianity, and his confidence in the magic power of the sign of the cross increased; yet he did not formally renounce heathenism, and did not receive baptism until, in 337, he was laid upon the bed of death. . . . He was far from being so pure and so venerable as Eusebius, blinded by his favor to the church, depicts him in his bombastic and almost dishonestly eulogistic biography, with the evident intention of setting him up as model for all future Christian princes. It must with all regret be conceded, that his progress, in the knowledge of Christianity was not a progress in the practice of its virtues. His love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power.

The very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age, and the policy of an absolute monarch, can not excuse. After having reached, upon the bloody path of war, the goal of his ambition, the sole possession of the Empire; yea, in the very year in which he summoned the great council of Nicaea, he ordered the execution of his conquered rival and brother-in-law, Licinius, in breach of a solemn promise of mercy. (324.) Not satisfied with this, he caused, soon afterward, from political suspicion, the death of the young Licinius, his nephew, a boy of hardly eleven years. But the worst of all is the murder of his eldest son, Crispus, in 326, who had incurred suspicion of political conspiracy, and of adulterous and incestuous purposes toward his step-mother, Fausta, but is generally regarded as innocent.....

At all events, Christianity did not produce in Constantine a thorough moral transformation. He was concerned more to advance the outward social position of the Christian religion, than to further its inward mission. He was praised and censured in turn by the Christians and Pagans, the Orthodox and the Arians, as they successively experienced his favor or dislike. . . . When, at last, on his death bed he submitted to baptism, with the remark, Now let us cast away all duplicity," he honestly admitted the conflict of two antagonistic principles which swayed his private character and public life. (Church History, Vol. 3, pp. 1318.) Uhlhorn says of him:"

At the beginning of A.D. 312, he seemed, to say the least, cool and non-committal. He had issued the edict of Galerius, and the orders concerning its execution which, as we have seen, were but little favorable to Christianity. He was no doubt even then a Monotheist; but the one God whom he worshiped was rather the sun god, the Unconquered Sun" than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But at the beginning of A.D. 313 he issued the edict of Milan, which was extraordinarily favorable to the Christians, and took the first decisive steps towards raising Christianity to the position of a dominant religion." (Conflict Between Heathenism and Christianity, p. 427.)

Knowing thus the character and antecedents of the man, the reader is better prepared to judge concerning the motives which led to the passage of his "Sunday Edict," the first act of legislation which directly affected the Sabbath question. The edict runs as follows:

Let all judges, and all city people, and all tradesmen, rest upon the venerable day of the Sun. But let those dwelling in the country freely and with full liberty attend to the culture of their fields; since it frequently happens, that no other day is so fit for the sowing of grain, or the planting of vines; hence the favorable time should not be allowed to pass, lest the provisions of heaven be lost. (Cod. Justin, III. Tit. 12, L.3.)

This was issued on the seventh of March, A.D. 321. In June of the same year it was modified so as to allow the manumission of slaves on the Sunday. The reader will notice that this edict makes no reference to the day as a Sabbath, as the Lord's-day, or as in any way connected with Christianity. Neither is it an edict addressed to Christians. Nor is the idea of any moral obligation or Christian duty found in it. It is merely the edict of a heathen emperor, addressed to all his subjects, Christian and heathen, who dwelt in cities, and were tradesmen, or officers of justice, to refrain from their business on the "venerable day" of the god whom he most adored, and to whom he loved in his pride to be compared. There are three distinct lines of argument which prove that this edict was a Pagan rather than a Christian document.

1. The language used. It speaks of the day only as the "venerable day of the Sun," a title purely heathen. It does not even hint at any connection between the day and Christianity, or the practices of Christians.

2. Similar laws concerning many other heathen festivals were common. Joseph Bingham bears the following testimony when speaking of the edict under consideration:

"This was the same respect as the old Roman laws had paid to their *feriae*, or festivals, in times of idolatry and superstition. Now, as the old Roman laws exempted the festivals of the heathen from all juridical business, and suspended all processes and pleadings, except in the fore-mentioned cases, so Constantine ordered that the same honor and respect should be paid to the Lord's-day, that it should be a day of perfect vacation from all prosecutions, and pleadings, and business of the law, except where any case of great necessity or charity required a juridical process and public transaction. (Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 20, chap. 2, sec. 2.) Bingham states here clearly the fact that such prohibitions were made by the Roman laws in favor of their festivals, but adds, incorrectly, that Constantine made the same in favor of the Lord's-day; for we have seen that it was not the Lord's-day, but the

venerable day of the Sun,"" which the edict mentions; and it is impossible to suppose that a law made by a Christian prince in favor of a Christian institution should not in any way mention that institution, or hint that the law was designed to apply to it."

Millman corroborates this idea as follows:

"The earlier laws of Constantine, though in their effect favorable to Christianity, claimed some deference, as it were, to the ancient religion, in the ambiguity of their language, and the cautious terms in which they interfered with Paganism. The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new Paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple, in the sanctity of the first day of the week. (History of Christianity, Book 3, chap. 1.)

In chapter four of the same book Millman says:

The rescript, indeed, for the religious observance of the Sunday, which enjoined the suspension of all public business and private labor, except that of agriculture, was enacted, according to the apparent terms of the decree, for the whole Roman Empire. Yet, unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, it maybe doubted whether the act would not be received by the greater part of the empire as merely adding one more festival to the fasti of the empire, as proceeding entirely from the will of the emperor, or even grounded on his authority as Supreme pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy days. In fact, as we have before observed, the day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by almost all the Pagan world, especially that part which had admitted any tendency toward the Oriental theology."

Stronger still is the testimony of an English Barrister, Edward V. Neale. These are his words:

"That the division of days into *juridici*, *et feriati*, judicial and nonjudicial did not arise out of the modes of thought peculiar to the Christian world must be known to every classical scholar. Before the age of Augustus, the number of days upon which, out of reverence to the gods to whom they were consecrated, no trials could take place at Rome, had become a resource upon which a wealthy criminal could speculate as a means of evading justice; and Suetonius enumerates among the praiseworthy acts of that emperor, the cutting off from the number, thirty days, in order that crime might not go unpunished nor business be impeded. (Feasts and Fasts, p. 6.)

After enumerating certain kinds of business which were allowed under these general laws, Mr. Neale adds, Such was the state of the laws with respect to judicial proceedings while the empire was still heathen."" Concerning the suspension of labor, we learn from the same author that:"

"The practice of abstaining from various sorts of labor upon days consecrated by religious observance, like that of suspending at such seasons judicial proceedings, was familiar to the Roman world before the introduction of Christian ideas. Virgil enumerates the rural labors, which might on festal days be carried on, without entrenching upon the prohibitions of religion and right; and the enumeration shows that many works were considered as forbidden. Thus it appears that it was permitted to clean out the channels of an old water course, but not to make a new one; to wash the herd or flock, if such washing was needful for their health, but not otherwise; to guard the crop from injury by setting snares for birds, or fencing in the grain; and to burn unproductive thorns. (Feasts and Fasts, p. 86, et. seq.)

These facts show how the heathen training and belief of Constantine gave birth to the Sunday edict. That he was a heathen is also attested by the fact that the edict of the 7th of March, 321, in favor of Sunday, was followed by another, published the next day, which was so purely heathen that no doubt can be entertained as to the character of the man who was the author of both edicts. (See Rose's Ind. of Dates, p. 380, Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, etc.) The edict of March 8th commanded that in case of public calamity, like the striking of the imperial palace or public buildings by lightning, the heathen ceremonies for propitiating the gods were to be performed, and the meaning of the calamity should be sought from the haruspices. The haruspices were soothsayers, who gave their answers from watching the movements of the entrails of slain beasts, and the smoke from burning certain portions. This was a proceeding purely heathen, and no Christian prince could have made such a law. There is an evident connection between the two edicts, as we shall see when we remember that Apollo, who was honored as the god of the sun, was the patron deity of these soothsayers. He was also the patron deity of Constantine, and the one to whom he, in his pride, loved to be compared.

Thus the Sunday edict, from its associations as well as its language, is shown to be the emanation of a heathen, and not a Christian, religion. Remember, too, that at least nine years later than this Constantine placed his new residence at Byzantium under the protection of the heathen goddess of Fortune; that he never gave up the title of high priest of the heathen religion; that he did not formally embrace Christianity, and submit to baptism until he lay upon his death bed, sixteen years later; and you cannot fail to see that whatever he did to favor Christianity, and whatever claims he made to conversion were the outgrowth of a shrewd policy rather than of a converted heart. And when the impartial historian can say, of him, The very brightest period of his reign is stained with

crimes, which even the spirit of the age and the policy of an absolute monarch cannot excuse," (Schaff) we cannot well claim him as a Christian prince."

If he made any general laws against heathenism, they were never executed; for it was not suppressed in the empire by law until A.D. 390 - seventy-nine years after his Sunday edict, and fifty-three years after his death. (See Gibbon, Vol. 3, chap. 28, *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire*.) The few abuses against which he enacted laws were those which had been condemned before by the laws of the heathen rulers who had preceded him, such as the obscene midnight orgies, etc. Millman speaks as follows on this point:

"If it be difficult to determine the extent to which Constantine proceeded in the establishment of Christianity, it is even more perplexing to estimate how far he exerted the imperial authority in the abolition of Paganism. . . . The Pagan writers, who are not scrupulous in their charges against the memory of Constantine, and dwell with bitter resentment on all his overt acts of hostility to the ancient religion, do not accuse him of these direct encroachments on Paganism. Neither Julian nor Zosimus lay this to his charge. Libanius distinctly asserts that the temples were left open and undisturbed during his reign, and that Paganism remained unchanged. Though Constantine advanced many Christians to offices of trust, and no doubt many who were ambitious of such offices conformed to the religion of the emperor, probably most of the high dignities of the state were held by the Pagans. . . . In the capitol there can be but little doubt that sacrifices were offered in the name of the senate and the people of Rome till a much later period. (Historical Commentaries, Book 4, chap. 4.)

The whole matter is tersely told by a late English writer, who, speaking of the time of the Sunday edict, says:

At a later period, carried away by the current of opinion, he declared himself a convert to the church. Christianity then, or what he was pleased to call by that name, became the law of the land, and the edict of A.D. 321, being unrevoked, was enforced as a Christian ordinance. (Sunday and the Mosaic Sabbath, p. 4.)"

The following words of the learned Niebuhr, in his lectures on Roman history, as quoted by Stanley, are to the same effect:

"Many judge of Constantine by too severe a standard, because they regard him as a Christian; but I cannot look upon him in that light. The religion which he had in his head, must have been a strange jumble indeed. He was a superstitious man, and mixed up his Christian religion with all kinds of absurd and superstitious opinions. When certain Oriental writers call him equal to the apostles, they do not know what they are saying; and to speak of him as a saint is a profanation of the word. (History of the Eastern church, p. 292.) It is a curious and little-known fact that markets were expressly appointed by Constantine to be held on Sunday. This we learn from an inscription on a slavian bath rebuilt by him, published in Gruter's *Inscriptiones-antiquae totius Orbis Romani*, CLXIV. 2. It is there recorded of the emperor that *provisione pietatis suae nundinas dies solis perpeti anno constituit*," "by a pious provision he appointed markets to be held on Sunday throughout the year." His pious object doubtless was to promote the attendance of the country people at churches in towns. "Thus," says Charles Julius Hare, "Constantine was the author of the practice of holding markets on Sunday, which, in many parts of Europe, prevailed above a thousand years after, though Charlemagne issued a special law (cap. CXL.) against it." (Philological Museum, i., 30.) In "Scotland, this practice was first forbidden on holy days by an Act of James IV., in 1503, and on Sundays in particular by one of James VI., in 1579." (Robert Cox, *Sabbath Literature*, Vol. 1, p. 359.) Before dismissing the Constantinian period, it is pertinent to notice Eusebius, the church historian. and the "dishonestly eulogistic" biographer of Constantine. He was a great partisan, and sought by all means to induce men to favor and honor his patron, the emperor. As a commentator on the Scriptures, his characteristic tendency to make unwarrantable statements is clearly seen. Prof. Moses Stuart made especial effort to reproduce the ideas of Constantine and to show that he taught the "puritan" theory of a transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. The important passages in support of this claim are from Eusebius's Commentary on the 92d Psalm. The"

Commentary abounds in unsupported statements, of which the following is the keynote:

And all things, whatsoever it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's-day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has a precedence and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath. For on that day, in making the world, God said, Let there be light; and there was light; and on the same day, the Sun of righteousness arose upon our souls. Therefore it is delivered to us that we should meet together on this day, and it is ordered that we should do those things announced in this Psalm.

This and similar passages are construed to mean that Christ gave authority for such a transfer of the Sabbath. But the reader will note that Eusebius says, "We have transferred," etc. The question is fairly summed up in the following, from Cox:

But supposing Eusebius to have meant that our Lord, by an express command, put Sunday in the place of Saturday, invested it with all the authority which the Sabbath had possessed, and laid upon his followers the duty of observing it as the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath -supposing Eusebius to say all this, of what value are his opinions to us? The Scripture is our rule, as it was also his; and if the command is recorded there, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced therefrom, surely we can profit but little from knowing that a bishop in the fourth century found or deduced it, as every intelligent Christian may on the supposition do. If, on the contrary, it is not in the Bible, or to be well and necessarily deduced from anything recorded therein, are we bound, or even at

liberty, to believe an assertion made for the first time by a writer in the fourth century - a writer, too, that was obviously under a strong temptation to recommend, in every possible way, the Sunday Sabbath of Constantine to the Christians of his time? When Eusebius declares that the Sabbath began with Moses, neither his thorough researches into the usages and antiquities of the Christian church," nor the "enlightenment and vigor of his mind." have the smallest effect in inducing Mr. Stuart, or any other Sabbatarian, to disbelieve in a universal primeval Sabbath law and its recognition by the early Gentile Christians. Are not all men equally entitled to reject his supposed interpretation of Scripture as to the transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week; and also to believe that when he finds in certain Psalms -allusions to and prophecies of the Eucharist, and the morning assemblies of Christians on the Lord's-day, he displays a purile fancy, rather than that soundness of judgment which an interpreter of Scripture stands greatly in need of? (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 364.)

The foregoing testimony relative to the Sunday under Constantine shows that it gained supremacy through his Pagan legislation, and not through Christian influence, nor by the authority of the Word of God. The adulterous union between Christianity and heathenism, thus consummated through civil legislation, brought forth the Papacy. Sunday became one of its representative features. One word describes the course of the church from the time of Constantine along the succeeding centuries until history, full of shame and sadness, hides it under the pall of the dark ages; that word is DOWNWARD. The leading features of that down-going will be given in the next chapter.

Before dismissing the question of Constantine's legislation, it is pertinent to add that the theory of civil legislation in religious matters is wholly opposed to the spirit of the Christianity of Christ and the Apostles. Christ taught very clearly: "My kingdom is not of this world." Paganism made the emperor Pontifex Maximus in matters of religion. Constantine held this title as great high priest of the Pagan State Church to the day of his death. When, therefore, he determined to adopt Christianity as a state religion, he naturally assumed, according to his Pagan theories, that he was the head of the church, and was at liberty to legislate as he would. The Sunday was sacred to his Patron Deity, the conquering and unconquered Sun. It was therefore a stroke of political sagacity, quite in keeping with Constantine's character, to issue the edict he did, Pagan in its terms and spirit, and yet applicable to all parties in his empire. This legislation was the beginning of weakness and ruin in the history of the church and its relations to the civil power.

Sunday From The Time Of Constantine

TO THE CLOSE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

IN tracing the history of Sunday subsequent to the time of Constantine, we first note the theories which were put forth by representative ecclesiastical writers; and second, the civil laws which were modified or enacted from time to time.

Athanasius, who died 373 A. D., left very little which bears upon the Sabbath question. In letter 54th, to Serapion Concerning the Death of Arius, the following passage occurs:

As we have caused him to be invited by the Emperor in opposition to your wishes, so tomorrow though it be contrary to your desire, Arius shall have communion with us in this church. It was the Sabbath when they said this. (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 4, p. 565.)

This use of the word Sabbath indicates that the Sabbath still held its place as a day of worship. In the same volume, p. 523, in Letter Six for Easter, 334 A. D., Athanasius says that the fast of 40 days began on the 25th of February and continued until the 31st of March, but that it was suspended on the Sabbaths and Sundays during that period.

CYRIL,

Bishop of Jerusalem, who died 386, A. D., has the following exhortation in his Catechetical Lectures:

But shun thou every diabolical operation, and believe not the apostate Serpent, whose transformation from a good nature was of his own free choice; who can overpersuade the willing, but can compel no one. Also give heed neither to observations of the stars nor auguries, nor omens, nor to the fabulous divinations of the Greeks. Witchcraft and enchantment, and the wicked practices of necromancy, admit not even to a hearing. From every kind of intemperance stand aloof, living thyself neither to gluttony nor licentiousness, rising superior to all covetousness and usury. Neither venture thyself at heathen assemblies for public spectacles, nor ever use amulets in sickness; shun also all the vulgarity of tavern-haunting. Fall not away either into the sect of the Samaritans, or into Judaism; for Jesus Christ henceforth hath ransomed thee. Stand aloof from all observance of Sabbaths, and from calling any indifferent meats common or unclean. But especially abhor all the assemblies of wicked heretics; and in every way make thine own soul safe, by fastings, prayers, almsgivings, and reading the oracles of God; that having lived the rest of thy life in the flesh in soberness and Godly doctrine, thou mayest enjoy the one salvation which flows from baptism; and thus enrolled in the armies of

heaven by God and the Father, mayest also be deemed worthy of the heavenly crown, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen. (Lecture 41, section 37, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 7, p. 28.)

The reader will note that Cyril associates Sabbath-keeping with the various Pagan errors into which those whom he was teaching were liable to be led. This indicates how, rapid was the growth of no-Sabbathism and how intense the opposition to Sabbath-keeping was at that time, because of the prejudice against the Jews. In the same strain he speaks again as follows:

"This Holy Spirit, who in unison with Father and Son has established the New Covenant in the Church Catholic, has set us free from the burdens of the law grievous to be borne, those I mean, concerning things common and unclean, and meats, and Sabbaths, new moons, and circumcision, and sprinkling, and sacrifices which were given for a season, and had a shadow of the good things to come, but which, when the truth had come, were rightly withdrawn. (Lecture 17, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 7, p. 131.)

CHRYSTOSTOM.

The most important testimony which marks the beginning of the fifth century is from Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, who died 402, A.D. In treating of the distinction between what he calls natural and positive laws, he says this:

How was it then when he said, ""Thou shalt not kill,"" that he did not add, ""because murder is a wicked thing."" The reason was, that conscience had taught this beforehand; and He speaks thus, as to those who know and understand the point. Wherefore when He speaks to us of another commandment, not known to us by the dictate of conscience, He not only prohibits, but adds the reason. When, for instance, He gave commandment respecting the Sabbath; ""On the seventh day thou shalt do no work. He subjoined also the reason for this cessation. What was this? ""Because on the seventh day God rested from all His works which He had begun to make."" And again, ""Because thou wert a servant in the land of Egypt."" For what purpose then I ask did He add a reason respecting the Sabbath, but did no such thing in regard to murder? Because this commandment was not one of the leading ones. It was not of those which were accurately defined of our conscience, but a kind of partial and temporary one; and for this reason it was abolished afterwards. (Homily Twelve, ""Concerning the Statutes,"" See. 9, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 9, p. 421.)"

In another place - Homily on Matthew, - after reviewing the history of the acts of Christ in healing the sick on the Sabbath, and the act of the disciples in plucking the ears of corn, he notes the arguments by which the accusing Jews were silenced, and draws the following conclusions:

Did Christ then, it will be said, repeal a thing so highly profitable? Far from it; nay. He greatly enhanced it. For it was time for them to be trained in all things by the higher rules, and it was unnecessary that His hands should be bound, who was freed from wickedness, winged for all good works; or that men should hereby learn that God made all things; or that they should so be made gentle, who are called to imitate God's own love to mankind (for He saith, Be ye merciful as your Heavenly Father"); or that they should make one day a festival, who are commanded to keep a feast all their life long; ("For let us keep the feast," it is said, "not with old leaven, neither with leaven of malice and wickedness; but with unleavened bread of sincerity and truth"); as neither need they stand by an ark and a golden altar, who have the very Lord of all for their inmate, and in all things hold communion with him; by prayer, and by oblation, and by Scriptures, and by almsgiving, and by having Him within them. Lo, now, why is any Sabbath required by Him who is always keeping the feast, whose conversation is in heaven? (Homily 39, See. 3, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 10, p. 257.)

This quotation from Chrysostom shows that his opinion was that no specific day should be observed as the Sabbath, and that those who lived upright lives in other things fulfilled the requirements formerly associated with Sabbath-keeping.

AUGUSTINE.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who died in 430 A.D., was one of the most voluminous writers and influential men of his time; his influence has also reached to this time in a degree greater than that of any other writer of that period. He taught the same doctrine of no-Sabbathism which appears in the writers previous to his time. The following are representative extracts from his writings. In his commentary on Psalm 92 he says:

"This Psalm is entitled, a Psalm to be sung on the Sabbath-day. Lo, this day is the Sabbath, which the Jews at this period observe by a kind of bodily rest, languid and luxurious. They abstain from labors, and give themselves up to trifles; and though God ordained the Sabbath, they spend it in actions which God forbids. Our rest is from evil works, theirs from good; for it is better to plow than to dance. They abstain from good, but not from trifling works. God proclaims to us a Sabbath. What sort of a Sabbath? First consider, where it is. It is in the heart, within us; for many are idle with their limbs, while they are disturbed in conscience. . . . That very joy in the tranquillity of our hope, is our Sabbath. This is the subject of praise and of song in this Psalm, how a Christian man is in the Sabbath of his own heart, that is, in the quiet, tranquillity, and serenity of his conscience undisturbed; hence he tells us here, whence

men are wont to be disturbed, and he teaches thee to keep Sabbath in thine own heart. (The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 8, p. 453.)

On Psalm 150 he says:

Firstly, the number fifteen, whereof it is a multiple; this number fifteen, I say, signifieth the agreement of the two Testaments. For in the former is observed the Sabbath, which signifieth rest; in the latter the Lord's day, which signifieth resurrection. The Sabbath is the seventh day, but the Lord's-day, coming after the seventh, must needs be the eighth, and is also to be reckoned the first. For it is called the first day of the week, and so from all is reckoned the second, third, fourth, and so on to the seventh day of the week, which is the Sabbath. But from Lord's-day to Lord's-day is eight days, wherein is declared the revelation of the New Testament, which in the Old was as it were veiled under earthly promises. (The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 8 p. 681.)"

In other places Augustine writes as follows. Speaking of the Jews, he says:

Observe the Sabbath-day is enjoined on us more than on them, because it is commanded to be spiritually observed. For the Jews observe the Sabbath in a servile manner, using it for luxuriousness and drunkenness. How much better would their women be employed in spinning wool than in dancing on that day in the balconies? God forbid, brethren, that we should call that an observance of the Sabbath. The Christian observes the Sabbath spiritually, abstaining from servile work. For what is it to abstain from servile work? From sin. And how do we prove it? Ask the Lord. "Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin." "Therefore is the spiritual observance of the Sabbath enjoined upon us." (Augustine on the Gospel of John, Tractate 3. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 7, p. 24.)

For they taking the observance of the Sabbath in a carnal sense, fancied that God had, as it were, slept after the labor of framing the world even to this day; and that therefore He had sanctified that day; from which He began to rest as from labor. Now to our fathers of old there was ordained a sacrament of the Sabbath, which we Christians observe spiritually, in abstaining from every servile work, that is from every sin (for the Lord saith, "Every one that committeth sin is the servant of sin"), and in having rest in our heart, that is, spiritual tranquillity. (On Gospel of John, Tractate 20. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 7, p. 132.)

Speaking of the complaint which the Pharisees made because Christ healed a blind man upon the Sabbath, Augustine says:

They brought to the Pharisees him who had been blind. And it was the Sabbath when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes. Then again the Pharisees also asked how he had received his sight. And he said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed and do see. Therefore said some of the Pharisees, not all, but some; for some were already anointed. What then said those who neither saw nor were anointed? "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath." He it was rather who kept it who was without sin. For this is the spiritual Sabbath, to have no sin. In fact, brethren, it is of this that God admonishes us, when he commends the Sabbath to our notice "Thou shalt do no servile work". These are God's words when commending the Sabbath, "Thou shalt do no servile work." Now ask the former lessons, what is meant by servile-work; and listen to the Lord: "Every one that committeth sin is the servant of sin." But these men, neither seeing, as I said, nor anointed, kept the Sabbath carnally, and profaned it spiritually. (On John, Tractate 44. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series, Vol. 7, p. 247.)

The foregoing are the representative references to the Sabbath in the writings of Augustine. A passage has been quoted from the treatise entitled *De Tempore*, which is sometimes ascribed to Augustine; but the evidences against the authenticity of the work are such as to preclude the conclusion that it came from the pen of Augustine. The passage is to the effect that "The holy doctors of the church decreed to transfer the glory of the Jewish rest to the Lord's-day." This sentiment corresponds to the Pharisaical churchism which prevailed during the latter part of the Middle Ages. Concerning the sermon from which this passage is taken, Doctor Pusey, as quoted by Hessey,

remarks: "It is later than the eighth century since it incorporates a passage from Alcuin." (Hessey: *Lect. on Sunday*, Note 202; and Cox: *Sab. Lit.*, Vol. 1, p. 123.) Robert Cox supports, by abundant testimony, the idea that the sermon is falsely ascribed to Augustine.

By these representative quotations, the reader will see that the Sunday had no true sabbatic character in the theories of the church at the close of the fifth century. The Pan-Sabbath theory of rest from sin did not reach the lives of the people. Indeed, it could not, for the means by which men come into those relations with God which develop the higher spiritual life were taken away from the people by no-Sabbathism. The absence of all sacred time is, in effect, separation from God. Men like Augustine seem to have apprehended the true idea of the Sabbath in some degree, but to have been blind to the fact that the Sabbath idea cannot be preserved without the Sabbath-day. Thus Sabbathless, and hence separated from God, the church continued to drift away into self-created darkness. Meanwhile commemorative days grew in numbers and importance. Many of them, like the Sunday, were transferred from Paganism, while the Pagan idea of "hero worship gave birth to many which were before unknown.

Of this sort were the *feriae stivae*, or thirty days of harvest, and the *feriae autumnales*, or thirty days of vintage.

Three days under the common name of calends of January, one day in memory of the founding of Rome, and another in memory of the founding of Constantinople, and four days in memory of the birth and inauguration of the Emperors, were exempt from judicial pleadings in the courts. All these, together, with the fifteen days of Easter, and all Sundays throughout the year, were exempted by a law of Theodosius and Valentinian, Junior, about the year 390; and afterward (560) there were added to these, by Justinian, the days of the passion of the apostles: and all public shows and games upon any of them were prohibited. Most of these were of long-standing among the Romans, and were retained after the introduction of Christianity. Consult Bingham, Antiquities, Book 20, chap. 1.

Heylyn thus sums up the testimony at this point:

For the imperial constitutions of this present age, (latter part of the fourth century,) they strike, all of them, on one and the self same string with that of Constantine before remembered, save that the Emperors, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, who were all partners in the empire, set out an edict to prohibit all public shows upon the Sunday.. .. The other edicts which concern the business now in hand, were only additions and explanations unto that of Constantine, one in relation to the matter, and the other in reference to the time. First, in relation to the matter; whereas all judges were forbidden by the law of Constantine from sitting on that day in open court, there was now added a clause touching arbitrators, that none should arbitrate any litigious cause, or take cognizance of any pecuniary business, on the Sunday, a penalty being inflicted upon them that transgressed herein. This, published by the same three Emperors, Honorius and Euodius being that year consuls, which was in anno 384, as the former was, afterward Valentinian and Valens, Emperors, were pleased to add, that they would have no Christians upon that day brought before the officers of the exchequer. In reference to the time, it was thought good by Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, all three Emperors together to make some other festivals capable of the same exemptions. For, whereas, formally, all the time of harvest and of autumn had been exempted from pleadings, and the calends of January (New Year's") also, these added thereunto the days on which the two great cities of Rome and Constantinople had been built, the seven days before Easter day, and the seven that followed, together with every Sunday in its course; yea, and the birthdays of themselves, with those in which each of them had begun his empire. So that, in this regard, the sacred day had no more privilege than the civil, but were all alike, the Emperor's-day as much respected as the Lord's. (History, Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 10.)

In this equality, concerning matters of business, the Sunday and numerous other festivals continued to stand, until more than eighty years after. In 469 A.D., the Emperor Leo made a statute prohibiting the obscene shows in the theaters, and the combats with wild beasts, upon the Sunday, more, however, because of the extreme obscenity of the shows and their interruption of the public services than of any sacredness of the day. (See Heylyn, Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 4, sec. 2; also Bingham, Book 20, chap. 5, sec. 4.) Even these prohibitions were not confined to the Sunday, for in the language of Bingham: "He not only restrained the people from celebrating their games on the Lord's-day, but on all other solemn festivals, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost, obliging both Jews and Gentiles, over all the world, to show respect to those days, by putting a distinction between days of supplication and days of pleasure, and this became the standing law of the Roman Empire."

Again Heylyn says:

"Thus do we see on what grounds the Lord's-day stands; on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings, that custom countenanced by the authority of the church of God, which tacitly approved the same, and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires. And as the day, so the rest from labor, and the restraint from business upon that, received its greatest strength from the supreme magistrate, as long as he retained that power, which to him belonged, as after from the canons and decrees of councils, and the decretals of popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them. . . . The Lord's-day had no such (divine) command that it should be sanctified, but was left plainly to God's people to pitch on this or any other for the public use. And, being taken up amongst them and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercise, yet, for three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from labor, nor from worldly business, required upon it. And when it seemed good to Christian princes, the nursing father's of God's church, to lay restraints upon their people, yet, at first, they were not general, but only thus, that certain men in certain places should lay aside their ordinary and daily works to attend God's service in the church; those whose employments were most toilsome and most repugnant to the true nature of a Sabbath, being allowed to follow and pursue their labors because most necessary to the Commonwealth. And in the following times when the princes and prelates, in their several places, endeavored to restrain them from that also, which formerly they had permitted, and interdicted almost all kinds of bodily labor upon that day, it was not brought about without much struggling and opposition of the people, more than a thousand years being passed after Christ's ascension, before the Lord's-day had attained that state in which now it standeth. (History Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 12.)

Doctor Hessey, after referring to the legislation of Constantine, adds:

About sixty years later, the transaction of business (*negotiorum intentio*) was forbidden by Theodosius the great, A.D. 386, who, in the words of canon Robertson, also abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day had been set apart from other secular uses by Constantine. Theodosius the younger, A.D. 425, in legislating on the subject, stated that the honors due to the Emperor were less important than the observance of the Lord's-day, and of certain other sacred seasons which he specifies.

Leo and Anthemius, A.D. 469, held yet stronger language. If the Emperor's birthday fell on that day, the acknowledgment of it which was accompanied by games was to be put off. It does not however appear that the Christians, now greatly increased in number, so much objected to the Emperors that all relaxation on the Lord's-day was unlawful, as that these games, being idolatrous, indecent, and cruel, and so unfit for a Christian to attend on any day, were especially unfit to engage his thoughts or attract his attention on the Lord's-day. In particular, the weaker brethren were likely to be led away by them. . . . A few notices as to legal proceeding, may conclude this portion of our subject. Constantine qualified his general prohibition of law-business on the Lord's-day, by soon afterwards permitting the acts of conferring liberty and legal rights, (manumissio, for instance, or giving freedom to the slave, and emancipation or setting the son free from the paternal power.) This law was followed, under Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 368, by one prohibiting the exacting on that day, from any Christian, the payment of any debt. . . . Theodosius the Great, (Cod. Theod. ii. 8, 2.) confirmed all this, but made his prohibition include not merely the Dies Solis qui repetito in se calculo revolvuntur, but such a number of other days as to constitute one hundred and twenty-four judicial holidays in the course of the year. (Lectures on Sunday, pp. 83, 84.)"

For a full view of the legislation referred to by Hessey, and the complete text of the laws, see my History of Sunday Legislation. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. - A. H. L.

Thus it is seen that the Sunday was by no means the most important festival of those times in a civil point of view.

1. The civil legislation in favor of Sunday down to the close of the fifth century differed but little, if at all, from the civil legislation relative to a large number of other festivals.

2. The ecclesiastical action both advisory and legislative sought to discourage "Judaism," and to introduce that false liberty which has ever been the legitimate attendant of no-Sabbathism. At best, the Sunday had little or no pre-eminence over days made sacred to saints, emperors, martyrs and cities. It did not approach the modern idea of the "Christian Sabbath." Doctor Hessey groups these facts in the following words:

But with all this, in no clearly genuine passage that I can discover in any writer of these two centuries, or in any public document ecclesiastical or civil, is the fourth commandment referred to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's-day. In no passage, too, is there anything like a reference to the Creation words, as the ground of the obligation to observe it, with the exception perhaps of that one passage in Chrysostom in which the command for the seventh day is made, *ainigmatodos* (Gk.) to shadow forth the command for the first. In no passage is there anything like the confusion between the seventh day" and "one day in seven," of which we have heard so much in England since A.D. 1595. In no passage is there any hint of the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's-day, or the planting of the Lord's-day on the ruins of the Sabbath, those fictions of modern times. If the Sabbath appears, it appears as a perfectly distinct day. And what is still more to our purpose, looking at the matter as a practical one, though law proceedings are forbidden, and labors for gain (at any rate in towns) are forbidden, and amusements unseemly for a Christian on any day are forbidden, no symptom is as yet discoverable of compulsory restrictions of, or conscientious abstinence from such recreations and necessary duties, (other than trades and professions) as are permissible on other days, so long as they do not interfere with divine worship, and the things connected with it, and appropriate to the Lord's-day. . . . In fact, we may at least say, that though to a certain extent formalized, and to a certain extent divested of its unique claims to the Christian's regard, the Lord's-day at the end of the fifth century is not transformed into anything like the Sabbath as the Jews had it. (Lectures on Sunday. pp. 85-87.)

Thus the facts of history demolish, step by step, the modern fictions of Puritanism relative to the early observance of Sunday.

Sunday In The Church Councils.

It is sometimes said that the church, through its councils, set the Sabbath aside and put the Sunday in its place.

What "the councils" were is fairly set forth in the following:

"It is not till after the middle of the second century that we find the example of Jerusalem followed, and councils called to solve questions that threatened the unity and well-being of the Christian church and community. The earliest councils historically attested are those convened in Asia Minor against the Montanists; though it is by no means unlikely that at a much earlier period the Christian Greeks gave scope, in ecclesiastical affairs, to their instinct for organization, for taking common action in regard to matters affecting the public good. Near the end of the second century again, varying views as to the celebration of Easter led to councils in Palestine, at Rome, in Pontus, Gaul, Mesopotamia, and at Ephesus. These councils were all specially called to consider particular questions. But before the middle of the third century, it seems that in Asia Minor at least the councils or synods had become a standing institution, and met yearly. About the same time we find councils in the Latin church of North Africa. Before the end of this century there were

councils meeting regularly in almost every province in Christendom, from Spain and Gaul to Arabia and Mesopotamia; and by extension and further organization, there was soon formed a system of mutually correspondent synods that gave to the church the aspect of a federative republic. (Ency. Brit., Vol. VI., p. 453, 9th ed.)

One would naturally expect to find much concerning Sunday in the records of these councils, if the day was adopted by the apostles or by the earlier church, instead of the Sabbath. We have made careful examination of their history previous to the middle of the fifth century, and give below every reference to Sunday or its observance. It will be seen that the Easter"" question is the prominent cause for the few references which are made. The period covered by these investigations includes the first two Ecumenical, or general councils, and not less than eighty local and provincial ones. They cover the time to 429 A.D. There seem to have been no rules concerning Sunday-observance. The references to it are of an incidental character rather than of a systematic consideration. The Synod of Elvira, Spain, 305 or 306 A.D., Canon 21, decrees that if one be staying in a city, and shall be absent from church on three Sundays, he shall be deprived of the communion for a little time. We have given the earliest date for this council, although there are strong reasons in favor of a later one, and the exact date is not known. (History Church Councils, Hefele, Vol. 1," p. 145. Edinburg, 1872.)

The 11th Canon of the Council of Sardica (343 - 347 A.D.) makes reference to the above action as follows:

Remember that our fathers have already directed that a layman, who is staying in a town, and does not appear at divine servile [celebrasset conventum] for three Sundays, shall be excommunicated, and if this is ordered with regard to the laity, no bishop can be allowed to absent himself for a longer time from his church, or leave the people entrusted to him, except from necessity, or for some urgent business. (Canon 11, Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 145.)

The penalty of excommunication was added to many other acts besides staying from service for three weeks. In the collection of canons attributed to the Fourth Synod of Carthage (Hefele, Vol. 2, pp. 413, 417) which collection was evidently compiled during the sixth century, we find the following decrees:

"24. Whoever leaves the church during the sermon of the priest shall be excommunicated.

88. He who neglects divine service on festivals, and goes instead to the theatre shall be excommunicated.

In the Fifth Carthaginian Synod, canon 5th (Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 423) declares:

On Sundays and feast days no plays may be performed."""

It will thus be seen that the act of "excommunication" was not ordered because Sunday stood above the other festivals in sacredness, but rather that this was a common punishment. Indeed it is attached to an almost endless catalogue of acts and omissions.

At the Council of Nice, the first Ecumenical council, 325 A.D., there was much discussion concerning the time of holding the Easter festival. In that discussion Sunday is referred to several times as the time for the specific Easter celebration. But the references throw no light upon the character of the Sunday, per se. The 20th canon of that council is as follows:

"As some kneel on the Lord's-day, and on the days of Pentecost, the holy Synod has decided that, for the observance of a general rule, all shall offer their prayers to God standing. (Hefele, Vol. 1, p. 434.)

The Synod of Laodicea - 343-381 A.D. - furnishes a decree which is quoted by many:

Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Sabbatum is always used for the Sabbath and is translated Saturday in the English edition of Hefele], but shall work on that day; but the Lord's-day they shall especially honor, and as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing they shall be shut out from Christ. (Canon 29, Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 316.)"

The 16th canon of the same council says that this restriction could have applied to only a part of the Sabbath, for it shows that it was a day of public religious service like Sunday. It is as follows: "On Saturday [Sabbath] the Gospels and other portions of the Scriptures shall be read aloud. (Ib. Id. p. 310.)

Hefele says of canon 16:

Neander remarks that this canon is open to two interpretations. It may mean that on Saturday, as on Sunday, the Holy Scriptures shall be read aloud in the church, and therefore, solemn public service shall be held; and canon 49, is in favor of this interpretation. It was also the custom in many provinces of the ancient church to observe Saturday as the feast of the creation.

Canon 49 reads as follows:

During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday [Sabbath] and Sunday.

Canon 51 says:

The natiivities of Martyrs, are not to be celebrated in Lent, but commemorations of the holy Martyrs are to be made on the Sabbaths and Lord's-days. (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 14, p. 156.)

The Council in Trullo, known also as the Quinisext Council, held in 692 A.D., gives directions concerning the liturgy in canon 52 as follows:

"On all days of the holy fast of Lent, except on the Sabbath, the Lord's-day and the holy day of the Annunciation, the Liturgy of the Presanctified is to be said. (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 14.)

The same council - canon 55, took up the longstanding difference in the practice concerning fasting between Constantinople and Rome. The Canon is as follows:

Since we understand that in the city of the Romans, in the holy fast of Lent they fast on the Saturdays, contrary to the ecclesiastical observance which is traditional, it seemed good to the holy Synod that also in the church of the Romans the canon shall immovably stand fast which says: ""If any cleric shall be found to fast on a Sunday or Saturday (except on one occasion only) be is to be deposed; and if he is a layman he shall be cut off."" Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, Vol. 14, p 391."

The next canon, 56, condemns the eating of "eggs and cheese on the Sabbaths and Lord's-days Of the holy Lent." The foregoing extracts constitute the testimony of the councils, local and general, down to the close of the seventh century. They show: (a) That little attention was paid to the Sunday question by the councils, aside from its relation to the contest relative to the time of observing Easter. (b) These extracts also show that the Sunday had no pre-eminence in point of sacredness over the Sabbath, or over other festivals. Indeed the order not to rest on the Sabbath indicates that the custom of abstaining from labor on that day still continued in force, and that cessation from labor on Sunday was not yet an established custom. These facts relative to what is said by the councils show that after the time of Constantine the civil law was the stronghold of the Sunday. Its gradual elevation into the place of the Sabbath resulted from the seeds of Paganism from which legislation began.

The Sabbath From Constantine To The Dark Ages.

WE have abundant testimony that the Sabbath survived for centuries in spite of the new-born opposition which arose with the civil legislation of Constantine and his successors. This, too, in the Western, Romanized church; saying nothing here of the dissenters, who, at a later period, withdrew from the Romanized branch, nor of the Eastern wing of the church, in which the Sabbath yet remains in a modified form. Certain writings once accepted as genuine, but now known to be spurious, have an historic value by showing what ideas and practices obtained as late as the seventh century. Prominent among these are the

CONSTITUTIONS OF THE HOLY APOSTLES.

The question of their date, authorship, etc., is stated by the Encyclopedia Britannica as follows:

"According to some authors, they are first quoted in the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople, in 394 A.D., and in those of the Synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon, in 431 and 451 A.D. Some have said that they are mentioned in the *Decretum de libris recipiendis*, issued by Pope Gelasius, (492 - 496 A.D.) while others have pointed out that the name occurs in those manuscripts only which have the decree of Hormisdas, (514-523). Perhaps the soundest decision is, that the collection is not mentioned in history until about the end of the 5th century; it is undoubted that it was in existence before the beginning of the sixth, for the Latin translation of the first fifty canons dates from the year 500 A.D. (Vol. 2, p. 170, American Reprint, 9th edition.)

Dr. Hesse speaks of the Constitutions as follows:

I have delayed until now the consideration of the remarkable document called the ""Apostolic Constitutions."" It is impossible, for many reasons to suppose that it was written by Clemens Romanus. And its whole tone, and its preceptive manner, and the state of things to which it alludes, make the notion of its being even an Ante-Nicene collection very questionable. It is probably to be relegated to the latter part of the fourth or the earlier part of the fifth century. (Lectures on Sunday, p. 76.)"

In his note, 203, Hesse quotes Lardner in favor of the date as given by him.

In Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 17, page 4, of Introductory Notice of Constitutions, we find this:

Modern critics are equally at sea in determining the date of the collections of canons given at the end of the eighth book. Most believe that some of them belong to the Apostolic Age, while others are of a comparatively late date. The safest conclusion seems to be this.

The Constitutions describe a state of things which came about gradually between the third and sixth centuries, and are of value as collateral historic evidence; as such, the references to the Sabbath question are given below. Book I., which is "Concerning the Laity," does not refer to the question. Book II. treats of "Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons." In this are the following references to the question under consideration. Chapter 36 treats of the Ten Commandments as follows:

Have before thine eyes the fear of God, and always remember the Ten Commandments of God - to love the one and only Lord God with all thy strength, to give no heed to idols, or any other beings, as being lifeless gods, or irrational beings or demons. Consider the manifold workmanship of God, which received its beginning through Christ. Thou shalt observe the Sabbath, on account of him who ceased from his work of creation, but ceased not from his work of providence: it is a rest for meditation of the law, not for idleness of the hands. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 65, 66, of Apostolic Constitutions.)

Nothing is said in this chapter about any observance of Sunday. In accepting the idea that Christians should not go to law before unbelievers, there is reference to a custom by which the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons heard and decided questions of difference between brethren. Several chapters are occupied in giving directions concerning such adjudications. The 47th chapter indicates that such courts were held on the Sabbath and on the Sunday. The instructions are as follows:

Let your judicatures be held on the second day of the week, that if any controversy arise about your sentence, having an interval till the Sabbath, you may be able to set the controversy right, and to reduce those to peace who have the contests one with another, against the Lord's-day. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, p. 75), of Apostolic Constitutions.)

Chapter 59 gives directions concerning public assemblies in the following words:

When thou instructest the people, Oh Bishop, command and exhort them to come constantly to church morning and evening every day, and by no means to forsake it on any account, but to assemble together continually. . . . Be not careless of yourselves, neither deprive your Saviour of his own members, neither divide his body nor disperse his members, neither prefer the occasions of this life to the Word of God; but assemble yourselves together every day, morning and evening, singing psalms and praying in the Lord's house, in the morning singing the sixty-second Psalm, and in the evening the hundred and fortieth, but principally on the Sabbath-day. And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's-day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent him to us, and condescended to let him suffer, and raised him from the dead. Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection, on which we pray thrice standing, in memory of him who arose in three days, in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 18, pp. 87, 88, of Apostolic Constitutions.)

Book III., "Concerning Widows;" and Book IV., "Concerning Orphans," are silent on the Sabbath question. Book V., See. 18, is "On Feast Days and Fast Days;" chapter 18 is as follows:

Do you, therefore, fast on the days of the passover, beginning from the second day of the week until the preparation, and the Sabbath, six days, making use of only bread, and salt and herbs and water for your drink; but do you abstain on these days from wine and flesh, for they are days of lamentation and not of feasting. Do ye who are able fast the day of the preparation and the Sabbath-day entirely, tasting nothing till the cock-crowing of the night but if any one is not able to join them both together, at least let him observe the Sabbath-day; for the Lord says somewhere, speaking of himself: When the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, in those days shall they fast." In these days, therefore, he was taken away from us by the Jews, falsely so named, and fastened to the cross, and was numbered among the transgressors. . . . Chap. 20. - We enjoin you to fast every fourth day of the week, and every day of the preparation, and the surplusage of your fast bestowed upon the needy; every Sabbath-day excepting one, and every Lord's-day, hold your solemn assemblies, and rejoice; for he will be guilty of sin who fasts on the Lord's-day, being the day of the resurrection, or during the time of Pentecost, or, in general, who is sad on a festival day to the Lord. For on them we ought to rejoice, and not to mourn. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 138, 143 of Apostolic Constitutions.)

Book VI., treats of "Heresies," etc., and contains nothing pertinent to the Sabbath question. Book VII., chapter 23, discusses the time for fasting in nearly the same language already quoted from Book V. It is as follows:

But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week. But do you either fast the entire five days, or on the fourth day of the week, and on the day of the preparation, because on the fourth day the condemnation went out against the Lord. Judas then promising to betray him for money; and you must fast on the day of the preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the cross under Pontius Pilate. But keep the Sabbath and the Lord's-day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honorable by nature and dignity than his own creatures. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, p. 186 of Apostolic Constitutions.) Chapter 36 gives a form of prayer in which Sabbath and Lord's-day appear as follows:

"Oh Lord Almighty, thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast appointed the Sabbath in memory thereof. because that on that day thou hast made us rest from our works, for the meditation upon thy laws. Thou hast also appointed festivals for the rejoicing of our souls, that we might come into the remembrance of that wisdom which was created by thee; how he submitted to be made of a woman on our account. He appeared in life, and demonstrated himself in his baptism; how he that appeared is both God and man. He suffered for us by thy permission, and died, and rose again by thy power; on which account we solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's-day, and rejoice on account of him who has conquered death, and has brought life and immortality to light. . . . Thou didst enjoin the observation of the Sabbath, not affording them an occasion of idleness, but an opportunity of piety for their knowledge of thy power, and the prohibition of evils, having limited them as within an holy circuit for the sake of doctrine, for rejoicing upon the seventh period. . . . On this account he permitted men every Sabbath to rest, that so no one might be willing to send one word out of his mouth in anger on the day of the Sabbath. For the Sabbath is the ceasing of the creation, the completion of the world, the inquiry after laws, and the grateful praise to God for the blessings he has bestowed upon men. All which the Lord's-day excels, and shows the Mediator himself, the Provider, the Lawgiver, the cause of the resurrection, the First-born of the whole creation, God the Word, and man, who was born of Mary alone, without a man, who lived holily, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died and rose again from the dead. So that the Lord's-day commands us to offer unto thee, O Lord, thanksgiving for all. For this is the grace afforded by thee, which on account of its greatness has obscured all other blessings. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 196, 197 of Apostolic Constitutions.)

Book VIII., chapter 33, presents a law said to have been made by the apostles, Peter and Paul, in the following words: I Peter and Paul do make the following Constitutions, Let the slaves work five days, but on the Sabbath-day and the Lord's-day let them have leisure to go to church for instruction in piety. We have said that the Sabbath is on account of the creation, and the Lord's-day of the resurrection. Let slaves rest from their work all the great week, and that which follows it - for the one in memory of the passion, and the other of the resurrection; and there is need they should be instructed who it is that suffered and rose again, and who it is permitted him to suffer, and raised him again. Let them have rest from their work on the ascension, because it was the conclusion of the dispensation by Christ. Let them rest at Pentecost because of the coming of the Holy Spirit, which was given to those that believed in Christ. Let them rest on the festival of his birth, because on it the unexpected favor was granted to men, that Jesus Christ, the Logos of God, should be born of the virgin Mary, for the salvation of the world. Let them rest on the festival of the Epiphany, because on it a manifestation took place of the divinity of Christ, for the Father bore testimony to him at the baptism, and the Paraclete, in the form of a dove, pointed out to the bystanders him to whom testimony was borne. Let them rest on the days of the Apostles; for they were appointed your teachers [to bring you] to Christ, and made you worthy of the Spirit. Let them rest on the day of the first martyr, Stephen, and of the other holy martyrs who preferred Christ to their own life."" (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 246, 247 of Apostolic Constitutions.)"

When we are told that Paul and Peter wrote or taught such things as the above, we can easily judge as to the genuineness of the "Constitutions." But the above is of worth as indicating the mass of holidays, which had grown up at the beginning of the Dark Ages. Book VIII. closes with

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS OF THE SAME APOSTLES.

There are eighty-five of these. They treat mainly of the duties of the clergy. The 64th canon says: "If any one of the clergy be found to fast on the Lord's-day, or on the Sabbath-day, excepting one only, let him be deprived; but if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended." (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 265 266, of Apostolic Constitution.) The 69th canon says:

If any bishop or presbyter, or deacon, or reader, or singer, does not fast the fast of forty days, or the fourth day of the week, and the day of the preparation, let him be deprived, except he be hindered by weakness of body. But if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended. (Ante-Nicene Lib. Vol. 17, p. 266, of Apostolic Constitutions.)

ANCIENT SYRIAN DOCUMENTS.

A group of Syrian documents attributed to the first three centuries presents several characteristics in common with the Constitutions. Neither the date nor the authors are known. One of them contains the correspondence between king Agbar and Christ, which is so manifestly spurious as to provoke rejection rather than criticism. The document which deals with the Sabbath and the Sunday is equally patent as a forgery. Its tone is of the fifth century, rather than the third. The document claims to be made up of rules laid down by the Apostles while under the influence of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit. After a brief preface concerning the matter, it opens in these words

"And by the same gift of the Spirit which was given to them on that day, they appointed Ordinances and Laws, such as were in accordance with the gospel of their preaching and with the true and faithful doctrine of their preaching:-

1. The apostles therefore appointed: Pray ye toward the East, because as the lightning which lighteneth from the east and is seen even to the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be, [which was said] that by this we might know and understand that he will appear from the east suddenly. ""
2. The apostles further appointed: On the first [day] of the week let there be service, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the oblation; because on the first day of the week our Lord rose from the place of the dead, and on the first day of the week he rose upon the world, and on the first day of the week, he ascended up to heaven, and on the first day of the week he will appear at last with the angels of heaven.
3. The apostles further appointed: On the fourth day of the week let there be service; because on that [day] our Lord made the disclosure to them about his trial and his suffering, and his crucifixion, and his death, and his resurrection; and the disciples were on account of this in sorrow.
4. The apostles further appointed: On the eve [of the Sabbath] at the ninth hour, let there be service, because that which had been spoken on the fourth day of the week about the suffering of the Saviour was brought to pass on the eve [of the Sabbath] the worlds and [all] creatures trembling, and the luminaries in the heavens being darkened.
5. The apostles further appointed: Celebrate the day of the Epiphany of our Saviour, which is the chief of the festivals of the church, on the sixth day of the latter Canun in the long number of the Greeks. (Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 20, pp. 38, 39, of the Syriac Documents.)

In this way the Document proceeds with twenty seven ordinances on all sorts of subjects. With such tendencies in the church, such a mixture of Pagan and Christian notions, with such dishonesty in forging in the name of Christ and his apostles, with the church and state united, and hence the church much corrupted, the world was ripe for the Dark Ages that were hurrying on. But these facts show that the Sabbath was still observed as a day of public service and worship down to the middle of the fifth century. In view of these facts no one can be excused for saying that the Sabbath was not observed by Christians even after the western church had become Romanized. No prominent feature of genuine apostolic practices was continued in the Apostatizing church longer than did Sabbath-observance.

Sunday During The Dark Ages.

CHURCH-APPOINTED festivals and holy days had become so numerous at the opening of the sixth century, that some new influence was demanded to give them importance, and to enforce their observance. This end was sought by claiming an analogy between the God-appointed days under the Jewish dispensation, and the church-appointed days under the gospel. It was assumed that the Roman Catholic church had power to appoint and enforce in the matter of holy days, as God had done under the Mosaic system. Sunday, in common with the other festivals, shared in these influences; and thus a more rigid observance of it began to prevail. There was no claim that the Sunday had taken the place of the Sabbath by any change or transfer of the fourth Commandment; it was only by analogy that this more rigid observance was introduced. As the darkness of the Middle Ages increased, ecclesiastical formalism grew more rigid and lifeless, and the prevailing ignorance and superstition became more galling and cruel. Dr. Hessey groups the facts together in the following words:

But a more serious change is at hand. In the centuries ranging from the sixth to the fifteenth, we find civil rulers and councils and ecclesiastical writers by degrees altering their tone. Holy days are multiplied more and more. Then, as the church has established so many that it is impossible to observe them all, and as her authority, from being exercised so often and in a manner so difficult to be complied with, begins to be thought lightly of, holy days must be distinguished, and some sanction which shall vividly reach the conscience must be found for days of special obligation. The Old Testament has been already referred to for the analogy of many of her festivals. The step from analogy to identification is not a startling or a violent one.

Thus a gradual identification of the Lord's-day with the Sabbath sets in. This naturally leads to the fourth commandment. The fourth commandment once thought of, vexatious restrictions follow, thwarting men in their necessary employments or enjoyments by an application of its terms either strictly literal or most ingeniously refined. Councils condescend to notice whether oxen may or may not be yoked on the Lord's-day, and not unfrequently contradict each other. The Second Council of Macon, A.D. 585, enjoins, "that no one should allow himself on the Lord's-day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns and the praise of God. For this is the day of perpetual rest; this is shadowed out to us by the seventh day in the law and the prophets." It then goes on to threaten punishments for profanation of the holy day, either by pleading causes or by other works. Offenders will displease God, and besides will draw upon themselves the "implacable anger of the clergy." Lawyers will lose their privilege of pleading causes. Clerks or monks will be shut out for six months from the society of their brethren; "Rusticus

aut servus gravioribus fustium ictibus verberabitur." Still, even in this Council, there is a recognition of the true origin of the Lord's-day, "Keep the Lord's-day, whereon we were born anew, and freed from all sins."

Things go on much in this way. Clothaire, King of France, issues an edict prohibiting all servile labors on the Lord's-day, assigning as a reason, "Quia lex prohibet, et sacra scriptura in omnibus contradicit." In the East, the exemption granted to agricultural labors by Constantine, which had been embodied in the code of Justinian, was repealed by the Emperor Leo Philosophus, A.D. 910, who animadverted in somewhat severe terms on the law of his great predecessor....

A few more instances, taken almost at random, may conclude this part of our subject. At the end of the eighth century, we find Alcuin asserting, that "the, observation of the former Sabbath had been transferred very fitly to the Lord's-day, by the custom and consent of Christian people." In England again, A.D. 1201, in the time of king John, Eustace, Abbot of Flay, preaches the observance of the Lord's-day with a strictness eminently Judaical, and

descending to the most ordinary occupations. He professes to confirm his doctrine by a letter, purporting to be from our Saviour, and miraculously found on the altar of St. Simeon at Golgotha. Various apocryphal judgments overtook persons transgressing in the slightest degree, the commands set forth in this document. It had said that from the ninth hour of the Sabbath (Saturday) to sunrise on Monday, no work was to be done: and it is curious to find that the instances of punishment seem to cluster about the profanation of the latter hours of Saturday. At length, the church, almost as a rule, though still asserting that the Lord's-day, and all other holy days, were of ecclesiastical institution, (not indeed in the high sense of that word, for they are not de Jure Divino, but de Jure Humano Canonico), had erected a complete Judaic superstructure upon an ecclesiastical foundation. . . . The most perfect development, however, of this Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism is displayed by Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, in the fourteenth century, in his Commentary on the twelfth chapter of Exodus.

..... If a musician, (says Tostatus), wait upon a gentleman to recreate his mind with music, and they are agreed upon certain wages, or he be only hired for a present time, he sins in case he play or sing to him on Holy Days, (including the Lord's-day), but not, if his reward be doubtful or depend only on the bounty of the parties who enjoy his music." "A cook that on the Holy Days, is hired to make a feast or to dress a dinner, commits a mortal sin; but not, if he be hired by the month or year." "Meat may be dressed upon the Lord's-day or the other Holy Days, but to wash dishes on those days, is unlawful - that must be deferred to another day." "A man that travels on Holy Days to any special shrine or saint, commits no sin, but he commits sin if he returns home on those days." "Artificers which work on these days for their own profit only, are in mortal sin, unless the work be very small, (quia modicum non facit solemnitate dissolvi), because a small thing dishonoreth not the festival." But I forbear to proceed with this catalogue of puerilities. (Hessey, Lectures on Sunday, Lect. 3, p. 87-92 seq.)

Heylyn treats very fully of that which Dr. Hessey has thus outlined. In part second of his "History of the Sabbath," we learn that the Council of Macon, under Gunthran, king of Burgundy, A.D. 588, although very strict in its prohibitions, says:

Not that the Lord exacts it of us, that we should celebrate this day in a corporeal abstinence, or rest from labor, who only looks that we do yield obedience to his holy will, by which, condemning earthly things, he may conduct us to the heavens of his infinite mercy.. . . yet notwithstanding these restraints from work and labor, the church did never so resolve it that any work was in itself unlawful on the Lord's-day, though to advance God's public service, it was thought good, that men should be restrained from some kinds of work, that so they might better attend their prayers, and follow their devotions. (Part 2, chap. 4, sec. 7.)

Speaking of the close of the sixth century, Heylyn adds:

"Yet all this while, we find not any one who did observe it as Sabbath, or which taught others so to do; not any who affirmed that any manner of work was unlawful on it, further than as it was prohibited by the Prince or Prelate; that so the people might assemble with their greater comfort: not any one who preached or published, that any pastime, sport, or recreation of an honest name, such as were lawful on the other days, were not fit for this. (Part 2, chap. 4, sec. 12.)

Concerning the forbidding of agriculture, Heylyn says:

I note it only for the close, that it was near nine hundred years from our Saviour's birth, if not quite so much, before restraint from husbandry had been first thought of in the East; and probably being thus restrained, did find no more obedience there than it had done before in the Western part. (Part 2, chap. 5, sec. 7.)"

Heylyn goes on to show that much of the rigidity concerning Sunday-observance existed only in theories and laws. In confirmation of which he cites the following:

"Nor were there reservations and exceptions only in point of business and nothing found in point of practice; but there are many passages, especially of the greatest persons and most public actions left upon record to let us know what liberty they assumed unto themselves, as well on this day as on the rest. And in such only shall I instance, and as being most exemplary, and therefore most

conducting to my present purpose. And first we read of a great battle fought on Palm Sunday, Anno 718, between Charles Martel, Grand Master of the household of the King of France, and Hilpericus the King himself; wherein the victory fell to Charles. And yet we read not there of any great necessity, nay of none at all, but that they might on both sides have deferred the battle had they conceived it any sin to fight on that day. Upon the Sunday before Lent, Anno 835, Ludovick the Emperor surnamed Pius, or the godly, together with his prelates and others, which had been present with him at the assembly held at Theonville,, went on his journey unto Metz; nor do we find that it did derogate at all from his name and piety. Upon the Sunday after Whitsuntide, Anno 844, Ludwic, son unto Lotharius the Emperor, made his solemn entrance into Rome, the Roman citizens attending him with their flags and ensigns; the pope and clergy staying his coming in St. Peter's Church, there to entertain him. Upon a Sunday, Anno 1014, Henry the Emperor, environed with twelve of the Roman Senators, came to St. Peter's Church, and there was crowned, together with his wife, by the Pope then being. On Easter day, Anno 1027, Conrade the Emperor was solemnly inaugurated by Pope John; Canutus King of England, and Rodolph King of the Burgundians, being then both present; and the next Sunday after began his journey towards Germany. . . . On Passion Sunday Anno 1148 Lewis the King of France, afterwards canonized for a saint, made his first entry into Jerusalem with all his army; and yet we read not anywhere that it was laid in bar against him, to put by his Sainthood; as possibly it might be now, were it yet to do. What should I speak of councils on this day assembled, as that of Charles, Anno 1146, for the recovery of the Holy Land; of Tours on Trinity Sunday, as we call it now, Anno 1164, against Octavian the Pseudo Pope; that of Ferraera, upon Passion Sunday, Anno 1177 against Frederick the Emperor; or that of Paris, Anno 1226, summoned by Stephen then Bishop there, on the fourth Sunday in Lent, for the condemning of certain dangerous and erroneous positions at that time on foot, I have the rather instanced in these particulars, partly because they happened about these times, when Prince and Prelate were most intent in laying more and more restraints upon their people, for the more honor of this day, and partly because, being all of them public actions, and such as moved not forward but by divers wheels, they did require a greater number of people to attend them. (Hist. of Sab., part 2, chap. 5, see. 9.)"

All these things accord with the spirit of an age in which religion was a form, and men were strict only in theory. In another place, Heylyn corroborates the statements that Sunday was referenced no more than many other holy days were, and upon the same ground, church appointment. An example or two will suffice:

Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anno 858, thus reckoneth up the festivals of especial note; viz., seven days before Easter, and seven days after Christmas, the feasts of the apostles, and the Lord's-day, and, then, he adds that on those days they neither suffer public shows nor courts of justice. Emanuel Comnenus next, Emperor of Constantinople, Anno 1174: We do ordain," saith he, "that these days following be exempt from labor;" viz., the nativity of the Virgin Mary holy-rood day (and so he reckoneth all the rest in those parts observed), together with all Sundays in the year; and that in them there be no access to the seat of judgment. Now, lest the feast of Whitsuntide might not have some respect as well as Easter, it was determined in the council held at Engelheim, Anno 948, that Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Whitsunweek, should no less solemnly be observed than the Lord's-day was. (Part 2, chap. 5, sec. 11.)

Morer, speaking of the question in the sixth century, says:

Under Clodoveus king of France, met the bishops in the first Council of Orleans (A.D. 507), where they obliged themselves and their successors, to be always at the church on the Lord's-day, Except in case of Sickness or some great Infirmary. And because they, with some other of the clergy those days, took cognizance of judicial matters, therefore by a Council at Arragon, about the year 518, in the reign of Theodoric king of the Goths, it was decreed, that No bishop or other person in holy orders should examine or pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Lord's-day." (Dialogues on the Lord's-day, pp. 263, 264.)

The third Council of Orleans was held A. D. 538; Hengstenberg, speaking of its action, says:

The third Council of Orleans says, In its twenty-ninth canon: The opinion is spreading among the people, that it is wrong to ride, or drive, or cook food, or do anything to the house or the person, on the Sunday. But since such opinions are more Jewish than Christian, that shall be lawful in the future which has been so to the present time. On the other hand, agricultural labor ought to be laid aside, in order that the people may not be prevented from attending church." (Hengstenberg On the Lord's-day, p. 58.)

This recognizes the well-known fact that the permission granted to agricultural labor by the first law of Constantine continued for many centuries. About the middle of the seventh century further action was found necessary, which is related by Morer as follows:

At Chalons a city in Burgundy, about the year 654, there was a Provincial Synod, which confirmed what had been done by the third Council of Orleans, about the observation of the Lord's-day, namely, that none should plow or reap, or do anything belonging to husbandry, on pain of the censures of the church, which was the more minded, because backed with the secular power, and by an edict menacing such as offended herein, who, if bondmen, were to be soundly beaten, but if free, had three admonitions, and then if faulty, lost the third part of their patrimony, and if still obstinate, were made slaves for the future." And in the first year of Eringius, about the time of Pope Agatho, there sat the twelfth council of Toledo, in Spain, A.D. 681; where the Jews were forbidden to keep their own festivals, but so far at least observe the Lord's-day, as to do no manner of work on it, whereby they might express their contempt of Christ or his worship." (Dialogues on the Lord's-day, p. 267.)

Sunday appears first on the statute-books of England, about the close of the seventh century. In the year 692, Ina, king of the West Saxons, ordered that,

If a servant do any work on Sunday by his master's order, he shall be free, and the master pay thirty shillings; but if he went to work on his own head, he shall be either beaten with stripes, or ransom himself with a price. A freeman, if he works on this day, shall lose his freedom, or pay sixty shillings; if he be a priest, double. (Morer, *Dialogues on the Lord's-day*, p. 283.)

About 747 A.D., Egbert, archbishop of York, to show positively what was to be done on Sunday, and what the laws designed by prohibiting ordinary work to be done on such days, made this canon:

"Let nothing else saith he be done on the Lord's-day, but to attend on God in hymns, and psalms, and spiritual songs. Whoever marries on Sunday, let him do penance for seven days. On all festivals and Sundays, let the minister preach to the people the gospel of Christ. (Morer, *Dialogues*, p. 284.)

But mere decrees of councils and emperors did not suffice. Men heard more than they heeded. Recourse was, therefore, had to the universal weapons of ignorant and bigoted men; and the argument of Divine Providence"" was brought to bear with evident effect. The same is used to-day by many who would feel greatly wronged if they were charged with ignorance and bigotry."

At a provincial council held in Paris, A.D. 829, the prelates complained that people disregarded the canons relative to Sunday and asserted that this was the reason why God had sent some very remarkable and terrible judgments upon men:

For (say they) many of us by our own knowledge, and some by hearsay know, that several countrymen, following their husbandry on this day, have been killed with lightning, others being seized with convulsions in their joints, have miserably perished - Whereby it is apparent, how high the displeasure of God was upon their neglect of this day. And at last they conclude that, in the first place, the priests and ministers, then kings and princes, and all faithful people be beseeched to use their utmost endeavors, and care that the day be restored to its honor, and for the credit of Christianity, more devoutly observed for the time to come. (Morer, *Dialogues*, etc., p. 271.)

Local councils and decrees proved insufficient, even when supported by such appeals to fear; and at length, in A.D. 853, a synod was held at Rome, under Pope Leo IV., which took the following action:

"It was ordered more exactly, than in former times, that no man should henceforth, dare to make any markets on the Lord's-day; no, not for things that were to eat, neither to do any kind of work which belonged to husbandry. Which canon, being made at Rome, confirmed at Compiègne, and afterwards incorporated, as it was, into the body of the canon law, became to be admitted, without further question, in most parts of Christendom; especially when the popes had attained their height, and brought all Christian princes to be at their devotion. For then the people, who before had most opposed it, might have justly said, Behold, two kings stood not before him, how then shall we stand? ""Out of which consternation all men presently obeyed, tradesmen of all sorts being brought to lay by their labors; and amongst those, the miller, who, though his work was easiest, and least of all required his presence. (Morer, *Dialogues*, etc., p. 272; Consult also Heylyn, *Hist. Sab.*, part 2, chap. 5, sec. 7.)"

On the establishment of the Saxon Heptarchy in England, Alfred the Great (A.D. 876) took care to protect Sunday. Morer says:

It was not the least part of his care to make a law, that among other festivals this day more especially might be solemnly kept, because it was the day whereon our Saviour Christ overcame the devil. . . . And whereas before the single punishment for sacrilege committed on any other day, was, to restore the value of the thing stolen, and withal lose one hand, he added that if any person was found guilty of this crime done on the Lord's-day, he should be doubly punished. (*Dialogues* etc., pp. 284, 285.)

Once begun, the work of excessive legislation found ready acceptance. These laws were added to, in one form or another, under Athelstan A.D. 928; and again, in 943, under the order of Otho, archbishop of Canterbury. In A.D. 967, Edgar "commanded that the festival should be kept from three o'clock in the afternoon on Saturday until the dawn of day on Monday." And under Ethelred, A.D. 1009, the demand for strict observance was renewed. In Norway the same tendency prevailed. Heylyn (*Hist. of Sab.*, part 2, chap. 5, sec. 2,) relates the story of pious king Olaus, in the year 1028, who, in absent-mindedness, having whittled a stick on Sunday, and being told that he had thereby trespassed upon the sanctity of Sunday, gathered the chips and set fire to them in his hand that he might punish himself for breaking God's commandment. The full text of all the Saxon and English legislation is found in my "*History of Sunday Legislation*."

But the crowning story of impious nonsense remains to be noticed. In the year A.D. 1200, one Eustace came from Normandy to preach in England, who also performed many miracles. He inveighed against the desecration of Sunday, but was evidently met by the reply that there was no commandment from God for its observance. Returning to the continent, he remained for a time; and in 1201

came back to England, armed with a document which was most befitting to his purposes. It is worth the room it takes as a curiosity, although it offers a sad commentary upon the honesty of the times which could produce such a forgery, and upon the credulity of the people who could accept it. The following account of the transaction is from a contemporary author:

"In the same year (1201), Eustace, Abbot of Flay, returned to England, and preaching therein the Word of the Lord from city to city, and from place to place, forbade any person to hold a market of goods on sale upon the Lord's-day. For he said that the commandment underwritten, as to the observance of the Lord'sday, had come down from heaven: THE HOLY COMMANDMENT AS TO THE LORD'S-DAY, which came from heaven to Jerusalem, and was round upon the altar of Saint Simeon, in Golgotha, where Christ was crucified for the sins of the world. The Lord sent down this epistle, which was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon; and after looking upon which three days and three nights, some men fell upon the earth, imploring the mercy of God. And after the third hour the patriarch arose, and Acharius the Archbishop, and they opened the scroll, and received the holy epistle from God; and when they had taken the same, they found this writing therein:

I am the Lord, who commanded you to observe the holy day of the Lord, and ye have not kept it; and have not repented of your sins, as I have said in my gospel, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' Whereas, I caused to be preached unto you repentance and amendment of life, you did not believe me, I have sent against you the Pagans, who have shed your blood on the earth; and yet you have not believed; and, because you did not keep the Lord's-day holy, for a few days you suffered hunger, but soon I gave you fullness, and after that you did still worse again. Once more, it is my will that no one, from the ninth hour on Saturday until sunrise on Monday, shall do any work, except that which is good. ""And if any person shall do so, he shall, with penance, make amends for the same. And if you do not pay obedience to this command, verily, I say unto you, and I swear unto you, by my seat and by my throne, and by the cherubim who watch my holy seat, that I will give you my commands by no other epistle; but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and hot water, in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men."

"This do I say unto you: for the Lord's holy day, you shall die the death, and for the other festivals of my saints which you have not kept, I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels; and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away to the tombs of the dead, and to hide yourselves for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from before your eyes, and will send darkness upon you, that, not seeing, you may slay one another, and that I may remove from you my face, and may not show mercy upon you. For I will burn the bodies and the hearts of you, and of all those who do not keep as holy the day of the Lord.

Hear ye my voice, that so ye may not perish in the land, for the holy day of the Lord. Depart from evil, and show repentance for your sins. For, if you do not do so, even as Sodom and Gomorrah, shall you perish. Now, know ye, that you are saved by the prayers of my most holy mother, Mary, and of my most holy angels, who pray for you daily. I have given unto you wheat and wine in abundance; and for the same ye have not obeyed me. For the widows and orphans cry unto you daily, and unto them you show no mercy. The Pagans show mercy, but you show none at all. The trees which bear fruit, I will cause to be dried up for your sins; the rivers and the fountains shall not give water."

I gave unto you a law in Mount Sinai, which you have not kept; I gave you a law with mine own hands, which you have not observed. For you I was born into the world, and my festive day ye know not. Being wicked men, ye have not kept the Lord's-day of my resurrection. By my right hand I swear unto you, that if do not observe the Lord's-day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send unto you the Pagan nations that they may slay you. And still do you attend to the business of others, and take no consideration of this? For this will I send against you still worse beasts, who shall devour the breasts of your women. I will curse those who, on the Lord's-day, have wrought evil. (Roger de Hoveden, Annals, Vol. 2. pp. 526-528, Bohn's Edition.)

This farce was carried out by pretended miracles, which attended disobedience to this "heavenly" mandate. These seem to cluster around the later hours of the Sabbath rather than the hours of Sunday. These are recounted as follows:

"On Saturday, a certain carpenter of Beverly, who, after the ninth hour of the day, was, contrary to the wholesome advice of his wife, making a wooden wedge, fell to the earth, being struck with paralysis. A woman also, a weaver, who, after the ninth hour on Saturday, in her anxiety to finish a part of the web, persisted in so doing, fell to the ground, struck with paralysis, and lost her voice.

At Rafferton also, a will belonging to Master Roger Arundel, a man made for himself a loaf and baked it under the ashes, after the ninth hour on Saturday, and ate thereof, and put part of it by till the morning; but when he broke it on the Lord's-day, blood started forth therefrom; and he who saw it bore witness, and his testimony is true.

At Wakefield also, one Saturday, while a miller was, after the ninth hour, attending to grinding his corn, there suddenly came forth, instead of flour, such a torrent of blood, that the vessel, placed beneath, was nearly filled with blood, and the mill wheel stood immovable, in spite of the strong rush of the water; and those who beheld it wondered thereat, saying, Spare us, oh Lord, spare thy people. ""

Also in Lincolnshire, a woman had prepared some dough, and, taking it to the oven after the ninth hour on Saturday, she placed it in the oven, which was then a very great heat; but when she took it out she found it raw, on which she again put it into the oven, which was very hot, and both on the next day and on Monday, when she supposed that she should find the loaves baked, she found raw dough. In the same country also, when a certain woman had prepared her dough, intending to carry it to the oven, her husband said to her, "It is Saturday, and it is now past the ninth hour, put it aside until Monday;" on which the woman, obeying her husband, did as he commanded; and so, having covered over the dough with a linen cloth, on coming the next day to look at the dough, to see whether it had not, in rising, through the yeast that was in it, gone over the sides of the vessel, she found there the loaves ready made by the divine will, and well baked, without any fire of the material of this world. This was a charge wrought by the right hand of him on high." (Hoveden, Vol. 2, pp. 529, 530.)

One more specimen of this blasphemous nonsense must suffice. It is from another contemporary work:

About this time, a certain woman of the county of Norfolk, despite the warnings of this man of God [i.e., Eustace], went one day to wash clothes after three o'clock on Saturday and while she was busily at work, a man of venerable appearance, unknown to her approached her, and reproachingly inquired the reason of her rashness in thus daring, after the prohibition of the man of God, to wash clothes after three o'clock; and thus by unlawful work, profane the holy Sabbath-day. He, moreover, added that unless she at once desisted from her work she would, without doubt, incur the anger of God, and the vengeance of heaven. But she, in answer to his rebuke, pleaded urgent poverty, and said that she had till then dragged on a wretched life by toil of that kind; and that if she should desist from her accustomed labor, she doubted her ability to procure the means of subsistence. After a while the man vanished suddenly from her presence, and she renewed her labor of washing the clothes, and drying them in the sun, with more energy than before. But for all this, the vengeance of God was not wanting: for, on the spot, a kind of small pig, of a black color, suddenly adhered to the woman's left breast, and could not by any effort be torn away; but, by continual sucking, drew blood, and, in a short time, almost consumed all the bodily strength of the woman. At length, being reduced to the greatest necessity, she was compelled, for a long time, to beg her bread from door to door, until in the sight of many who wondered at the vengeance of God, she terminated her wretched life by a miserable death. (Roger de Hoveden, *Chronicles, or Flowers of History*; formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris, Vol. 2, pp. 188-192. London, 1849.)

In such foolish forgeries did the Sunday Sabbathism of the Dark Ages culminate. Two or three years later, in 1203, this same "Roll from heaven" was produced at a council held in Scotland under Pope Innocent III., and King William, in order to further the sacred observance of Saints' days and Sundays in that kingdom. It is difficult to believe that such a state of things could have existed among our ancestors a few centuries ago. But the facts are so well vouched for by the contemporary historians above quoted, and by representative writers on the Sunday question at the present time, that there is no chance to doubt them. In addition to the authorities already quoted, the curious reader, who wishes to pursue the case further, will find the "Roll" and the pretended judgments referred to by the following writers: Binnus, "Councils," Vol 3, pp. 1448, 1449; Sir David Dalrymple, "Historical Memorials," pp. 7, 8, Edition 1769; Heylyn, *History of the Sabbath*; Hessey, "On Sunday"; Gilfillan, "Sunday"; Cox, "Sabbath Literature"; J.N. Andrews, "History of the Sabbath"; and other modern writers. The same "Roll," in a slightly modified form, figures in the history of the Sabbath question among the Armenians.

Many, pages more might be filled with similar decrees and laws, which found expression between the close of the fifth century and the Reformation. But the case does not demand it. We, therefore, sum up the case. From the opening of the sixth century forward there was increasing formality and much Phariseism in the matter of holy days. Their appointment and the manner of their observance was placed on no other ground than church authority, the "custom and consent" of Christian people. The Old Testament was appealed to, not as direct authority, but on analogical grounds. The reasons given for the observance of the Sunday are vague and varied. Sometimes, the Sabbath was said to foreshadow the Sunday; sometimes, circumcision was made to do a like duty. By some, the reason for its appointment was found in the fact that it was the first day of creation; by others that it was the day of the Saviour's resurrection. This last is the general reason; but some or all of the others are usually associated with it, to strengthen it. There is more or less talk, in a loose way, concerning the example of the apostles and the early church. But this argument is used with equal freedom in support of the many other holy days, and of practices which are wholly without such authority. The Sunday had no prominence over other church festivals, except that which came naturally from the fact that it occurred oftener. Its observance, in keeping with the general character of the religion of the times, consisted in an outward formalism, without pure spiritual life. Stringent restrictions were promulgated, which the people did not observe. There was no power in this pseudo-Sabbathism to elevate men, to draw them toward God, or to nourish true spiritual life. Those centuries of increasing darkness all present the same sad spectacle of a sinking church trying to lift itself, and sinking deeper at every struggle.

The Sabbath In Western Church During The Dark Ages.

PAPACY never succeeded in driving the Sabbath wholly from its dominions. As the Romanized church gradually expelled the Sabbath from the Orthodox body, those who were loyal to the law of God and the practices of the apostolic church stood firm, regardless of excommunication and persecution. Dissenters who kept the Sabbath existed under different names and forms of organization from the time of the first Pope to the Reformation. They were either the descendants of those who fled from the heathen persecutions previous to the time of Constantine, or else those who, when he began to rule the church and force false practices upon it, refused submission and sought seclusion and freedom to obey God in the wilderness in and around the Alps. In their earlier history they were known as Nazarenes, Cerinthians and Hypsistarii, and later as Vaudois, Cathari, Toulousians, Albigenses, Petrobrusians, Passagii, and Waldenses. We shall speak of them in general under this latter name. They believed the Romish church to be the "Anti-Christ" spoken of in the New Testament. Their doctrines were comparatively pure and Scriptural, and their lives were holy, in contrast with the ecclesiastical corruption which surrounded them.

The reigning church hated and followed them with its persecutions. In consequence of this unscrupulous opposition, it is difficult to learn all the facts concerning them, since only perverted accounts have come to us through the hands of their enemies. Before the age of printing, their books were few; and from time to time these were destroyed by their persecutors, so that we have only fragments from their own writers. At the beginning of the twelfth century they had grown in strength and numbers to such an extent as to call forth earnest opposition and bloody persecution from the Papal power. Their enemies have made many unreasonable and false charges concerning their doctrines and practices, but all agree that they rejected the doctrine of "Church Authority," and appealed to the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice. They condemn the usurpations, the innovations, the pomp and formality, the worldliness and immorality of the Romish hierarchy. Even their bitter enemies have not denied that which all accord to them, viz., moral excellence and holiness of life far in advance of their times and surroundings.

There are three lines of argument which show that these dissenters were Sabbath-keepers.

1. Apriori argument, founded upon the following facts. They accepted the Bible as their only standard. They were familiar with the Old Testament, and held it in great esteem. They acknowledged no custom or doctrine is binding upon Christians which was not established before the ascension of Christ. Such a people must have rejected those feasts which the church had appointed, and must have observed the Sabbath. But there is direct testimony showing their antiquity, their high moral character and piety, and their special character as Sabbath-keepers. The following from the pen of Mr. Benedict, the Baptist historian, shows that it is almost a miracle that any information concerning them has come down to this time:

"As scarcely any fragment of their history remains, all we know of them is from the accounts of their enemies, which were always uttered in a style of censure and complaint; and without which we should not have known that millions of them ever existed. It was the settled policy of Rome to obliterate every vestige of opposition to her decrees and doctrines, everything heretical, whether persons or writings, by which the faithful would be liable to be contaminated and led astray. In conformity to this their fixed determination, all books and records of their opposers were hunted up and committed to the flames. Before the art of printing was discovered in the fifteenth century, all books were made with a pen; the copies, of course, were so few that their concealment was much more difficult than it would be now, and if a few of them escaped the vigilance of the inquisitors, they would be soon worn out and gone. None of them could be admitted and preserved in the public libraries of the Catholics from the ravages of time, and the hands of barbarians with which all parts of Europe were at different times overwhelmed. (History of the Baptists, p. 50. New York, 1848.)

Dean Waddington bears testimony as follows:

Rainer Sacho, a Dominican, says of the Waldenses: ""There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: first, it is the most ancient; some say it is as old as Sylvester, others, as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated; there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Third, while other sects are profane, and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing concerning God which is not good."" (Church History, chap. 22, sec. 1.)"

This same writer, Sacho, admits that they flourished at least five hundred years before the time of Peter Waldo. Their great antiquity is also allowed by Gretzer, a Jesuit, who wrote against them. Cratitz, in his "History of the United Brethren," speaks of this class of Christians in the following words:

"These ancient Christians date their origin from the beginning of the fourth century, when one Leo, at the great revolution in Religion under Constantine the Great, opposed the innovations of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome. Nay, Rieger goes further still, taking them for the remains of the people of the valleys, who, when the Apostle Paul, as is said, made a journey over the Alps into Spain, were converted to Christ. (Latrobe's Trans., p. 16. London, 1780.) Jortin bears the following testimony:

In the seventh century, Christianity was preached in China by the Nestorians and the Valdenses who abhorred the papal usurpations, and are supposed to have settled themselves in the valleys of the Piedmont."" (Eccl. Hist., Vol. 2, sec. 38.)"

President Edwards says:

"Some of the popish writers themselves own that that people never submitted to the Church of Rome. One of the popish writers speaking of the Waldenses, says: The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest in the world. It is supposed that this people first betook themselves to this desert, secret place among the mountains to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions, which were before Constantine the Great, and thus the woman fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent. Rev. 12:6-14. And the people being settled there, their posterity continued there from age to age afterward; and being, as it were, by natural walls as well as God's grace separated from the rest of the world, never partook of the overflowing corruption. . . . Theodore Belvedere, a popish monk, says that the heresy had always been in the valleys. In the preface to the French Bible the translators say that they (the Valdenses) have always had the full enjoyment of the heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched with the same by the apostles, having preserved, in fair manuscripts the entire Bible in their native tongue from generation to generation. (History of Redemption, pp. 293, 294.)

Thus history furnishes full and explicit testimony concerning the antiquity of these un-Romanized Christians, showing that their separation began very early, and that they never submitted to the Papal power, nor accepted its false teachings. Their numbers is a matter of no less interest than their antiquity. Jones bears the following testimony:

Even in the twelfth century their numbers abounded in the neighborhood of Cologne in Flanders, the south of France, Savoy, and Milan. They were increased, says Egbert, to great multitudes throughout all countries, and although they seem not to have attracted attention in any remarkable degree previous to this period, yet, as it is obvious they could not have sprung up in a day, it is not an unfair inference that they must have long existed as a people wholly distinct from the Catholic church, though, amidst the political squabbles of the clergy, it was their good fortune to be almost entirely overlooked. Toward the middle of the twelfth century, a small society of the Puritans, as they were called by some, or Waldenses, as they are termed by others, or Paulicians as they are denominated by our old monkish historian, William of Newburg, made their appearance in England. This latter writer speaking of them says: ""They came originally from Gascoyne, where, being as numerous is the sand of the sea, they sorely infested France, Italy, Spain and England. (Hist. of the Waldenses, Vol. 1, chap. 4, sec. 3, pp. 509, 510. London, 1816.)"

Benedict says:

"In the thirteenth century, from the accounts of Catholic historians, all of whom speak of the Waldenses in terms of complaint and reproach, they had founded individual churches, or were spread out in colonies in Italy, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Poland, Lithuania, Albania, Lombardy, Milan, Romagna, Vicenza, Florence, Valeponetine, Constantinople, Philadelphia, Slavonia, Bulgaria, Diognitia, Livonia, Saramatia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Briton, and Piedmont. (Hist. of the Baptists, p. 31.)

It is not claimed that there was perfect agreement in sentiment on all points among these different sects in all the different localities. That they agreed on the fundamental point of rejecting the Romish Hierarchy, and appealing to the Bible as the only standard of faith and practice, is undeniable. The following testimonies will show what they were in these respects. Allix speaks as follows:

They can say a great part of the Old and New Testaments by heart. They despise the decretals, and the sayings and expositions of holy men, and only cleave to the text of Scripture. . . . They say that the doctrine of Christ and his apostles is sufficient to salvation, without any church statutes and ordinances. That the traditions of the church are no better than the traditions of the Pharisees; and that greater stress is laid on the observation of human traditions than on the keeping of the law of God. ""Why do you transgress the law of God by your traditions?"" They condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs which they do not read of in the gospel, as the observation of Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the reconciliation of penitents, and the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. They despise the feast of Easter and all other festivals of Christ and the Saints, because of their being multiplied to that vast number, and say that one day is as good as another, and work upon holy days where they can do it without being taken notice of.... They declare themselves to be the apostles' successors, to have apostolic authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. They hold the church of Rome to be the Whore of Babylon, and that all who obey her are damned, especially the clergy that are subject to her since the time of Pope Sylvester. . . . They hold that none of the ordinances of the church that have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed, being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, officers of the church and the like, they utterly reject."" (Ecc. Hist. of the Ancient Piedmont Church, pp. 209, 216, 217. London, 1690.)"

This is said of them in Bohemia. As late as the time of Erasmus these Bohemians continued to keep the Sabbath with great strictness, as will be seen by the following.

An old German historian, John Sleidan, speaking of a sect in Bohemia called "Picards," says:

"They admit of nothing but the Bible. They choose their own priests and bishops; deny no man marriage, perform no offices for the dead, and have but very few holy days and ceremonies. (History of the Reformation, etc., p. 53. London, 1689.)

These are the same people to whom Erasmus refers, representing them as extremely strict in observing the Sabbath. Robert Cox, (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 2, pp. 201,202) quotes from Erasmus, and comments as follows:

With reference to the origin of this sect [Seventh-day Baptists], I find a passage in Erasmus, that at the early period of the Reformation when he wrote, there were Sabbatarians in Bohemia, who not only kept the seventh day, but were said to be so scrupulous in resting on it, that if anything went into their eyes they would not remove it till the morrow. He says: Nunc audimus apud Bohemos exoriri novum Judaeorum genus Sabbatarios appellant, qui tanta superstitione servant Sabbatum, ut si quid eo die inciderit in oculum, nolint eximere; quasi non sufficiat eis pro Sabbato Dies Dominicus qui Apostolis etiam erat sacer, aut quasi Christas non satis expresserit quantum tribuendum sit Sabbati."" (De Amabili Ecclesiae Concordia, Op. tom., V, p. 506; Lugd. Bat., 1704.)"

Hospinian of Zurich, in his treatise De Festis Judaeorum et Ethnicorum, Cap. iii, (Tiguri.-1592.) replies to the arguments of these Sabbatarians. (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 2, pp. 201, 202.)

The story concerning their extreme strictness on the Sabbath is probably a mistake. But inasmuch as they accepted the Bible as their only guide, it is not wonderful that they refused to place the "Dies Dominicus before the Sabbath," since the Bible gives no authority for such a course. Doctor Hessey refers to these same Sabbatarians as the origin of the present Seventh-day Baptists. A voluminous work by Alexander Ross, speaking of those people at the beginning of the Reformation, says:

Some only will observe the Lord's-day; some only the Sabbath; some both, and some neither. (A View of All Religions in the World, etc., p. 237. London, 1653.)

In his history of the Christian church, Jones gives their "confession of faith," article tenth of which is as follows: "Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God; such as the festival days and vigils of the saints, and what is called holy water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things, but above all, the Masses. (History of the Christian Church, Vol. 2, p. 43. New York, 1824.)

On page 65 of the same volume Jones quotes various other authorities.

Claudius Seisselius, Archbishop of Turin, is pleased to say:

Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than the Christians. They never swear but by compulsion, and rarely take the name of God in vain. They fulfill their promises with punctuality, and living for the most part in poverty, they profess to preserve the apostolic life and doctrine. They also profess it to be their desire to overcome only by the simplicity of faith, by purity of conscience, and by integrity of life not by philosophical niceties, and theological subtleties. And he very candidly admits that, In their lives and morals they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves with all their might to observe the commandments of God." Lielenstenius, a Dominitian, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says: "I say that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love, but their faith is incorrigible and vile as I have shown in 'my Treatise.'" (History of the Waldenses, Vol. 2, p. 71. London, 1816.)

Again Jones says:

"Louis XII., king of France, being informed by the enemies of the Waldenses, inhabiting a part of the province of Provence, that several heinous crimes were laid to their account, sent the Master of Requests, and a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, who was confessor to his majesty, to make inquiry into this matter. On their return, they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found there no images, nor signs of ornaments belonging to the Mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish church; much less could they discover any traces of the crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary, they kept the Sabbath-day, observed the ordinance of baptism, according to the Primitive church, and instructed their children in the articles of Christian faith, and the commandments of God. (History Christian Church, chap. 5, sec. 1. New York, 1824.)

Eccolampadius, Luther, Beza, Bullinger, De Vignaux, Chassagnon, Milton and others unite in bearing testimony to their uprightness and faithful adherence to the Word of God. Their observance of the Sabbath is also further attested as follows. Jones says: Because they would not observe saints' day they were falsely supposed to neglect the Sabbath also, and called Insabbatati, or Insabbatists. (History Christian Church chap. 5, sec. 1. New York, 1824.) Benedict has the following:"

"We find that the Waldenses were sometimes called Insabbathos, that is regardless of Sabbaths. Mr. Milner supposes this name was given to them because they observed not the Romish festivals and rested from their ordinary occupations only on Sundays. A Sabbatarian would suppose that it was because they met for worship on the seventh day, and did not regard the first day Sabbath. (Hist. Baptists, Vol. 2, p. 412. Ed. 1831.)

Not only must a Sabbatarian thus conclude, but all must agree; since no fact is better established than this, viz., that the Sunday was understood to be purely a church festival, one of the very things which they rejected. Blair's History of the Waldenses gives the following:

Among the documents we have by the same peoples is an explanation of the ten commandments, dated by Boyer, 1120. It contains a compendium of Christian morality. Supreme love to God is enforced, and recourse to the influence of the planets and to sorcerers is condemned. The evil of worshipping God by images and idols is pointed out. A solemn oath to confirm anything doubtful is admitted, but profane swearing is forbidden. Observation of the Sabbath, by ceasing from worldly labors and from sin, by good works, and by promoting the edification of the soul, through prayer and hearing the word, is enjoined. Whatever is preached without Scripture proof, is accounted no better than fables. (Vol. 1, pp. 216, 220. Edinburg, 1833.)"

From a historical work of the early part of the seventeenth century, entitled "Purchase's Pilgrimages," a sort of universal history, we learn that the Waldenses, in different localities,

Keep Saturday holy, nor esteem Saturday fasts lawful. But on Easter, even, they have solemn services on Saturdays, eat flesh, and feast it bravely, like the Jews. (Vol. 2, p.1269. London, 1625.)

During the twelfth century they were known in some parts of France and Italy as Passaginians. Of these Mosheim has the following:

"Like the other sects already mentioned, they had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the church of Rome; but they were, at the same time, distinguished by two religious tenets, which were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion that the observation of the law of Moses, in everything except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon Christians, in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstain from those meats, the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic economy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. (Eccl. Hist., Vol. 3, p. 127. London, 1810.)

The charge of circumcision is made only by their enemies, the Romanists, and is not well sustained; but if it were true, they were not Jews, but, even as their enemies admit, were most blameless and worthy Christians. Concerning this charge, Benedict says:

The account of their practicing circumcision is undoubtedly a slanderous story, forced by their enemies, and probably arose in this way: Because they observed the seventh day, they were called, by way of derision, Jews, as the Sabbatarians are frequently at this day; and if they were Jews they either did, or ought to, circumcise their followers. This was probably the reasoning of their enemies. But that they actually practiced the bloody rite is altogether improbable. (Hist. Baptists, Vol. 2, pp. 412-418. Ed. 1813.)"

Another direct and important testimony is found in a "Treatise on the Sabbath," by Bishop White. Speaking of Sabbath-keeping as opposed to the practice of the church and as heretical, he says:

"It was thus condemned in the Nazarenes and in the Cerinthians, in the Ebionites and in the Hypsistarii. The ancient Synod of Laodicea made a decree against it, chap. 29; also Gregory the Great affirmed that it was Judaical. In St. Bernard's days it was condemned in the Petrobrussians. The same, likewise being revised in Luther's time, by Carlstadt, Sternberg, and by some secretaries among the Anabaptists, hath both then, and ever since, been condemned as Jewish and heretical. (P. S. London, 1635.)

The various and slanderous charges of corruption and religious excesses which certain Romish writers have made against the Waldenses are truthfully and fairly disposed of by Mr. W. S. Gully, in a work entitled *Waldenses*," etc.: ""We may, therefore, consider that all the licentious tales which have been told at the expense of Valdo and his disciples, were the inventions of aftertimes. That individuals among them may have broached some extravagant and fanatical dogmas is not improbable, but we have no contemporary evidence in proof of their having departed from the strictest rules of moral and religious purity, or of their having been guilty of any other than the unpardonable offense of disobeying a spiritual authority which had become as tyrannical in the exercise of its power as it was remiss in the discharge of the sacred trusts committed to it. ""The worst thing that can be said of them,"" said the inquisitor Reiner, whose business it was to accuse and hunt them down, ""is that they detest the Romish church."" (P. 57, Edinburg edition."

Allix reproduces the following testimony from high Roman Catholic authority:

"The Bishop of Meaux highly chargeth Beza for saying that the Waldenses time out of mind, had stiffly opposed the abuses of the Romish church, and that they held their doctrine from father to son ever since the year 120, as they had heard and received it from the elders and ancestors. He tells us that the first disciples of Waldo were content to allege for themselves, that they had separated themselves from the Romish church at the time when, under Pope Sylvester, she had accepted of temporal endowments and possessions. (History Churches of Piedmont, p. 177.)

Other testimony might be added, but the case does not demand it. It is clear that when the great apostacy began, which culminated in the establishment of the Papacy and the union of Church and State, there were those who refused to join with the apostate throng, or recognize its unscriptural doctrines; that they rejected the false dogma of church infallibility, and adhered to the Bible, Old and New Testaments, as the only divine authority and rule of Christian living. As a result of this their lives were holier and purer than those of the apostate church. Being driven from the central arena of ecclesiastical and civil strife, they increased in strength and numbers until they came to be feared by their enemies, when they were eagerly hunted, relentlessly condemned, and slaughtered without mercy. In common with the other truths of the Bible, they obeyed the law of the Fourth Commandment and kept God's Sabbath. Their history forms a strong link in the unbroken chain of Sabbath-keepers which unites the years when the Lord of the Sabbath"" walked upon the earth with these years in which he is marshaling his forces for its final vindication. Traces of these Sabbath-keepers are still found in the Alps."

The Sabbath In The Eastern Church.

HAVING followed the Sabbath and the Sunday down to the close of the Dark Ages, in the Western, Romanized church, it is well to turn attention to the Eastern Church, which is even yet an unknown field to many readers.

In the changes of the first four centuries after Christ the Eastern Church, which was really the mother church, and the home of primitive Christianity (See Stanley, Eastern Church, Lect. 1, p. 87, seq.) was left unaffected by the influences which started the strong current of empire westward by way of Rome. The Eastern world grew quiet rather than active, and passed into a gradual stagnation of thought, which its isolation from the westward currents served to perpetuate. (See Life and Times of St. Gregory, pp. 28, 49, London Edition, 1850.) No great revival of thought and theology in the Eastern church has yet taken place; Mohammedanism overwhelmed large portions of the field, perverting and preventing reform. In the 16th century the Papacy made some strong inroads, and by the fires and dungeons of the Inquisition and the blandishments of its emissaries turned many into its ranks. Protestant missions began at different points about the opening of the last century, but have not yet gone far enough to create any general awakening. For this reason little interest has been felt in the Eastern Church, and many have deemed that all of church history is involved in the Western branch, out of which our own ecclesiastical currents have come. On the contrary, a very large factor of Christian history is found in the Eastern Church, and especially so in regard to the ideas and practices of the Apostolic period. Dean Stanley notices this feature of the case as follows:

I have said that the field of Eastern Christendom is a comparatively untrodden field. It is out of sight, and therefore out of mind. But there is a wise German proverb which tells us that it is good, from time to time, to be reminded that Behind the mountains there are people to be found." Hinter dem Berge sind auch Leute. This, true of all large bodies of the human family, from whom we are separated by natural or intellectual divisions, is eminently true of the whole branch of the Christian family, that lies in the far East. Behind the mountains of our knowledge, of our civilization, of our activity, - behind the mountains, let us also say, of our ignorance, of our prejudice, of our contempt, is to be found nearly a third part of Christendom - one hundred millions of souls professing the Christian faith. Even if we enter no further into their history it is important to remember that they are there. No theory of the Christian church can be complete which does not take some account of their existence....

But the Oriental church has claims to be considered, over and above its magnitude and its obscurity. By whatever name we call it - "Eastern," "Greek," or "Orthodox" - it carries us back, more than any other existing Christian institution, to the earliest scenes and times of the Christian religion. Even though the annals of the Oriental Patriarchates, are, for the most part, as regards the personal history of their occupants, a series of unmeaning names, the recollections awakened by the seats of their power are of the most august kind. Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, are centers of local interest, which none can see or study without emotion. And the churches which have sprung up in those regions, retain the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out everywhere else." (Hist. Eastern Church, pp. 88, 89. -New York, 1862.)

There are three groups of these Eastern Christians which we shall consider in the order of their nationality.

THE ABYSSYNIAN CHURCH.

The following extract from the pen of Rey. Samuel Gobat is a befitting preface to what may be said concerning this branch of the church:

It is generally admitted that Christianity was first introduced into Abyssinia about the year of our Lord 330, at the time when Athanasius was patriarch of Alexandria in Egypt.. . . It is from this date that the Abyssinian church assumes importance in the annals of ecclesiastical history. Through all succeeding ages, from that period to the present, she has received her superior ecclesiastic, or Abuna (literally our Father,) by the appointment of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and has continued with little interruption to maintain an intimate connection with the Coptic church of Egypt. . . . During the seventh century, when the Mohammedans of Arabia, spurred

on by their religious enthusiasm, made an irruption into Egypt, and nearly crushed the church then existing in that country, the strong ties which had hitherto bound together the Eastern and Western churches were almost entirely sundered; and the Abyssinian church, suddenly becoming obscured, retired for several ages from the page of history. But ere she passed behind the cloud, she encountered a fearful struggle with the Arabians, a circumstance which evinced the reality of her vital energies. The Arabians were a crafty foe; skillful in device, and unscrupulous in means, they employed alike stratagem and force to induce her to submit to their sway, and to adopt the new religion. But, steadfast in her religious principles, the Abyssinian church remained unshaken as a rock amid the dashing billows. Covering her with his shield, God preserved her from the galling yoke of Mohammedan tyranny and permitted her to keep feebly burning the flame of Christian faith which she had received as a rich inheritance from her fathers. (Journal of three years' residence in Abyssinia, pp. 55-58. New York, 1850.)

From the seventh century to the opening of the sixteenth century, the church of Abyssinia was almost entirely shut out from the knowledge of Europe. During the seventeenth century repeated and violent attempts were made by the Jesuits, under the patronage of Portugal, to convert or subdue it. Artful intrigue and bloody war were alike unsuccessful, and the Jesuits were finally driven from the field. Touching the Sabbath as an issue in this struggle, Gobat speaks as follows:

The flame of discord might easily have been extinguished, by the death of the Viceroy and that of the Abuna, had not the Emperor, regarding his late success as a decisive victory, issued a decree forbidding the people longer to celebrate the Jewish Sabbath, which, from time immemorial, they had been accustomed to hallow with the same strictness and solemnity as the Lord's-day. (Journal, etc., p. 83.)

Against this decree made by the Emperor under the prompting of the Pope's emissaries, the people protested with voice and sword, and the war raged anew. Mr. Gobat describes it thus:

This unhappy war continued to rage with unabated fury, trembling in the balance between alternate successes and reverses till the Emperor felt the imperious necessity, in consideration of the interest of his throne, and the tranquility of his subjects, of requesting the patriarch to negotiate a treaty between the Pope and his royal highness, in which it should be stipulated, that the Abyssinian church might retain their ancient liturgy, celebrate the same festival days that they formerly observed, and enjoy the privilege of hallowing not less the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's-day, in agreement with their uniform practice previous to the introduction of the Catholic faith. (Journal, etc., p. 93.)

But this was not enough. The people "claimed nothing less than the entire re-establishment of the ancient constitution of their church, and the total expulsion of the strangers from the kingdom." The Emperor was too much under the control of the Jesuit emissaries to grant this. Another bloody battle took place between his own troops and the protesting people. Though temporarily victorious in this encounter, he finally yielded:

An imperial herald was accordingly sent through the streets of the capital, proclaiming, Hear!" "Hear!" I formerly recommended to your acceptance the Catholic faith, because I believed it to be true: but as great numbers of my subjects have sacrificed their lives in defence of the religion of our fathers, I hereby certify that the free exercise of this religion shall be hereafter guaranteed to all. Your priests are hereby authorized to resume possession of their churches, and worship without molestation the God of their ancestors.

It is impossible, adequately to describe the demonstration of joy, evinced by the gushing tears of gratitude which accompanied this public declaration. Voices, echoing the praises of the emperor, floated on every breeze; the people threw from their houses the rosaries and chaplets of the Jesuits and burnt them in bonfires: satisfaction and delight were expressed in every countenance, gladness sparkled in every eye." (Journal, etc., p. 97, 98.)

Gibbon describes this incursion of the Portuguese at length, and tells the story of the demands made by the emissaries of the Pope in the following words:

After the amusement of some unequal combats between the Jesuits and his illiterate priests, the Emperor declared himself a proselyte to the Synod of Chalcedon presuming that his clergy and people would embrace, without delay, the religion of their prince. The liberty of choice was succeeded by a law, which imposed, under pain of death, the belief of the two natures of Christ; the Abyssinians were enjoined to work and to play on the Sabbath; and Segved, in the face of Europe and Africa, renounced his connection with the Alexandrian church. (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 4, chap. 47, p. 565. Harper's edition, 1883.)

Such strength of character and tenacity of purpose have ever marked this branch of the church. Incidental remarks, scattered through the work of Mr. Gobat, show that the Abyssinian church still keeps the Sabbath. Turning to other authority the reader will learn that:

"The Abyssinians do hold the Scriptures to be the perfect rule of Christian faith; inasmuch that they deny it to be in the power of a general council to oblige the people to believe anything as articles of faith without an express warrant from them. (Church History of Ethiopia, by Michael Geddes, p. 31. London, 1696.)

Tran-substantiation and the adoration of the consecrated bread in the sacrament were what the Abyssinians abhorred. They deny purgatory, and know nothing of extreme unction; they condemn graven images; they keep both Saturday and Sunday. (Ibid, pp. 34, 35.)

This author, Geddes, gives a detailed account of their doctrines and practices, as given by one Zaga Zabo, the ambassador of the king of Ethiopia, at Lisbon, Spain, in 1534, as follows:

We are bound by the Institutions of the Apostles to observe two days, to wit; the Sabbath and the Lord's day, on which it is not lawful for us to do any work, no, not the least. On the Sabbath-day, because God, after he had finished the creation of the world, rested thereon; which day, as God would have it called the Holy of Holies, so the not celebrating thereof with great honor and devotion seems to be plainly contrary to God's will and precept, who will suffer heaven and earth to pass away sooner than his word; and that especially, since Christ came not to dissolve the law, but to fulfill it. It is not, therefore, in imitation of the Jews, but in obedience to Christ and his holy apostles, that we observe that day, the favor that was showed herein to the Jews, being transferred to us, Christians; so that, excepting Lent, we eat flesh every Saturday in the year. But in the kingdoms of Barnagaus, Tigre and Mahon, the Christians, according to ancient custom, do eat flesh on all Saturdays and Sundays, even in Lent. We do observe the Lord's-day after the manner of all other Christians in memory of Christ's resurrection."" (Church History of Ethiopia, pp. 34, 35.)"

More intelligent, Scriptural, and truly Christian views of the Sabbath could scarcely be given. Nor is there in all the account any hint of authority for the Sunday beyond tradition. The "History of the Eastern Church," by Arthur P. Stanley, informs the reader that:

The church of Abyssinia, founded in the fourth century, by the church of Alexandria, furnishes the one example of a nation, savage, yet Christian, showing us, on the one hand, the force of the Christian faith in maintaining its superiority at all against such immense disadvantages, and, on the other band, the utmost amount of superstition with which a Christian church can be overlaid without perishing altogether. One lengthened communication it has hitherto received from the West - the mission of the Jesuits. With this exception, it has been left almost entirely to itself. Whatever there is of Jewish, or of old Egyptian, ritual preserved in the Coptic church is carried to excess in the Abyssinian. The likeness of the sacred ark, called the ark of Zion, is the center of Abyssinian devotion. To it gifts and prayers are offered. On it the sanctity of the whole church depends. Circumcision is not only practiced, as in the Coptic church, but is regarded as of equal necessity with baptism. There alone the Jewish Sabbath is still observed, as well as the Christian Sunday. They (with the exception of a small sect of the Seventh-day Baptists) are the only true Sabbatarians in Christendom. (P. 96, 97. New York, 1862.)

Thus has the Abyssinian church stood firm on the fundamental truth of God's Word, and clung to his Sabbath through all the vicissitudes and cruel opposition of fifteen hundred years, as Christians too, and not as Judaizers, their own words being witnesses. It is not wonderful if they are to-day below the highest Christian standards of religious life; it is rather wonderful that they have not been wholly corrupted and overrun. When we remember the fierce attacks of Mohammedanism, the craft and cruelties of Romanism and the continued encroachments of surrounding Paganism, their present purity in doctrines and in life seems almost miraculous. Gobat testifies that, though he had "sometimes overheard conversation of a very improper and, indeed, debasing character," nevertheless he had "never witnessed so much lewdness or indecency of conduct in the capital of Abyssinia as is sometimes witnessed in those of Egypt, France or England." (Journal, etc., p. 459.)

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

Here is another example, similar to the one just presented. According to Stanley, this church was founded

A.D. 302. It was the central Christian influence in Asia, and during its early history pushed its missionary enterprises even to China. In the fifth century a translation of the Bible was made into the Armenian tongue, which is so perfect as to have been called the "queen of versions." Their general character at the present time is described by Mr. Stanley as follows:

The Armenians are by far the most powerful, and the most widely diffused, in the group of purely Oriental churches of which we are now speaking, and is such exercise a general influence over all of them. Their home is in the mountain tract that encircles Ararat. But, though distinct from all surrounding nations, they are yet scattered far and wide through the whole Levant, extending episcopate, and carrying on at the same time the chief trade of Asia. A race, a church, of merchant princes, they are in quietness, in wealth, in steadiness, the Quakers" of the East, the "Jews," if one may so call them, of the Oriental church." (Hist. Eastern Church, pp. 92, 93.)

Rev. Lyman Coleman speaks of the observance of the Sabbath among the Armenians in the following casual manner:

There are at least fourteen great feast-days in the course of the Year, on which all ordinary labor is suspended, and the day is observed more strictly than the Sabbath. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified, pp. 561,562. Philadelphia, 1852.)

J.W. Massie thus describes them:

The creed which these representatives of an ancient line of Christians cherished was not in conformity with Papal decrees, and has with difficulty been squared with the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Episcopacy. Separated from the Western world for one thousand years, they were naturally ignorant of many novelties introduced by the councils and decrees of the Lateran; and their conformity with the faith and practices of the first ages, laid them open to the unpardonable guilt of heresy and schism, as estimated by the church of Rome. We are Christians, and not idolators," was their expressive reply, when required to do homage to the image of the Virgin Mary.....

La Croze states them at fifteen hundred churches, and as many towns and villages. They refused to recognize the pope, and declared they had never heard of him; they asserted the purity and primitive truth of their faith, since they came, and their bishops had for thirteen hundred years been sent from, the place where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians. . . . Remote from the busy haunts of commerce, or the populous seats of manufacturing industry, they may be regarded as the Eastern Piedmontes, the Vallois of Hindoostan, the witnesses prophesying in sack cloth through revolving centuries, though indeed their bodies lay as dead in the streets of the city they had once peopled." (Continental India, Vol. 2, pp. 116, 117, 120.)

Yeates informs us that Saturday "amongst them is a festival day agreeable to the ancient practice of the church." (East India Church History, p. 134.)

But the following testimony from the pen of Rev. Claudius Buchanan presents the case still more clearly. He says: "Next to the Jews, the Armenians will form the most generally useful body of Christian missionaries. They are to be found in every principal city of Asia; they are the general merchants of the East, and are in a state of constant motion from Canton to Constantinople. Their general character is that of a wealthy, industrious, and enterprising people. They are settled in all the principal places of India, where they arrived many centuries before the English. Wherever they colonize, they build churches, and observe the solemnities of the Christian religion in a decorous manner.... The history of the Armenian church is very interesting. Of all the Christians in Central Asia, they have preserved themselves most free from Mohammedan and Papal corruptions. The Pope assailed them for a time with great violence, but with little effect. The churches in lesser Armenia indeed consented to a union, which did not long continue; but those in Persian Armenia maintained their independence, and they retain their ancient Scriptures, doctrines, and worship to this day. . . . The Bible was translated into the Armenian language in the fifth century, under very auspicious circumstances, the history of which has come down to us. It has been allowed, by competent judges of the language, to be a most faithful translation. La Croze calls it the "Queen of Versions." This Bible has ever remained in the possession of the Armenian people, and many illustrious instances of genuine and enlightened piety occur in their history. . . . The Armenians in Hindoostan are our own subjects. They acknowledge our Government in India, as they do that of the Sophi in Persia, and they are entitled to our regard. They have preserved the Bible in its purity, and their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship throughout our empire on the seventh day; and they have as many spires pointing to heaven among the Hindoos as we ourselves. Are such a people then entitled to no acknowledgment on our part, as fellow Christians? Are they forever to be ranked by us with Jews, Mohammedans, and Hindoos?" (Researches in Asia, pp.207209.)

The above is from a Boston edition of 1811. It will not be found in some, if any, of the later editions, from which it has been expunged, i.e., the passage relative to their observance of the Sabbath. A similar instance of corrupting the text of history is found in a late edition of Grant's History of the Nestorians, in which the word "Christian" is often thrown in before "Sabbath," thus leading the reader to suppose that Sunday is observed by the Nestorians, instead of the Sabbath.

NESTORIAN OR CHALDEAN CHRISTIANS.

Stanly states that:

The "Chaldean Christians," called by their opponents, "Nestorians," are the most remote of these old Separatists. Only the first two councils, those of Nicaea and Constantinople, have weight with them. The third - of Ephesus - already presents the stumbling block of the decree which condemned Nestorius. Living in the secluded fastnesses of Kurdistan, they represent the persecuted remnant of the ancient church of Central Asia. They trace their descent from the earliest of all Christian missions - the mission of Thaddaeus to Abgarus. . . . In their earlier days they sent forth missions on a scale exceeding those of any Western church, except the See of Rome in the sixth and sixteenth centuries, and for the time redeeming the Eastern church from the usual reproach of its negligence in propagating the gospel. Their chief assumed the splendid title of "Patriarch of Babylon," and their missionaries traversed the whole of Asia, as far eastward as China, and as far southward as Ceylon. (Hist. Eastern Church, pp. 91, 92.)

Coleman speaks of their Sabbath-keeping doctrines and practices as follows, quoting from their authorities:

These eight festivals of our Lord we observe, and we have many holy days and the Sabbath-day, on which we do not labor. And on Wednesday and Friday we eat no flesh. The Sabbath-day we reckon far-far above the others.... The worship of the Sabbath does not differ materially from that of other days, except that an extra service for preaching the gospel is now extensively introduced under the influence of the missionaries. . . . Incense is burned in the churches of the Nestorians on the Sabbath and on feast days. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 573.)

Doctor Hessey quotes from Grant's History of the Nestorians as follows:

The Sabbath, he says, is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes, which I have seen among no other Christians in the East. I have repeatedly been told by Nestorians of the plain, that their brethren in the mountains would immediately kill a man for traveling or laboring 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 this subject. While in the mountains, I made repeated inquiries concerning the observance of that remarkable statute of the Jews, which required that whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath-day be shall surely be put to death;" and I was everywhere told that this statute had formerly been literally executed. Nor does there appear to be any motive for deception, since the practice is now disapproved by all. There are said to be Nestorians now in Tiary who will not kindle a fire on the Sabbath to cook their food; but their cold winters oblige them to do it for necessary warmth." (Lectures on Sunday, pp. 309, 310.)

Such is the passage as quoted by Dr. Hessey, and referred to page 171 of the edition of "Grant's Nestorians," used by him. On pages 214, 215 of an edition of 1853, New York, the same passage occurs, except that before the second use of the word Sabbath the word "Christian" is inserted. This is such an evident inconsistency, and so out of harmony with the surroundings, that there can be no doubt that the edition quoted from by Dr. Hessey is the correct one. The sentence referring to the general desecration of "the Lord's-day on the plains" seems to have led Dr. Hessey to suppose that Grant meant to refer to Sunday in the whole paragraph. On the contrary, it seems to us that he was drawing a contrast between the loose observance of the Sunday on the plains and the strict observance of the Sabbath in the mountains, to emphasize his theory that the Nestorians were of Jewish origin, and that the purest stock clung tenaciously to the Sabbath, while those who were more Romanized yet held Sunday in light esteem. This latter fact appears throughout Dr. Grant's work.

Rev. Justin Perkins gives the following from an order of church service among the Nestorian Christians of the present day:

1. Alternate prayers for each day in two weeks.
2. Prayers for every day in the year except the Sabbath-day and festivals.
3. Prayers for the Lord's-day and festivals.

This makes a definite distinction between the Sabbath and the Lord's-day.

Mr. Perkins also reports the existence of a "Romish Legend of the Epistle on the Sabbath," -which custom demanded should be read every Sabbath, and which severely denounced Sabbath-breaking. He also states that reciting prayers constitutes a very considerable part of the daily church service of the Nestorians. The gospels are also read, particularly on the Sabbath and on festivals. (A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians, p. 15. Andover, 1843.)

Neale, writing concerning the church calendar of the Armenians, says: "The observation of Saturday is, as every one knows, a subject of bitter dispute between the Greeks and Latins the former observing it as a festival, the latter as a day of abstinence. That primitive authority is on the side of the Oriental church none I imagine, will deny.... Among both Greeks and Armenians, Saturday is viewed in the light of a second Sunday. The liturgy is then celebrated even when on other days of the week it is not; communions are more frequent, and, as we shall see, the Troparia, etc., as for a day of peculiar solemnity.

Under the head of "The Armenio-Gregorian Calendar," Neale adds:

"There is in truth no great difficulty in the Armenian fasts; at the same time there are great difficulties in the calendar arising from the Saturday commemorations, fixed as such, and the translation of festivals from a fast to a following Saturday. (History of the Holy Eastern Church, Vol. 2, pp. 731, 795.)

Another modern author testifies as follows:

It must not be forgotten that throughout the East, Saturday is looked on as a second Sunday. The Armenians keep Saturday is a day in honor of Almighty God the Creator of all things, and Sunday in commemoration of the new creation, brought about by the resurrection of our blessed Lord, Jesus Christ."" (The Armenian Church, by E.F.K. Fortescue, p. 53. London, 1872.)"

Thus it is clear that with all that modern Papal and Protestant influence has been able to do, the Armenians down to this time keep the Sabbath for the reasons given in the Fourth Commandment.

It is also evident that these branches of the church which have never been subject to the Roman Catholicism have never ceased to observe the Sabbath. It is also shown by their own words that they do this as a Christian duty, after the example of him who is "Lord of the Sabbath." These branches of the church continue to do according to the words of Athanasius, when he said: "We meet upon the Sabbath, not because we are affected with Judaism, but to worship Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath;" for they were colonized about the time he wrote those words. Thus is another link added to the chain of proof in favor of the observance of the Sabbath as a Christian institution by the early church.

CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.

Another branch of the Eastern Church called Christians of St. Thomas, Syrian Christians, Christians of Malabar, etc., presents the same picture of Sabbath-keepers.

Early in the ministry of the apostles, St. Thomas is said to have preached the gospel in the south of Arabia, and then, crossing the Arabian Sea, into the southern part of India, where large numbers were converted to the gospel. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., in his "Christian Researches in Asia," says:

The Syrian Christians inhabit the interior of Travancore and Malabar, in the south of India, and have been settled there from the early ages of Christianity. The first notices of this ancient people in recent times are to be found in the Portuguese histories. When Vasco de Gama arrived at Cochin, on the coast of Malabar, in the year 1503, he saw the sceptre of the Christian king; for the Syrian Christians had formerly regal power in Malay-ala. The name or title of their last king was Belliarie; and he dying without issue, the dominion devolved on the king of Cochin and Diamper. When the Portuguese arrived, they were agreeably surprised to find upwards of a hundred Christian churches on the coast of Malabar. But when they became acquainted with the purity and simplicity of their worship, they were offended. These churches," said the Portuguese, "belong to the pope." "Who is the pope?" said the natives, "we never heard of him." The European priests were yet more alarmed when they found that these Hindoo Christians maintained the order and discipline of a regular church under Episcopal jurisdiction; and that for 1,300 years past they had enjoyed a succession of bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. "We," said they, "are of the true faith, whatever you from the west may be; for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians."

"The doctrines of the Syrian Christians are few in number, but pure, and agree in essential points with those of the church of England, so that although the body of the church appears to be ignorant, and formal, and dead, there are individuals who are alive to righteousness, who are distinguished from the rest by their purity of life, and are some times censured for too rigid a piety....

All must confess that it was Christ's church in the midst of a heathen land. The Church of England would be happy to promote its welfare, to revive its spirit, and to use it as a means of future good in the midst of her own empire. I took occasion to observe that there were some rites and practices in the Syrian church, which our church might consider objectionable or nugatory. (pp. 85, 86. 99, 103, 104. Armstrong, Boston, 1811.)

The efforts of the emissaries of the Papal church to reduce these primitive Syrian Christians to the Romish faith were carried forward through the Inquisition. Dellon, one of the victims of that bloody tribunal, who escaped, wrote an account of its workings, and of the charges upon which men were tried, in which we find Sabbath-keeping a prominent one. Witness the following from his book. His arrest occurred in 1673:

Amongst the crimes cognizable in the Inquisition there are some which may be committed by one person alone, as blasphemy, impiety, etc., and others again which require several, as assisting at the Jewish Sabbath."

In chapter 20, on "The injustice committed in the Inquisition toward those accused of Judaism," he says:

But when the period of the Auto da Fe approaches, the Proctor waits upon him and declares, that he is charged by a great number of witnesses, of having Judaized; which means, having conformed to the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, such as not eating pork, hare, fish without scales, etc., of having attended the solemnization of the Sabbath, having eaten the Paschal Lamb, etc. He is then conjured by the bowels of the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ," (for such are the terms affected to be used in this Holy House,) voluntarily to confess his crimes, as the sole means of saving his life; and the Holy Office desires, if possible, to prevent his losing it. The innocent man persists in denying what he is urged to confess; he is, in consequence, condemned as "convicto negativo," (convicted, but confessing not,) to be delivered over to the secular power, to be punished according to law, that is to be burnt.

He, perhaps, then concludes, that he shall be discharged; but he has other things to perform, which are infinitely less easy than what he has hitherto done; for the Inquisitors, by degrees, begin to urge him in this way – "If thou hast observed the law of Moses, and assembled on the Sabbath-day as thou sayest, and thy accusers have seen thee there, as appears to have been the case; to convince us

of the sincerity of thy repentance, tell us who are thine accusers, and those who have been with thee at these assemblies.'" (Dellon's Account of the Inquisition at Goa, translated from the French-Paris, 1684. Hull, England, 1812, pp. 83,56,58.

There can be no doubt that the charge of "Judaism" as opposed to Christianity was false. The Inquisition was never noted for the justness nor the accuracy of its charges. But the fact that assembling on the Sabbath was a prominent crime in the eyes of the Inquisitors shows that these Christians, like their compeers, the Abyssinians and Armenians, kept the Sabbath as they received it from the apostles.

The Reformers

REFORMS center around one representative idea. Great reforms usually begin by reaction at the point where great evils become too dangerous and dominant. Each stage of the reformation must come in its own order. Error grows tyrannical with age. It imposes bitter experiences before men rise up in determined rebellion. The Lutheran movement began when the burden of "church authority" became intolerable. Fainting humanity longed to come to God for rest and salvation, without the intervention of church and priest and pope. The system of indulgences was the lowest point in the Papal apostasy. Here Luther made the attack. Thus salvation through faith, without the intervention of the church or the sanction of its authority, became the central idea in the first stage of the reformatory movement. Under such circumstances, outside issues were almost forgotten, and the battle raged around the question of man's right to read God's Word and to believe in Christ without ecclesiastical intervention.

Aside from these general principles of reform there were special reasons why the Sabbath question did not find a prominent place in the earliest stage of the Reformation. The theory which had been held so long, that the Sabbath was Jewish only, was accepted by the Continental Reformers. Keeping this fact in view, the reader will not wonder at what follows. Doctor Hessey, speaking of Luther's Larger Catechism, says:

The comment which it offers on the fourth commandment begins by explaining the word Sabbath, with reference to its Hebrew meaning to be a Feiertag, dies feriandi seu vacandi a labore."

It then goes on to speak thus:

"This precept, so far as its outward and carnal meaning is concerned does not apply to us Christians. The Sabbath is an outward thing, like the other ordinances of the Old Testament which were bound to certain modes and persons and times and places, but are now all of them, made free by Christ. But still, in order that we may gather for simple people some Christian meaning from this precept, understand what God requires of us therein, in the following manner. We celebrate festivals, not for the sake of intelligent and instructed Christians (for these have no need of them), but first even for the sake of the body. Nature herself teaches the lesson that the working classes, servants and maids, are to be considered; they have spent the whole week in laborious employment, and require a day on which they may take breath from their work and refresh themselves and restore their exhausted frames by repose. The second reason, and indeed the chief one, is this; that on such a day of rest (an dem solchem Ruhetage -die Sabbati), leisure and time may be obtained for divine worship (a duty for which, otherwise, no opportunity could be found); so that we may come together to hear and handle the Word of God, and further that we may glorify God with hymns and psalms, with songs and prayers.

It is, however, to be observed, that with us, this is not so tied to certain times, in the way it was with the Jews, as that this or that day in particular should be ordered or enjoined for it. No day is better or more excellent than another. These duties ought to be performed every day. But the majority of mankind are so cumbered with business that they could not be present at such assemblies. Some one day, therefore at least, must be selected in each week, for attention to these matters. And seeing that those who preceded us (majores nostri) chose the Lord's-day (Sonntag - dies dominica) for them, this harmless and admitted custom must not be readily changed; our objects in retaining it are, the securing of unanimity and consent of arrangement, and the avoidance of the general confusion which would result from individual and unnecessary innovation. (Sunday, Lecture 6, pp. 167, 168.)

The following, from other sources, shows Luther's position yet more clearly:

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. (Michelet's Life of Luther, Hazlitt's Translation, p. 271. London, 1884.) Again Luther says:"

The gospel regardeth neither Sabbath nor holidays, because they endured but for a time, and were ordained for the sake of preaching, to the end that God's Word might be tended and taught. (Luther's Table Talk, Bell's Translation, chap. 31, p. 357 London, 1652.)

And again:

"Keep the Sabbath holy, for its use both of 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 do anything that shall remove this encroachment on the Christian spirit of liberty. (Quoted in *Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century*. p. 20. London, 1846.)

And again:

According to Luther the Mosaic law was imposed on the Jews alone, and even upon them ceased to be obligatory at the coming of Christ. The ten commandments, says he: "'do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt. If he says no, then say: How then does Moses concern me, since he speaks to the people that have been brought out of Egypt? In the New Testament Moses comes to an end, and his laws lose their force. He must bow in the presence of Christ. We must stop the mouths of the factious spirits who say: Thus says Moses. Then do you reply: Moses does not concern us. If I accept Moses in one commandment, I must accept the whole Moses. In that case I should be obliged to be circumcised, and to wash my clothes in a Jewish manner, and to eat and drink and dress, and do everything of this kind, in the manner in which the Jews are commanded to do them in the law."

Therefore we will not obey Moses, or accept him. Moses died and his government terminated when Christ came. (Luther on the Ten Commandments, quoted by Hengstenberg, *On the Lord's-day*, p. 62.)

Again Luther says:

"The words of the Scripture prove clearly to us that the ten commandments do not affect us; for God has not brought us out of Egypt, but only the Jews. We are willing to take Moses as a teacher, but not as our lawgiver, except when he agrees with the New Testament and with the law of nature. . . . No single point in Moses binds us. . . . Leave Moses and his people alone. I listen to the word which concerns me. We have the gospel. (Instructions to Christians. How to make use of Moses, quoted by Hengstenberg, p. 61. This treatise may be found in the Latin of Luther's Works 111, 68, Jena, 1603. See also *Cox Sabbath Literature*, Vol. 1, pp. 383, 384.)

The Augsburg Confession,"" which was drawn up by Melancthon, and is still recognized as the standard of faith in the Lutheran church, is equally plain in its unqualified no-Sabbathism. It speaks as follows:"

"Concerning ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, we teach that those may be kept and performed which can be attended to without sin, and which promote peace and good order in the church, such is certainly holy days, festivals, etc. Concerning matters of this kind, however, caution should be observed, lest the consciences of men be burdened, as though such observances were necessary to salvation. (Unaltered Augsburg Confession, Art. 15. New York, 1850.)

The twenty-eighth article, treating of the power of the church, takes up the Sabbath question directly and says, speaking of the traditions of the Romish church:

Likewise the authors of traditions act contrary to the command of God, when they place sin in meats, days and such like things; and burden the church with the bondage of the law; as if there ought to be among Christians, for the meriting of righteousness, a worship of God like unto that of which we read in Leviticus, in ordering whereof God committed, as they say, to the apostles and bishops. And the pontiffs appear to be deceived by the example of Moses's law; hence those burdens, that certain meats defile and pollute the conscience, and that it is deadly sin to do any manner of work on the holy days and on Sunday, or to leave unsaid the *Horae Septa*; that fastings deserve remission of sins, and that they are necessary to the righteousness of the New Testament; that sin, in a case reserved, cannot be forgiven without the authority of the reserver, where, indeed, the canons themselves speak only of the reservation of the canonical penalty, and not of the reservation of sin. From whence, and of whom, have the bishops the power and authority to impose these traditions upon the church, to wound consciences? For St. Peter forbids the yoke to be laid upon the disciples' necks. And St. Paul to the Corinthians says, that the power was given them to improve, and not to destroy. Why then do they multiply sins by such precepts? We have clear texts of Divine Writ, forbidding the institution of such precepts, thinking thereby to merit grace, or as if the same were necessary to salvation. . . . For it is necessary that the doctrine of Christian liberty be kept still in the churches, which is, that the bondage of the law is not necessary to justification, as it is written, "'Be not again entangled in the yoke of bondage.'" The pre-eminence of the gospel must still be retained, which declares that we obtain remission of sins and justification freely by faith in Christ. and not for certain observations or rites devised by men."

What shall we think, then, of the Lord's-day, and church ordinances and ceremonies? To this our learned men respond, that it is lawful for bishops or pastors to make ordinances that things be done orderly in the church; not that we should purchase by them remission of sins, or that we can satisfy for sins, or that consciences are bound to judge them necessary, or to think that they sin who, without offending others, break them. So Paul ordains, that in the congregation women should cover their heads, and that interpreters and teachers be heard in order in the church. It is convenient that the churches should keep such ordinances for the sake of charity and tranquility, that so one should not offend another, that all things may be done in the churches in order, and without tumult; but yet, so

that the conscience be not charged, as to think that they are necessary to salvation, or to judge that they sin who, without hurting others, break them; as that no one should say that a woman sins who goeth abroad bareheaded, offending none.

Even such is the observation of the Lord's-day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and the like holy days and rites. For they that judge that, by the authority of the church, the observing of Sunday instead of the Sabbath-day, was ordained as a thing necessary, do greatly err. The Scripture permits and grants, that the keeping of the Sabbath-day is now free; for it teaches that the ceremonies of Moses's law, since the revelation of the gospel, are not necessary. And yet, because it was needful to ordain a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the church did appoint Sunday, which day, as it appears, pleased them rather than the Sabbath-day, even for this cause, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the keeping and observance of either Saturday, or of any other day is not necessary.

There are wonderful disputations concerning the changing of the law - the ceremonies of the new law - the changing of the Sabbath-day, which all have sprung from a false persuasion and belief of men, who thought that there must needs be in the church an honoring of God, like the Levitical law, and that Christ committed to the apostles and bishops authority to invent and find out ceremonies necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the church when the righteousness of faith was not clearly taught. Some dispute that the keeping of the Sunday is not fully, but only in a certain manner, the ordinance of God, They prescribe of holy days, how far it is lawful to work. Such manner of disputations, whatever else they be, are but snares of consciences." (Unaltered Augsburg Confession, pp. 172-175. New York, 1850.)

Under such theories, but one practical result could come, viz., the loss of all regard for any day as sacred. The fruitage of these theories is fully seen in the Continental Sunday in Germany and elsewhere in Europe at the present time.

Sunday In The Swiss Reformation.

ZWINGLE was the leader of the Reformation in Switzerland. John Calvin came to his assistance, and became the leading spirit in the work, in Switzerland and in France. Calvin's exacting nature led him to demand greater uniformity in practice than was sought in Germany. But his theories concerning Sunday were the same as those promulgated by Luther, as will be seen below. Theophilus Brabourne, an English author who wrote a century after Zwingli, quotes him in the following words:

"The Sabbath, in so far forth as it is ceremonial, is abolished; and, therefore, now we are not tied or bound to any certain times. (On the Sabbath, p. 277. London, 1630.)

Heylyn corroborates the above as follows:

Zwinglius avoweth it to be lawful, on the Lord's-day, after the end of the divine service, for any man to follow and pursue his labors, as commonly we do, saith he, in time of harvest. (Hist. of the Sab., Part 2, chap. 6, sec. 9.)"

Dr. Hessey quotes Zwingli as follows:

"Now hear, my Palentinus, how the Sabbath is rendered ceremonial. If we would have the Lord's-day so bound to time that it shall be wickedness, in aliud tempus transferre, to transfer it to another time, in which resting from our labors equally as in that, we may hear the Word of God, if necessity haply shall so require, this day so solicitously observed, would obtrude on us a ceremony, for we are no way bound to time, but time ought so to serve us, that it is lawful, and permitted to each church, when necessity urges, (as is usual to be done, especially in harvest time), to transfer the solemnity and rest of the Lord's-day or Sabbath to some other day; or on the Lord's-day itself, after finishing of the holy things, to follow their labors, though not without great necessity. Libel ad Valentin, Gentil. (Sunday, p. 352, Note 387.)

Zwingle's notes on Col. 2: 16, say:

The spirit of the law is its very marrow - to love God supremely, and our neighbor also. To bear God's Word, to meditate on his bounties, to give thanks for the same, and to assemble for public worship - all this belongs to the spirit of the law which likewise regards the love of our neighbor, in requiring that our servants and workmen be permitted to rest from their toil. For although we are not bound to a certain time, we are bound to set forth the glory of God to bear his Word, to celebrate his praise, and to exercise charity toward our neighbors. (Work's, Vol. 4, p. 515.)"

JOHN CALVIN.

The prominence of Calvin in the work of the Reformation, and the extent of his influence in the Reformed churches down to the present time, lend interest to his opinions on all questions. His views relative to the Sabbath question are fully expressed in his

Institutes of the Christian Religion, from which we give somewhat copious extracts. Writing of the Fourth Commandment and of the Sabbath, he says:

"The end of this precept is, that, being dead to our own affections and works, we should meditate on the kingdom of God, and be exercised in that meditation in the observance of his institutions. But, as it has an aspect peculiar and distinct from the others, it requires a little different kind of exposition. The fathers frequently call it a shadowy commandment, because it contains the external observance of the day, which was abolished with the rest of the figures at the advent of Christ. And there is much truth in their observation; but it reaches only half of the subject. Wherefore it is necessary to seek further for an exposition, and to consider three causes, on which I think I have observed this commandment to rest. For it was the design of the heavenly Lawgiver, under the rest of the seventh day, to give the people of Israel a figure of the spiritual rest, by which the faithful ought to refrain from their own works, in order to leave God to work within them. His design was, secondly, that there should be a stated day, on which they might assemble together to hear the law and perform the ceremonies, or at least which they might especially devote to meditations on his works; that by this recollection they might be led to the exercises of piety. Thirdly, he thought it right that servants, and persons living under the jurisdiction of others, should be indulged with a day of rest, that they might enjoy some remission from their labor.

This perpetual cessation was represented to the Jews by the observance of one day in seven, which the Lord, in order that it might be the more religiously kept, recommended by his own example. For it is no small stimulus to any action, for a man to know that he is imitating his Creator. If any one inquire after a hidden signification in the septenary number, it is probable, that because in Scripture it is the number of perfection, it is here selected to denote perpetual duration. This is confirmed also by the circumstance, that Moses, with that day in which he narrates that the Lord rested from his works, concludes his description of the succession of days and nights. We may also adduce another probable conjecture respecting this number that the Lord intended to signify that the Sabbath would never be completed until the arrival of the last day. For in it we begin that blessed rest, in which we make new advances from day to day. But because we are still engaged in a perpetual warfare with the flesh, it will not be consummated before the completion of that prediction of Isaiah, It shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord;" that is, when God shall be "all in all." The Lord may be considered, therefore, as having delineated to his people, in the seventh day, the future perfection of his Sabbath in the last day, that, by a continual meditation on the Sabbath during their whole life, they might be aspiring towards this perfection."

As the two latter causes, however, ought not to be numbered among the ancient shadows, but are equally suitable to all ages - though the Sabbath is abrogated, yet it is still customary among us to assemble on stated days for hearing the Word, for breaking the mystic bread, and for public prayers; and also to allow servants and laborers a remission from their labor. That in commanding the Sabbath, the Lord had regard to both these things, cannot be doubted. The first is abundantly confirmed even by the practice of the Jews. The second is proved by Moses, in Deuteronomy, in these words: "That thy man-servant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt." Also in Exodus: "That thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed." Who can deny that both these things are proper for us as for the Jews? Assemblies of the church are enjoined in the Divine Word, and the necessity of them is sufficiently known even from the experience of life. Unless there be stated days appointed for them, how can they be held?

According to the direction of the Apostle, "all things are to be done decently and in order" among us. But so far is it from being possible to preserve order and decorum without this regulation, that, if it were abolished, the church would be in imminent danger of immediate convulsion and ruin. But if we feel the same necessity, to relieve which the Lord enjoined the Sabbath upon the Jews, let no one plead that it does not belong to us. For our most provident and indulgent Father has been no less attentive to provide for our necessity than for that of the Jews. But why, it may be asked, do we not rather assemble on every day, that so all distinction of days may be removed? I sincerely wish that this were practiced; and truly spiritual wisdom would be well worthy of some portion of time being daily allotted to it; but if the infirmity of many persons will not admit of daily assemblies, and charity does not permit us to require more of them, why should we not obey the rule which we have imposed upon us by the will of God? I am obliged to be rather more diffuse on this point because, in the present age, some unquiet spirits have been raising noisy contentions respecting the Lord's-day. They complain that Christians are tinctured with Judaism, because they retain any observance of days. But I reply, that the Lord's-day is not observed by us upon the principles of Judaism; because in this respect the difference between us and the Jews is very great. For we celebrate it not with scrupulous rigor, as a ceremony which we conceive to be a figure of some spiritual mystery, but only use it as a remedy necessary to the preservation of order in the church.

However, the ancients have, not without sufficient reason substituted what we call the Lord's-day in the room of the Sabbath. For since the resurrection of the Lord is the end and consummation of that true rest, which was adumbrated by the ancient Sabbath, the same day which put an end to the shadows admonishes Christians not to adhere to a shadowy ceremony. Yet I do not lay so much stress on the septenary number, that I would oblige the church to an invariable adherence to it; nor will I condemn those churches, which have other solemn days for their assemblies, provided they keep at a distance from superstition. And this will be the case, if they be only designed for the observance of discipline and well regulated order. Let us sum up the whole in the following manner: As the truth was delivered to the Jews under a figure, so it is given to us without any shadows; first, in order that during our whole life we should meditate on a perpetual rest from our works, that the Lord may operate within us by his Spirit; secondly, that every man, whenever he

has leisure, should diligently exercise himself in private in pious reflections on the works of God, and also that we should at the same time observe the legitimate order of the church, appointed for the hearing of the Word, for the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayer thirdly, that we should not unkindly oppress those who are subject to us. Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who in past ages have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part of this commandment, which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day, has been abrogated, but that the moral part of it, that is, the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day; for on this principle, the same mysterious signification would still be attributed to particular days, which they formerly obtained among the Jews. . . . But the principal thing to be remembered is the general doctrine, that lest religion decay or languish among us, sacred assemblies ought diligently to be held, and that we ought to use those external means which are adapted to support the worship of God. (Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. 1, Book 2, chap. 8, pp. 354-359.)

In his commentary on Galatians, Calvin gives full expression to the idea that no particular day is to be regarded as sacred. He says:

"Of what nature, then, was the observation which Paul reproves. It was that which would bind the conscience by religious considerations, as if it were necessary to the worship of God, and which, as he expresses it in the Epistle to the Romans, would make a distinction between one day and another. (Rom. 14:5.) When certain days are represented as holy in themselves, when one day is distinguished from another on religious grounds, when holy days are reckoned a part of divine worship, then days are improperly observed. The Jewish Sabbath, new moons and other festivals were earnestly pressed by the false apostles, because they had been appointed by the law. When we, in the present age, make a distinction of days, we do not represent them as necessary, and thus lay a snare for the conscience. We do not reckon one day to be more holy than another; we do not make days to be the same thing with religion and the worship of God, but merely attend to the preservation of order and harmony. The observance of days among us is a free service and devoid of all superstition. (Calvin's Com. on Gal. 4:10, Pringle's Trans.) In Calvin's sermons on the Book of Deuteronomy, sermon 34, we have the following:

Yea, and we have to mark also, that it is not enough for us to think upon God and his works upon the Lord's-day every man by himself; but that we must meet together upon some certain day to make open confession of our faith. Indeed this ought to be done every day, as I have said afore. But yet in respect of men's rawness, and by reason of their slothfulness, it is necessary to have one special day dedicated wholly thereunto. It is true that we be not bound to the seventh day, neither do we (indeed) keep the same day that was appointed to the Jews, for that was Saturday. But to the intent to show the liberty of Christians, the day was changed because Jesus Christ in his resurrection did set us free from the bondage of the law, and canceled the obligation thereof. That was the cause why the day was shifted. But yet we must observe the same order of having some day in the week, be it one or be it two, for that is left to the free choice of Christians. (Sermons, pp. 204, 205 of Golding's Trans.)"

Again he says:

But some one will say, We still keep up some observance of days. I answer that we do not by any means observe days as though there were any sacredness in holy days, and as though it were not lawful to labor upon them, but respect is paid to order and Government, not to days." (Com. on Col. 2:16.)

Hopkins bears the following testimony: "Calvin took low ground upon this subject, speaking of the Sabbath as "abrogated," to be used by Christians only as a remedy necessary for the preservation of order in the church, for hearing the Word, for breaking the mystic bread, for public prayers, and to let servants and laborers rest. The

pernicious influence of his views still infects the Continental church. . . . It was the custom with the Protestant churches on the Continent - thanks in part to Calvin -for the people, after divine service, to refresh themselves with bowling, walking abroad, and other innocent recreations." (Hist. of the Puritans. Vol. 3. p. 586. Boston, 1859.)

But lest some one should charge us with not fully representing Calvin, we add his comments upon those specific portions of the New Testament which are claimed in support of the "Puritan" theory of a "change of day," and of Sunday as sacred on New Testament authority. In commenting on the time of Christ's resurrection, and the harmony of the evangelists on that point, he says nothing of the "change of day," or the commemorating of the day because of the resurrection. In his comments on John 20, he makes no claim that "after eight days" was the next Sunday. On Acts 2:1, in treating of Pentecost, he makes no claim that it fell on the first day of the week. On Acts 20:7, the meeting at Troas, he speaks with definiteness, but in a way which shows that he found in it no support for Sunday-observance. He says:

"Either he doth mean the first day of the week, which was next after the Sabbath, or else some certain Sabbath. Which latter thing may seem to me more probable, for this cause, that the day was more fit for an assembly, according to custom.

For to what end is there mention of the Sabbath, save only that he may note the opportunity and choice of time? Also it is a likely matter that Paul waited for the Sabbath, that the day before his departure he might the more easily gather all the disciples into one

place. Therefore, I think thus, that they had appointed a solemn day for the celebrating of the holy supper of the Lord among themselves, which might be commodus for them all. (Commentaries, Latin Edition of 1667. Acts 20:7.)

On 1 Cor. 16:2, Calvin is still more plainly committed against the idea that Sunday had any recognition in the New Testament. The following are his words:

On one of the Sabbaths. The end is this that they might have their alms ready in time. He therefore exhorts them not to wait until he came, as anything that is done suddenly, and in a bustle, is not well done, but to contribute on the Sabbath what might seem good, and according as every one's ability might enable - that is on the day on which they held their sacred assemblies."

For he has an eye, first of all, to convenience; and farther, that the sacred assembly, in which the communion of saints is celebrated, might be an additional spur to them. Nor am I inclined to admit the view taken by Chrysostom, that the term Sabbath is employed here to mean Lord's-day, for the probability is, that the apostles, at the beginning, retained the day that was already in use, but that afterwards, constrained by the superstition of the Jews, they set aside that day and substituted another. Now the Lord's-day was made choice of chiefly because our Lord's resurrection put an end to the shadows of the law. Hence the day itself puts us in mind of our Christian liberty." (Commentaries, 1 Cor. 16.)

The foregoing comments show that the idea of a sacred Sunday was no part of Calvin's personal creed, however much the Puritan notions became associated with the Calvinistic theology at a later day. The Puritan Sunday traveled northward from England, and not southward from Scotland. Dr. Hessey gives credence to the tradition that Calvin carried out his ideas of liberty in his personal practices. He says:

At Geneva a tradition exists, that when John Knox visited Calvin on a Sunday, he found his austere coadjutor bowling on a green. At this day, and in that place, a Calvinist preacher, after his Sunday sermons, will take his seat at the card table. (Bampton Lectures, p. 366, note 449. As authority for this tradition, and the accompanying statement, Hessey gives Disraeli - Charles the First, Vol. 2, p.16; also Strypes Life of Bp. Aylmer, c. xi.) Such were the views of the great lights in the Continental Reformation, Luther and Calvin. The lesser lights followed in the same paths. Bullinger and Beza, upon whom Calvin's mantle fell, were true to the teachings of their predecessor. In his commentary upon Rev. 1:10, Bullinger asserts that "Christian churches entertained the Lord's-day, not upon any commandment from God, but upon their free choice." In his sermons he discusses the question at length. In that discussion he says:

Now, as there ought to be an appointed place, so likewise there must be a prescribed time, for the outward exercise of religion, and so consequently, an holy rest. They of the primitive church, therefore, did change the Sabbath-day, lest, peradventure they should have seemed to have imitated the Jews, and still to have retained their order and ceremonies; and made their assemblies and holy restings to be on the first day of sabbaths, which John calleth Sunday or the Lord's-day, because of the Lord's glorious resurrection upon that day. And although we do not in any part of the Apostles' writings find any mention made that this Sunday was commanded us to be kept holy; yet, for because, in this fourth precept of the first table we are commanded to have a care of religion and the exercising of outward godliness, it would be against all godliness and Christian charity, if we should deny to sanctify the Sunday, especially, since the outward worship of God cannot consist without an appointed time and space of holy rest. I suppose also, that we ought to think the same of those few feasts and holy days, which we keep holy to Christ our Lord, in memory of his nativity or incarnation, of his circumcision, of his passion, of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord into heaven, and of his sending of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples. For Christian liberty is not a licentious power and dissolving of godly ecclesiastical ordinances, which advance and set forward the glory of God and love of our neighbor. But for because the Lord will have holy days to be solemnized and kept to himself alone, I do not therefore like of the festival days that are held in honor of any creatures. This glory and worship is due to God alone. Paul saith: I would not that any man should judge you in part of an holy day, or of the sabbaths, which are shadow of things to come." And again: "Ye observe days and months and years and times; I fear lest I have labored in you in vain." And therefore we at this day, that are in the church of Christ, have nothing to do with the Jewish observation; we have only to wish and endeavor to have the Christian observation and exercise of Christian religion to be freely kept and observed. (Sermons Second Decade, pp. 259 - 261.)

Beza speaks as follows:

Concerning the fourth commandment, I suppose it is agreed upon among Christians, that the same is abrogated, so far as it was ceremonial, but not in such a manner as that the Lord's-day ought to be observed according to the manner of the Jewish Sabbath, etc.; that Christians upon that day should abstain from their daily labors, except only such time of the day is was appointed for public assemblies. This was neither commanded in the Apostles' days, nor yet observed, until Christian Emperors enjoined the same to the end that people might not be abstracted from holy meditations. Neither in those days was the same precisely or strictly observed. (Homily 30, on the Songs of Solomon.)

Heylyn speaks of Beza's views in these words:

"Beza his [Calvin's] scholar and Achates' sings the selfsame song, that howsoever the assemblies of the Lord's-day were of apostolic and divine tradition, yet so that there was no cessation from work required, as was observed among the Jews. For that, saith he, had not so much abolished Judaism, as put it off and changed it to another day. And he then adds that this cessation was first brought in by Constantine and afterwards confirmed with more and more restraints, by the following Emperors, by means of which it came to pass, that that which was first done for a good intent, viz., that men being free from their worldly business, might wholly give themselves to hearing of the Word of God, degenerated at last into downright Judaism. (History Sabbath, part 2, chap. 6, see. 5.)

Heylyn goes on, speaking of others, as follows:

So for the Lutheran churches, Chemnitz charges the Romanists with superstition, because they taught the people that the holy days, considered only in themselves, had a native sanctity. And howsoever for his part, he thinks it requisite that men should be restrained from all such works as may be any hindrance to the sanctifying of the day, yet he accounts it but a part of the Jewish leaven so scrupulously to prohibit such external actions which are at all no hindrance to God's public service, and man's Sabbath duties. Bucer goes further yet, and doth not only call it a superstition, but an apostasy from Christ, to think that working on the Lord's-day, in itself considered, is a sinful thing. He adds that he ""did very well approve of the Lord's-day meetings, if men were once dispossessed of the opinions that the day was necessary to be kept, that it was holier in itself than the other days, and that to work upon that day was in itself sinful."" Lastly, the churches of the Switzers profess, in their confession – c. 24 - that, in the keeping of the Lord's-day, they give not the least hint to any Jewish superstitions, ""for neither,"" as they said, ""do we conceive one day to be more holy than another, or think that rest from labor, in itself considered, is any way pleasing unto God."" Bucer resolves the point more clearly, and saith, that in the apostles' times ""the Lord's-day, by the common consent of Christian people, was dedicated unto public rest, and the assemblies of the church."" And Peter Martyr, upon a question being asked, why the old seventh day was not kept in the Christian church, makes answer, ""that upon that day, and all the rest, we ought to rest from our own works, the works of sin."" That this was rather chosen than that, for God's public service, ""that,"" saith he, ""Christ left totally unto the liberty of the church, to do therein what should seem most expedient, and that the church did very well, in that she did prefer the memory of the resurrection before the memory of the creation."" Gaultier speaking more generally (says) that ""the Christians first assembled on the Sabbath-day, as being then most famous and so most in use. But when the churches were augmented, the next day after the Sabbath was designed to those holy uses."" (Hist. Sab., part 2, chap. 6, sees. 5,7.)"

IN FRANCE.

The character of the reformatory movement in France was so nearly allied to that in Switzerland that little need be said concerning it. It met with but slight success until after the reformed party had become established in Switzerland, when Calvin, who had been exiled from his native France, returned, and became, as he had been in Switzerland, the master spirit of the French Reformation. The first Protestant congregation was formed in Paris, in 1555, and the first Synod held there in 1559. In 1571, the General Synod at La Rochelle adopted the Gallican Confession and the Calvinistic system of Government and discipline. Thus the same view obtained as in Switzerland; and the French church was characterized by the same ideas of Christian liberty.

SUMMARY.

We are therefore ready to sum up the case regarding the Reformation on the Continent. We cannot do this better than by quoting from Doctor Hessey:

And so it was in reference to the Lord's-day. With one blow, as it were, and with one consent, the Continental Reformers rejected the legal or Jewish title which had been set up for it, the more than Jewish ceremonies and restrictions by which, in theory it least, it had been encumbered; the army of holy days, of obligation by which it had been surrounded. But they did more. They left standing no sanction for the day itself, which could commend itself powerfully to men's consciences. They did not perceive that, through the Apostles, it was of the Lord's founding. They swept away, together with the upper works, which were not the Lord's, the under works which were the Lord's. And when they discovered that men, that human nature, in fact, could not do without it, they adopted the day indeed, but with this reservation, expressed or implied, The Lord's-day is to be placed in the category of ordinances, which, being matters of indifference, any particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, or abolish; or, which was worse still, they made it a purely civil institution, dependent, if not for its origin, at least for its continuance, upon the secular power." (Sunday, Lect. 6, pp. 165, 166.)

On page 172, Hessey concludes in these words: "We are now, I think, in a condition to sum up the views of the Continental Reformers of the sixteenth century on the subject before us. Sabbatarians, indeed, those eminent men were not. They are utterly opposed to the literal application of the fourth commandment to the circumstances of Christians. They scarcely touch upon that commandment, except to show that the Sabbath has passed away.... They feel it necessary to defend their practice on grounds, sometimes perhaps of apostolic example, (with the proviso, however, that such example is to be taken only for what it is worth,) but generally, of antiquity, of the church's will, of the church's wisdom, of considerations of expediency, of regard to the weaker brethren, and sometimes on lower grounds still. And neither the day itself, nor the interval at which it recurs, is of obligation. Our Lord's resurrection is made a decent excuse for the day, rather than the original reason, or one of the original reasons on its institution. We miss also in their

writings that close connection of the Lord's day with the Lord's Supper, which was prominently brought forward in early times.... And it seems to me more than probable that the want of a deeper sanction for the observance of the Lord's-day than their teachers supplied, led the members both of the Protestant and of the Reformed communions into a practical disregard of it, closely resembling that of the communion which they had indignantly disclaimed.

Heylyn sums up the case in a similar strain:

"Thus have we proved by the doctrine of the Protestants, of what side soever, and those of greatest credit in their several churches, eighteen by name, and all the Lutherans in general of the same opinion, that the Lord's-day is of no other institution than the authority of the church.

.. Nay, by the doctrine of the Helvetian churches, if I conceive their meaning rightly, every particular church may designate what day they please to religious meetings, and every day may be a Lord's-day or a Sabbath. (Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 6, see. 8.)"

The fact is thus placed beyond question that the "Continental" reformers taught unmodified no-Sabbathism. The present flood of no-Sabbathism, which is pouring into America from the Continent of Europe, is the logical fruitage of the theories which were taught thus early. But according to the philosophy of history such results were unavoidable. It was a no-Sabbath tree which the reformers planted.

Robert Cox makes the same conclusions in a criticism upon a passage from the papers of the "Sabbath Alliance," in which he states that Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Bucer, Zwingli and others taught "expressly or in effect that the Sabbath was an exclusively Jewish institution, and was never meant for this more advanced age." (Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties, p. 484.)

Sunday In The English Reformation.

The reformatory movement was less radical at first in England than in Germany. It sought to correct certain abuses without any material change in the doctrines of the church. The personal alienation between Henry VIII. and the pope hastened the rupture, and gave birth to the "English Church." But the fickleness of Henry, and his tendency to favor the Papacy during the later years of his life, prevented the accomplishment of much legal reform previous to the close of his reign, in 1546. A majority of the Regents who administered the affairs of the government during the minority of Edward VI. favored the Reformation. This brought the support of the civil power, and, so far as it could be expressed by civil law, the Reformation was well advanced at the close of Edward's reign. Speaking on this point, Neale says:

"They made as quick advances, perhaps, in restoring religion toward its primitive simplicity as the circumstances of the time would admit; and it is evident that they designed to go further, and not make this the last standard of the Reformation. Indeed, Queen Elizabeth thought her brother had gone too far, by stripping religion of too many ornaments, and, therefore, when she came to the crown, she was hardly persuaded to restore it to the condition in which he left it. King James I., King Charles I., Archbishop Laud, and all their admirers, instead of removing farther from the superstitious pomps of the Church of Rome, have been for returning back to them, and have appealed to the settlement of Queen Elizabeth as the purest standard. (History of the Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 55. New York, 1843.) The editor of Neale's work, John a Choules, M.A., adds a note to the above as follows:

It is evident to the careful student of history that the Reformation in England produced its happiest effects in the days of Edward, that the church of England has never been so pure, as soon after its transition from popery; and that its subsequent alterations have ever been in favor of Romanism."""

With this glance at the general situation, the reader is prepared to examine the matter in hand more in detail.

TYNDALE.

William Tyndale stands at the head of the list. He suffered martyrdom in 1533. In his "Reply to Sir Thomas Moore" we find the following:

"And as for the Sabbath, a great matter, we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into the Monday, or any other day as we see need; or may make every tenth day holy day, only if we see a cause why. We may make two every week, if it were expedient and one not enough to teach the people. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, than to put a difference between us and the Jews, and less we should become servants to the day after their superstition. Neither needed we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught without it. (Works of the English Reformers, William Tyndale and John Fryth, Vol. 2. p. 101. London, 1831.)

JOHN FRYTH.

Tyndale's associate, John Fryth, speaks with still greater plainness in the following words:

Our forefathers who were in the beginning of the church, did abrogate the Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an ensample of Christian liberty, and that they might know that neither the keeping of the Sabbath, nor of any other day is necessary according to Paul: ""Ye observe days, times and months."" ""I am afraid of you, that I have labored in vain toward you."" Howbeit, because it was necessary that a day should be reserved, in which the people should come together to hear the Word of God, they ordained, instead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next day following, which is Sunday. And, although they might have kept the Saturday with the Jew, as a thing indifferent, yet they did much better to overset the day, to be a perpetual memory that we are free, and not bound to any day, but may do all lawful works to the pleasure of God and the profit of our neighbor. We are in manner as superstitious in the Sunday as they were in the Saturday; yea, and we are much madder. For the Jews have the Word of God for their Saturday, since it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemn. And we have not the Word of God for us, but rather against us; for we keep not the seventh day as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God's law. But Paul biddeth that no man judge us, as concerning holy days, meats and such other exterior things; yea, and in no ways will he that we observe them, counting them more holy than other days. For they were instituted that the people should come together to hear God's Word, receive the sacraments, and give God thanks; that done, they may return unto their houses and do their business as well as any other day. He that thinketh that a man sinneth which worketh on the holy day, if he be weak or ignorant, ought better to instruct and so to leave his hold; but if he be obstinate and persevere in his sentence, he is not of God but of the devil, for he maketh sin in such as God leaveth free. According to this ensample, I would that our ceremonies were altered; because (as I have said) the people seek health in them, and what villiany more can they do to Christ's blood."" (Declaration of Baptism, p. 96.)"

CRANMER.

Thomas Cranmer (burned in 1555), in his Catechism, first published 1548, has the following:

"And here note, good children, that the Jews in the Old Testament were commanded to keep the Sabbath-day, and they observed every seventh day, called the Sabbath or Saturday. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses's law concerning differences of times, days and meats, but have liberty to use other days for our Sabbath-days therein to hear the Word of God, and keep an holy rest. And therefore, that this Christian liberty may be kept and maintained we now keep no more the Sabbath on Saturday as the Jews do, but we observe the Sunday, and certain other days, as the magistrates do judge convenient, whom in this thing we ought to obey. (Catechism, p. 40, Oxford, 1829; also Cox Sab. Lit., and Hessey, Sunday Lectures.)

In another work, Cranmer reiterates the same doctrine in these words:

There be two parts of the Sabbath-day - one is the outward bodily rest from all manner of labor and work; this is mere ceremonial, and was taken away with the other sacrifices and ceremonies by Christ at the preaching of the gospel. The other part of the Sabbath-day is the inward rest or ceasing from sin, from our own wills and lusts, and to do only God's will and commandments. . . . This spiritual Sabbath - that is to abstain from sin and to do good - are all men bound to keep all the days of their life, and not only on the Sabbath-day. And this spiritual Sabbath may no man alter nor change, no not the whole church."

That the outer observance of the Sabbath is mere ceremonial, St. Paul writeth plainly, as that the holy days of the new moon, and of the Sabbath-days are nothing but shadows of things to come.

Jerome also, to the Galatians IV., according to the same, saith, "Lest the congregation of the people without good order, should diminish the faith in Christ, therefore certain days were appointed, wherein we should come together; not that that day is holier than the other in which we come together, but that whatsoever day we assemble in, there might arise greater joy by the sight of one of us to another." (Confutation of Unwritten Verities, Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 60, 61. Cambridge, 1846.)

Concerning civil enactments, Heylyn speaks as follows, after quoting the opinions of Tyndale, Fryth and others: "Now that which was affirmed by them in their particulars, was not long afterwards made good by the general body of this church and state, the king, the lords spiritual and temporal, and all the commons met in Parliament, anno, fifth and sixth of King Edward VI., where, to the honor of Almighty God, it was thus enacted: "Forasmuch as men be not at all times so mindful to laud and praise God, so ready to resort to hear God's Holy Word, and to come to the holy communion as their bounded duty doth require, therefore, to call men to remembrance of their duty and to help their infirmity, it hath been wholesomely provided that there should be some certain times and days appointed, wherein the Christians should cease from all kinds of labor, and apply themselves only and wholly unto the aforesaid holy works, properly pertaining to true religion which works, as they may well be called God's service, so the times especially appointed for the same, are called holy days. Not for the matter of the nature either of the time or day - for so all days and times are of like holiness - but for the nature and condition of such holy works, whereunto such times and days are sanctified and hallowed: that is to say, separated from all profane uses, and dedicated, not unto any saint or creature but, only unto God and his true worship. Neither is it to be thought that there is any certain time, or definite number of days prescribed in the holy Scriptures, but the appointment both of the time and also of the number of days, is left by the authority of God's Word unto the liberty of Christ's church, to be determined and assigned

orderly in every country by the discretion of the rulers and ministers thereof, as they shall judge most expedient, to the true setting forth of God's glory, and the edification of their people."

Nor is it to be thought that all of this preamble was made in reference to the holy days or saint's days only, whose being left to the authority of the church was never questioned; but in relation to the Lord's-day, also, as by the act itself doth fully appear; for so it followeth in the act.

Be it therefore enacted, etc., that all the days hereafter mentioned shall be kept, and commanded to be kept holy days, and none other; that is to say, all Sundays in the year, the feasts of the Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Epiphany, of the Purification, with all the rest now kept, and there named particularly, and that none other day shall be kept and commanded to be kept holy day, and to abstain from lawful bodily labor.

Nay, which is more, there is a further clause in the selfsame act, which plainly shows that they had no such thought of the Lord's-day, as that it was a Sabbath, or so to be observed, as the Sabbath was, and therefore did provide it, and enact by the authority aforesaid, "that it shall be lawful to every husbandman, laborer, fisherman, and to all and every other person and persons, of what estate, degree or condition he or they be, upon the holy days aforesaid, in harvest, or at any other time in the year, when necessity shall so require, to labor, ride, fish, or work any kind of work at their free will and pleasure, any thing this act to the contrary notwithstanding."

This is the total of this act, which if examined well, as it ought to be, will yield us all those propositions or conclusions, before remembered, which we collected from the writings of those three particular martyrs. Nor is it to be said that it is repealed and of no authority. Repealed, indeed, it was, in the first year of Queen Mary, and stood repealed in law, though otherwise in use and practice, all the long reign of Queen Elizabeth; but in the first Year of King James was revived again. Note here that in the selfsame Parliament, the common prayer book, now in use, being reviewed by many godly prelates, was confirmed and authorized; wherein so much of the said act as doth concern the names and numbers of the holy days, is expressed, and, as it were, incorporated into the same. Which makes it manifest that in the purpose of the church, the Sunday was no otherwise esteemed of than any other holy day." (Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 2.)

Such testimony from one who was Sub-Dean of Westminster, and chaplain to Charles I., and whose History of the Sabbath was first published in 1631, is of the highest importance. It shows beyond question that the same no-Sabbathism which characterized the Reformation on the continent obtained in the Church of England.

Mary, who succeeded Edward, was a persistent papist. She checked the tide of reformation and cursed the land with her brief but bitter reign. She was succeeded by Elizabeth in 1558, who at once set about restoring the desolations which Mary had left along her bloody pathway. But the work was less radical, and moved more slowly than it had moved under Edward. The "Act of Conformity" finally drove the Puritan element out of the church. This prepared the way for the fuller development of the Puritan movement, and left the Established Church to sink into that arrested development which always succeeds partial reform. The state of the Sunday question is seen by the "Injunctions" published during the first year of Elizabeth:

All the Queen's faithful and loving subjects shall henceforth celebrate and keep their holy day according to God's holy will and pleasure, that is, in hearing the Word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offenses unto God and amendment of the same in reconciling of themselves charitably to their neighbors, where displeasure hath been, in oft-times receiving the communion of the body and blood of Christ, in visiting the poor and sick, using all soberness and godly conversation. Yet, notwithstanding, all Parsons, Vicars and Curates shall teach and declaim to their parishioners, that they may with a safe and quiet conscience, after their common prayer, in time of harvest, labor upon the holy and festival days, and save that which God hath sent; and if for any scupulosity or grudge of conscience, men should abstain from working on these days, that then they should grievously offend God.

This makes it evident that Queen Elizabeth in her own particular, took not the Lord's-day for a Sabbath, or to be of a different nature from the other holy days. Nor was it taken so by the whole body of our Church and State, in the first Parliament of her reign, what time it was enacted: that all and every person and persons, inhabiting within this realm and any other of the Queen's dominions, shall diligently and faithfully - having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, - endeavor themselves to repair to their parish church or chapel, accustomed, or, upon reasonable let thereof, to some usual place where common prayer shall be used in such time of let, upon every Sunday, and other days ordained and used to be kept as holy days, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly, during the time of common prayer, preaching, or other service of God, upon pain of punishment, etc.

This law is still in force, and still like to be; and by this law, the Sundays and holy days are alike regarded. Nor by the law only, but by the purpose and intent of the Holy Church, who in her public liturgy is as full and large for every one of the holy days, as for the Sunday, the liturgy only excepted. For otherwise, by the rule and prescript thereof, the same religious offices are designed for both, the same devout attendance required for both, and whatsoever else may make both equal. And therefore by this statute, and the common

prayer book, we are bound to keep more Sabbath, than the Lord's-day Sabbath, or else none at all. (Heylyn Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 8, see. 4.) Doctor Hessey speaks of the reign of Elizabeth as follows:

"Practically, the observance of Sunday was in a very unsatisfactory state throughout the reign of Elizabeth, A.D. 1558-1603. There seems to have been a great forgetfulness of its religious character. In one of the Queen's injunctions, Sunday is classed with other holidays, and it is expressly said, that if for any scrupulosity or grudge of conscience some should superstitiously abstain from working on those days, they shall grievously offend."" In fact, labor was almost enjoined after common prayer. On the same principle we find the Queen granting a license to one John Seconton, to use certain plays and games upon nine several Sundays. After a time, in A.D. 1580, the London Magistracy obtained from her an interdiction of this practice on Sunday, within the liberties of the city. Elsewhere it was carried on; and the pictures of the Sunday recreations of the period which have come down to us, though somewhat profusely colored, indicate a low tone of feeling on the subject of the holy day."" (Sunday, etc., see. 7, pp. 201, 202.)"

During the latter years of the reign of Elizabeth when, according to Mr. Hessey, "The desecration of Sunday which prevailed seems to have been most appalling" (Ibid, pp. 206, 207), she refused to sanction a law for its better observance, which had been carried through Parliament by the Puritan influence. In this she only carried out the doctrine of the church by which the Sunday was held as a holiday only, and not as a Sabbath. Neale speaks of these times in the following words:

"The Lord's-day was very much profaned by the encouragement of plays and sports in the evening, and sometimes in the afternoon. The Rev. Mr. Smith, M.A., in his sermon before the University of Cambridge, the first Sunday in Lent, maintained the unlawfulness of these plays, for which he was summoned before the Vice Chancellor, and upon examination offered to prove that the Christian Sabbath ought to be observed by abstinence from all worldly business, and spent in works of piety and charity; though he did not apprehend we were bound to the strictness of the Jewish precepts. The Parliament had taken this matter into consideration, and passed a bill for the better and more reverent observation of the Sabbath, which the Speaker recommended to the Queen in an elegant speech. But her Majesty refused to pass it, under pretense of not suffering the Parliament to meddle with matters of religion, which was her prerogative. However, the thing appeared so reasonable, that, without the sanction of a law, the religious observation of the Sabbath grew in esteem with all sober persons, and after a few years became the distinguishing mark of a Puritan. (History of the Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 176.)

In another place Neale adds:

While the bishops were thus harrassing honest and conscientious ministers for scrupling the ceremonies of the church, practical religion was at a very low ebb. The fashionable vices of the times were profane swearing, drunkenness, reveling, gaming, and profanation of the Lord's-day; yet there was no discipline for these offenders, nor do I find any such cited into the spiritual courts, or shut up in prisons. If men came to their parish churches and approved of the habits and ceremonies, other offenses were overlooked, and the court was easy. At Paris Gardens, in Southwark, there were public sports on the Lord's-day, for the entertainment of great numbers of people who resorted thither. But on the thirteenth of January, being Sunday, it happened that one of the scaffolds being crowded with people, fell down, by which accident some were killed, and a great many wounded. This was thought to be a judgment from heaven; for the Lord Mayor, in the account he gives of it to the treasurer, says, ""that it gives great occasion to acknowledge the hand of God for such abuse of the Sabbath-day, and moveth me in conscience to give order for redress of such contempt of God's service;"" adding, that for this purpose he had treated with some justices of the peace in Surrey, who expressed a very good zeal, but alleged want of commission, which he referred to the consideration of his lordship. But the court paid no regard to such remonstrances, and the Queen had her ends in encouraging the sports, pastimes and revelings of the people on Sundays and holy days."" (Id., p. 154.)"

Such were the doctrines of the Reformed English Church, and such their fruits at the opening of the seventeenth century. In 1603, James I. of Scotland came to the throne. A stricter observance of the Sunday had obtained to some extent among those of the Puritan party who accepted the doctrines concerning the Sabbath which had just then been published by Nicholas Bownde. These efforts made by the Puritans caused no little complaint, which led to a declaration by the King, commonly called the "Book of Sports," which was published in 1618. In this he declares that for the good of his people it is his pleasure that lawful recreations be allowed, and therefore:

After divine service, they should not be disturbed, hindered or discouraged from any lawful recreations; such as dancing, either men or women, archery for men. Leaping vaulting or any other such harmless recreation; nor from having May-games, Whitsun-ales or Morrice-dances, and setting up of May-poles or other sports therewith used; so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or hindrance of divine service; also, that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decorating of it, according to their ancient custom; withal prohibiting all games unlawful to be used on the Sundays, only as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, enterludes and, at all times prohibited among the meaner sort of people, bowling.

A declaration which occasioned much noise and clamor; and many scandals spread abroad, as if these counsels had been put into that prince's head by some great prelates which were then of most power about him. But on that point they might have satisfied themselves that this was no court doctrine, no new divinity which that learned prince had been taught in England. He had declared himself before, when he was King of the Scots only, to the selfsame purpose, as may appear from his Basilicon Doron, published anno 1598. This was

the first blow, in effect, which had been given, in all his time, to the new Lord's-day Sabbath, then so much applauded. (Heylyn's Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 10.)

James I. was succeeded by his son, Charles I., who took the throne in 1625, and married Marie, sister of Louis XIII. of France. She was an intriguing papist, and had great influence over her husband. Neale says:

The Queen was a very great bigot to her religion; her conscience was directed by her confessor, assisted by the Pope's nuncio, and a secret cabal of priests and Jesuits. These controlled the Queen, and she the King, so that in effect the nation was governed by popish counsels till the Long Parliament. (Hist. Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 279.)

Perhaps Mr. Neale states the case too strongly; nevertheless, the leading tendency was toward Romanism rather than Protestantism. William Laud, Bishop of London, became Prime Minister three years after the accession of Charles I. His character is aptly described by one of his contemporaries, Bishop Hall, who says to him in a letter:

I would I knew where to find you; to-day you are with the Romanists, to-morrow with us; our adversaries think you ours; and we, theirs. Your conscience finds with both, and neither; how long will you halt in this indifference? (Hist. Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 279.)

With such men at the head of affairs, it is not wonderful that the tide beat hard against reform. About 1633, since the Puritan element was gaining among the people, efforts were made to suppress the more riotous assemblies that were common upon Sunday. Laud took affront at this so-called invasion of the domain of the church, and complained to the King. The case was tried, the civil officers severely reprimanded, and ordered to revoke their enactments against the recreations. The results of this action are stated by Mr. Neale in the following words:

To encourage these disorderly assemblies more effectually, Archbishop Laud put the King upon republishing his father's declarations of the year 1618, concerning lawful sports to be used on Sundays after divine service, which was done accordingly, Oct. 18th, with this remarkable addition: After a recital of the words of King James's declaration, his majesty adds, Out of a like pious care for the service of God, and for suppressing of those humors that oppose truth, and for the ease, comfort and recreation of his majesty's well-deserving people, he doth ratify his blessed father's declaration, the rather, because of late, in some of the counties of the kingdom, his majesty finds that, under the pretense of taking away an abuse, there hath been a general forbidding, not only of ordinary meeting, but of the feasts of the dedication of churches, commonly called wakes; it is therefore his will and pleasure, that these feasts with others, shall be observed, and that all neighborhood and freedom, with manlike and lawful exercises, be used, and the justices of the peace are commanded not to molest any in their recreations, having first done their duty to God, and continued in obedience to his majesty's laws. And he does farther will that publication of this command be made, by order from the bishops, through all the parish churches of their several dioceses, respectively." (Hist. Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 312.)

The publication of the foregoing widened the breach between the Puritans and the government. Many clergymen were deposed for refusing to read these declarations from their pulpits and much trouble and persecution came upon all dissenters. These agitations, and the ripening of other turbulent elements culminated in civil war in 1642. The government soon came into the hands of the Puritan party, and hence the civil history of the Sunday from 1646 to 1660 belongs to the next chapter. The execution of the King in 1649, the establishment of the Cromwellian Protectorate in 1653, the death of Cromwell in 1658, the military interregnum, and the restoration of Charles II. in 1660, are the prominent points in this turbulent period. The restoration of Charles and the re-establishment of the Church of England were followed by a period of great moral and social debauchery. The King gave himself up to a life of avowed lewdness, and great dissoluteness prevailed among the baser sort of those who adhered to the throne and to the state religion. In 1661 the "Savoy Conference" was called. This was an effort to harmonize the Puritan party with the state religion party. This it failed to do. Concerning the Sunday at that time and since, Dr. Hessey speaks as follows:

The Savoy Conference, as we have said, refused to make any alteration in our authorized documents so far as Sunday was concerned. Since that time, the church of England has not formally meddled with the subject. Meanwhile, Sunday has gone through considerable vicissitudes. What it was in the licentious reign of Charles the II. may be surmised from the mournful picture, given by Evelyn, of the Sunday preceding the death of that king. Puritanism had indeed died out in reference to the Lord's-day; but I confess that the state of things which succeeded was worse than Puritanism. In the middle of the eighteenth century, there was a reaction. Methodism rose up. This is not the place to discuss either the justifiableness of that movement, or the influence which it has had upon the church of England. But I may venture to quote a passage from Earl Stanhope which illustrates very clearly its bearings upon the immediate subject. It is," says he, "certainly one of the ill effects of Methodism that it has tended to narrow the circle of innocent enjoyments." Then, after mentioning some instances he adds: "Of one clergyman, Mr. Grimshaw, who joined the Methodists, and is much extolled by them, it is related by his panegyrist: "He endeavored to suppress the generally prevailing custom in country places during the summer, of walking in the fields on the Lord's-day, between the services, or in the evening in companies. He not only bore his testimony against it from the pulpit, but reconnoitered the fields in person to detect and reprove delinquents." How different was the saying of good old Bishop Hacket, "Serve God and be cheerful."" (Sunday, Lect. 7, pp. 218, 219.)

The Church of England has not spoken authoritatively upon the Sabbath question since the above extract from Hessey's work was written, and hence it is not needful to trace its history further. The civil enactments, which are noted in the foregoing pages, constitute the legal authority concerning Sunday and its observance in England. The use of the ten commandments in the liturgy of the English Church cannot be interpreted as favoring the idea of the Sabbath –Saturday - as may be seen from the discussions and interpretations at the time they were first placed in the liturgy (1552), which interpretations are sustained by modern churchmen. (See Cox, Sab. Lit. Vol. 1, p. 139; Heylyn, Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 3; and Hessey, Sunday, Lect. 5, p. 149.)

The "Book of Homilies," published in 1562, in the homily on the "Place and Time of Prayer," presents the claim of analogy between the Sabbath and the Sunday. This was done to conciliate the Puritan element, which was then beginning to separate from the church; but the homily - which is not authoritative - teaches nothing different from what is shown in the foregoing extracts, concerning the origin of Sunday-observance, or the authority upon which it is based. (See Cox, Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 412; and Morer, Dialogues on the Lord's-day, p. 299.)

Hence the case, as regards the Church of England, may be stated briefly thus:

The English church has always taught that the civil and religious authorities, the state and the church, have power to ordain and regulate the observance of Sunday. In her purest days, the Sunday is placed on a footing with the other church holidays. After the separation between the church and the Puritan party, the enactments in favor of Sunday were less strict, and the practical observance of it was looser until the time of Cromwell. When the church party was restored, after the civil war, there was no improvement in theory, and none in practice, except here and there where the Puritan element affected the people in spite of the teachings and laws of the ruling power. If there has been any temporary or local effort for a more sabbatic observance of Sunday since the middle of the eighteenth century, it has been made by Dissenters, and not by the church. The history of the English church must, therefore, go in to form a part of the history of that ecclesiastical no-Sabbathism which was developed with the papacy, and beyond which the English church was not carried by her efforts at reformation. In further support of this thought, it is befitting to close this chapter with the following, from high authority:

The founders of the English Reformation, after abolishing most of the festivals kept before that time, had made little or no change as to the mode of observance of those they retained. Sundays and holy days stood much on the same footing as days on which no work, except for good cause, was to be performed; the service of the church was to be attended, and any lawful amusement might be indulged in. . . . Those who opposed them (the Puritans) on the high-church side, not only derided the extravagance of the Sabbatarians, as the others were called, but pretended that the commandment, having been confined to the Hebrews, the modern observance of the first day of the week, as a season of rest and devotion, was an ecclesiastical institution, and in no degree more venerable than that of the other festivals, or the seasons of Lent, which the Puritans stubbornly despised. (Hallam's Constitutional History of England. Works, Vol. 4, p. 227. New York, 1847.)

Thus it is seen that the English Reformers took the same position concerning the Sabbath and Sunday which the Continental reformers had taken. They continued the no-Sabbath theories which were first introduced by the early Pagan-Christian leaders beginning with Justin Martyr. Those theories were the basis of Sunday-observance for centuries in the Roman Catholic Church, with the added doctrine of church authority in the place of Biblical authority. Thus it has come about that neither on the continent nor in England has the Sabbath question ever risen to the true Protestant position, and therefore the fact that Sunday-observance, especially on the continent of Europe, has never risen much above the holiday standard.

Puritanism And The Sunday In England.

THE more radical and devoted men, who led in the work of reformation under Edward VI., were so restrained by conservative influences during the reign of Elizabeth that they grew restive and evinced a strong tendency to separate from the Established Church. The restrictions which were imposed by the "Act of Conformity" increased this tendency until it culminated in open separation. At first the Puritans plead for a better observance of Sunday as a part of the general work of civil and religious reform. As they continued to seek for higher life and greater purity, the Sabbath question grew in importance. This was not fortuitous. Men never come into closer relations with God without feeling the sacredness of the claims which his law imposes; and no part of that law stands out more prominently than the Fourth Commandment, when the heart seeks to bring highest honors to him who is at once Creator, Father and Redeemer. As these men threw off the shackles of church authority, and stood face to face with God, recognizing him as their only lawgiver, they were compelled to take higher ground concerning the Sabbath. This fact crowded the Puritan movement toward the position then occupied by English Seventh-day Baptists, who were already a vigorous factor in the prevailing discussions concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday. Seventh-day Baptists insisted that Protestantism could not be true to its fundamental principles without returning to the Sabbath according to the Bible. The logic of their position was unanswerable, and from that time to this one of the strongest points made by Romanists against Protestants is that they do not keep the Sabbath. As will be seen below,

Puritanism adopted the Seventh-day Baptist position, rejecting only the seventh day of the week.

The key-note of the Puritan theory concerning the Sabbath and Sunday was struck by Nicholas Bownde (or Bound), in a book entitled, "The Doctrine of the Sabbath, plainly laid forth and soundly proven," etc. This was first published in 1595. Very few copies of the book are in existence. The only one in America, so far as we know, is in Alfred University Library, Alfred, New York, from which the following copious quotations are made. After a preliminary discussion, Mr. Bownde opens the case in these words:

"First of all, therefore, it appeareth in the story of Genesis, that it was from the beginning, and that the seventh day is sanctified at the first, so soon as it was made, insomuch that Adam and his posterity, if they had continued in their first righteous estate, should have kept that day holy above the rest, seeing the Lord sanctified it for their sakes; and though it be so indeed that they should have been occupied in some honest calling and work upon the six days (according as it is said to Adam, that the Lord put the man into the garden of Eden, that he might dress it and keep it), yet notwithstanding, upon the seventh day they should have ceased from all worldly labor, and given themselves to the meditation of God's glorious works, and have been occupied in some more immediate parts of his service, according to the former commandment. And that we might understand indeed, that the law of sanctifying the Sabbath is so ancient, the prophet Moses, in Genesis, doth of purpose use the same words which the Lord God himself doth in pronouncing it (as it is set down in Exodus), namely, that he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, and that in it God rested from all his work which he made; to teach us assuredly that this commandment of the Sabbath was no more than first given when it was pronounced from heaven by the Lord than any other of the moral precepts; nay, that it hath so much antiquity as the seventh day hath being; for so soon as the day was, so soon was it sanctified, that we might know, that as it came in with the first man, so it must not go out but with the last man, and as it was in the beginning of the world, so it must continue to the ending of the same, and as the first seventh day was sanctified so must the last be, and as God bestowed this blessing upon it in the most perfect estate of man, so must it be reserved with it till he be restored to his perfection again. (The Doctrine, etc., pp. 5, 6.)

Mr. Bownde next proceeds to argue that a knowledge of the Sabbath existed from Adam to Moses, basing the claim largely upon the fact of the recognition of the Sabbath as an established institution, before the giving of the law at Sinai, as shown in the sixteenth of Exodus. The argument under this head is well sustained. The New Testament argument he presents as follows:

And that this Sabbath-day, which hath that commendation of antiquity and consent which we have heard, ought to stand still in his proper force, and that it appertaineth to us Christians now, most evidently appeareth by the authority and credit which it receiveth from the gospel and New Testament also, in which it is so highly commended unto us (that I might not in this place speak of the manifold other testimonies that it hath in the Old). And by name we may see how our Saviour Christ, and all his apostles established it by their practice; for they upon the Sabbath, ordinarily enter into the synagogues of the Jews and preach unto the people, doing such things upon those days as appertain to sanctifying of them according to the commandment. (Id., p. 9.)"

Mr. Bownde next goes on to show that Christ and the apostles did not observe the Sabbath ceremonially, since they observed it guided by the Holy Spirit after the ceremonies were abolished. He quotes several passages from the Book of Acts, and adds to these the argument founded upon the wants of our race, showing that perpetual and universal wants demand a perpetual and universal Sabbath. He also argues that if Adam needed the Sabbath before the Fall, the world lost in sin needs it much more. This done, Mr. Bownde answers certain commonplace objections to the perpetuity of the Sabbath, and proceeds to make a last and logical effort in support of a "change" from the Sabbath to the Sunday. His words are as follows:

Now, as we have hitherto seen, that there ought to be a Sabbath-day, so it remaineth that we should hear upon what day this Sabbath should be kept, and which is that very day that is sanctified for that purpose. For I know it is not agreed upon among them that do truly hold that there ought to be a Sabbath, which is that very day upon which the Sabbath should always be. Herein the Lord hath been merciful unto his church, and succored the infirmities of man in this behalf, and decided the endless contention that might have been about this matter, in that he hath told us that it is the seventh day, which he hath sanctified for that purpose. For it is in express words said, in Genesis, that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. And in Exodus, The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" and afterwards the same words be repeated by Moses in Deuteronomy. Therefore it must needs be upon that day, and upon none other: for the Lord himself sanctified that day, and appointed it for that purpose, and none but it; and therefore it is truly said, of that great clerk saint, Augustine, *De solo Sabbatho dictum est*, etc., "This is said only of the Sabbath, God sanctified the seventh day," insomuch, that a man being in conscience persuaded that he should keep holy unto the Lord some one day or other, should ignorantly choose out some other day, neglecting the seventh, to sanctify it by resting from his labors, and wholly applying himself to God's service, he could not look for that blessing from God, which no doubt, the church of God doth find at his hand, upon that day, by virtue of his special promise; for he blessed that day and sanctified it. And as Peter Martyr alledgeth it out of Rabbi Agnon, "This blessing doth light upon those who observe and sanctify the same Sabbath that God hath appointed; and we do not read that he bestowed that blessing upon any other day which we know he did upon the seventh. So that the substance of this law is natural, as Master Junius saith, and to be observed of all men alike, namely, that every seventh day should be holy unto God. And so it is true not only that of every seven days, as Peter Martyr saith, "one must be reserved unto God," and, a little after, "It is perpetual that one day in the week should be reserved for the service of God," but that this must be upon the seventh. In setting down of which, I do not so far forget myself, but that I remember that some, whom with all humility I do reverence in the Lord, and give thanks unto him for their

labors, that (I say) they are otherwise minded, and do not think that the church is necessarily tied to the number of seven in observing the day. Yet I do not see (be it far from me that I should obstinately contend with any) where the Lord hath given any authority to his church, ordinarily and perpetually, to sanctify any day except that which he hath sanctified himself. For I hold this, with other learned men, as a principle of divinity, that it belongeth only to God to sanctify the day as it belongeth to him to sanctify any other things to his own worship. . . . Therefore we must needs acknowledge it to be the singular wisdom and mercy of God toward his church, thus by sanctifying the seventh day, to end the strife. For, as we see in God's service, when men go away from his Word, there is no end of devising that which he alloweth not; and they fall upon everything, saving upon that they should; so in appointing the day if we be not ruled by the Word, we shall find by experience that every day will seem more convenient to us than that, at leastwise we shall seem to have as good reason to keep any other as the seventh." (Id., pp. 30, 31, 33.) Continuing the subject, he presses the point that God sanctified the day because in it he had rested, and that the Jews were not at liberty to change even "the number of that day," and that they only properly worshiped God and proved their love for him holy when they kept his specific day. His conclusion is in these words:

"Thus we learn that God did not only bless it, but bless it for this cause and so we see that the Sabbath must needs still be upon the seventh day, as it always hath been. (Id., p. 35.)

After thus surveying the field, it is difficult to understand how Mr. Bownde could be so blinded to the legitimate deductions from his own arguments as to talk of a change of day. But so strong were his prejudices against what he calls Judaism that he clung to Sunday, supporting his claim with the following broken reed: But now concerning this very special seventh day that we now keep in the time of the gospel, that is well known, that it is not the same it was from the beginning, which God himself did sanctify, and whereof he speaketh in this commandment, for it was the day going before ours, which in Latin retaineth its ancient name, and is called the Sabbath, which we also grant, but so that we confess it must always remain, never to be changed any more, and that all men must keep holy this seventh day, and none other, which was unto them not the seventh, but the first day of the week, and it is so called many times in the New Testament, and so it still standeth in force, that we are bound unto the seventh day, though not unto that very seventh. Concerning the time, and persons by whom, and when the day was changed, it appeareth in the New Testament, that it was done in the time of the apostles, and by the apostles themselves, and that together with the day, the name was changed, and was in the beginning called the first day of the week, afterwards the Lord's-day. (Id., pp. 35, 36.)"

Mr. Bownde quotes only two passages of Scripture in support of the above claim, Acts 20:7, and 2 Cor.

16:2. In direct opposition to his previous proposition, that the Word of God alone is authority, he devotes several pages to quotations and remarks concerning the "Doctors and Fathers " in the church, seeking to show that the early Christians changed the observance from the Sabbath to the Sunday. These quotations are made from those who gave most prominence to the resurrection theory as a reason for its observance, and so, by a sort of implication, a degree of divine authority is hinted at. The greater part of the book is occupied in discussing the manner of observing Sunday, as regards rest from labor and forms of public worship. Great strictness in the one and extreme simplicity in the other are inculcated. The appearance of this book caused no little commotion. It was at once adopted by the Puritan party. It was strongly opposed by the church party as an encroachment upon Christian liberty, and as putting an undeserved luster and importance upon Sunday over the other festivals. Rogers, author of the Commentary upon the Thirty-nine Articles, in his preface, boasts that it had been, and would be until his dying day, "the comfort of his soul" that he had been instrumental in bringing this Sabbatarian heresy to light. Archbishop Whitgift and Lord Chief-Justice Popham called in this work and forbade its reprinting. It was much read privately, however, and after the death of Whitgift, was reprinted with additions in 1606.

Such were the theories of the Puritans concerning Sunday. It now remains to trace its history in civil legislation in brief outline. The open separation between these radical reformers and the Established Church began about 1560, when they were derisively called Puritans. During the remainder of the reign of Elizabeth and that of her successor, James I., they had but little direct political influence. But as all reforms find their first welcome among the common people, Puritanic ideas and practices gained steadily among the masses. The spirit of liberty demanded release from those civil and ecclesiastical usurpations and oppressions which marked the beginning of the reign of Charles I. His queen was an open friend of the Papists, while he claimed to be the supporter of the orthodox church, as founded by Elizabeth. Archbishop Laud and his co-workers were the King's advisers, and were at the head of the church party. Against these were arranged the whole Puritan party, and many others who could not fellowship the papistic tendency of the court. In the Parliament, this included the body of the House of Commons and a part of the House of Lords. But the Bench of Bishops, who were ex-officio members of the House of Lords, for a long time thwarted all efforts for change or reform.

About 1640 the open struggle commenced by the passage of a reformatory bill in the House of Commons, one provision of which was for a stricter observance of Sunday. It was defeated in the House of Lords; but the discussion and agitation did much to arouse the people, and to disturb the security of the throne and the church party. This would probably have ended for the time in discussion except that upon the failure of the bill there came the insurrection of the Papists, and the massacre of Protestants in Ireland, on the 23d of October, 1642. Strong suspicions were entertained that the Court, especially the Queen, was a party to the plot, and fears were aroused that a similar fate awaited English nonconformists. The failure of the efforts of Parliament and of the Irish Protestants to obtain relief for the sufferers and punishment for the offenders, at the hands of the Court, widened the breach between the two parties,

and showed the complicity of the Court with the barbarous butchery of the Irish. This led to a rapid separation. The Bishops were soon driven from the House of Lords. The King fled to York. Parliament, having tried in vain to obtain his co-operation in averting the dangers to the kingdom, took the power into its own hands. Each party possessed itself of as much territory and military strength as possible, and the King, marching against London, was met at Edgehill, near Keinton, in Warwickshire, by the Parliament forces under the Earl of Essex, and the first battle took place on the 23d of October, 1643.

Two causes now set to work to bring about a more religious observance of Sunday:

(a) The Parliament was bound, by the turn matters had taken, to press the reforms for which it had been contending, among which was a stricter observance of Sunday.

(b) The calamity of civil war with all its horrors was upon the nation, and like all great calamities it tended to make the people more religious. Of the influence of the war in its early stages on the religious habits of the people, Neale speaks as follows:

"Though the discipline of the church was at an end, there was nevertheless an uncommon spirit of devotion among the people in the Parliament quarters. The Lord's-day was observed with remarkable strictness, the churches being crowded with numerous and attentive hearers three or four times in the day. The officers of the peace patrolled the streets and shut up all public houses. There was no traveling on the road or walking in the fields, except in cases of absolute necessity. Religious exercises were setup in private families, as reading the Scriptures, family prayer, repeating sermons and singing, of Psalms, which was so universal that you might walk through the city of London on the evening of the Lord's-day without seeing an idle person or hearing anything but the voice of prayer or praise from churches and private houses.

As is usual in times of public calamity, so at the breaking out of the civil war all public diversions and recreations were laid aside. By an ordinance of September 2d, 1642, it was declared that, whereas public sports do not agree with public calamities, nor public stage-plays with the seasons of humiliation, this being an exercise of sad and pious solemnity, the other being spectacles of pleasure too commonly expressing lascivious mirth and levity, it is therefore ordained that, while these sad causes and set times of humiliation continue, public stage-plays shall cease, and be forborne; instead of which are recommended to the people of this land the profitable duties of repentance and making their peace with God." (History Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 424.)"

The Parliament party was not at once successful. The advantage seemed to be with the Royalists for some time after the opening of the war. Concerning this, and its effect on the observance of the Sunday, Neale says:

"The Parliament's affairs being low, and their counsels divided, they not only applied to heaven by extraordinary fastings and prayers, but went on vigorously with their intended reformation. They began with the Sabbath, and on March 22d, 1642-3, sent to the Lord Mayor of the city of London, to desire him to put in execution the statutes for the due observation of the Lord's-day. His lordship, accordingly, issued his precept the very next day to the aldermen, requiring them to give strict charge to the church wardens and constables within their several wards, that from henceforth they do not permit or suffer any person or persons, in time of divine service, or at any time on the Lord's-day, to be tippling in any tavern, inn, tobacco shop, ale house or other victualing house whatsoever; nor suffer any fruiterers, or herb-women to stand with fruit, herbs or other victuals or wares in any streets, lanes or alleys, or any other ways to put things for sale at any time of that day, or in the evening of it; or any milk woman to cry milk; nor to suffer any persons to unlade any vessels of fruit or other goods, and carry them on shore; or to use any unlawful exercises or pastimes; and to give express charge to all inn keepers, taverns, cook shops, ale houses, etc., within their wards, not to entertain any guests to tipple, eat, drink or take tobacco in their houses on the Lord's-day, except inn-keepers, who may receive their ordinary guests, or travelers who come for the dispatch of their necessary business; and if any persons offend in the premises, they are to be brought before the Lord Mayor or one of his Majesty's justices of the peace to be punished as the law directs." This order had a very considerable influence upon the city, which began to wear a different face of religion to what it had formerly done. May 5th the book tolerating sports upon the Lord's-day was ordered to be burned by the hands of the common hangman in Cheapside and other usual places; and all persons having any copies in their hands were required to deliver them to one of the sheriffs of London to be burned." (Id. Vol. 1, p. 454.)"

This fanatical spirit and the desire to gain the blessing of God upon their cause led to a similar observance of other days. A monthly fast had been ordained, previous to the commencement of the war, in view of the troubles in Ireland. Concerning this, Mr. Neale speaks as follows:

Next to the Lord's-day, they had a particular regard to their monthly fast. April 24th, all constables, or their deputies were ordered to repair to every house within their respective liberties, the day before every public fast, and charge all persons strictly to observe it according to the said ordinances. And upon the day of the public fast, they were enjoined to walk through their said liberties, to search for persons who, either by following the work of their calling or sitting in taverns, victualing or ale houses, or in any other ways, should not duly observe the same, and to return their names to the Committee for examination, that they might be proceeded against

for contempt. The fast was observed the last Wednesday in every month, the public devotions continued with little or no intermission from nine in the morning till four in the afternoon, and (as has been already observed) with uncommon strictness and rigor. (Ibid.)

Then came the "Assembly of Divines at Westminster," the Solemn League and Covenant, the expulsion of the common prayer book of the Established Church, and the introduction of the Directory as the guide to worship in the Parliament churches, the expulsion of royal professors from the universities, etc. This brings us to the next enactment concerning Sunday, made by the Puritan Parliament, April 6, 1644. Neale briefly records with reference to it as follows:

"Religion was the fashion of the age. The Assembly was often turned into a house of prayer, and hardly a week passed without solemn fasting and humiliation in several of the churches of London and Westminster. The laws against profaneness were carefully executed, and because the former ordinances for the observation of the Lord's-day had proved ineffectual, it was ordained, April 6th, that all persons should apply themselves to the exercise of piety and religion on the Lord's-day; that no wares, fruits, herbs, or goods of any sort, be exposed to sale, or cried about the streets, upon penalty of forfeiting the goods. That no person without cause shall travel, or carry a burden or do any worldly labor, upon penalty of ten shillings for the traveler, and five shillings for every burden and for every offense in doing any worldly labor or work. That no person shall on the Lord's-day, use or be present at, any wrestling, shooting, fowling, ringing of bells for pleasure, markets, wakes, church-ales, dancing, games, or sports whatsoever, upon penalty of five shillings to every one above fourteen years of age. And if children are found offending in the premises, their parents or guardians to forfeit twelve pence for every offense. That all May poles be pulled down, and none others erected. That if the several fines above mentioned cannot be levied, the offending party shall be set in the stocks for the space of three hours. That the King's declaration concerning lawful sports on the Lord's-day be called in, suppressed and burned.

This ordinance shall not extend to prohibit dressing meat in private families, or selling victuals in a moderate way in inns or victualing houses, for the use of such as cannot otherwise be provided for; nor to the crying of milk before nine in the morning, or after four in the afternoon. (Ib., Vol. 1, p. 499, 500.)

Tracing the history of the Puritan party through these years of strife, years of wide-spread anarchy in church and state, the reader finds but few more enactments relative to the Sunday.

In 1650, stringent laws, with severe penalties, were enacted against all the prominent vices, such as profaneness, different forms of licentiousness, impious opinions concerning God and the Bible, drunkenness, etc. Sunday came in with these for its share.

Though several ordinances had been made heretofore for the strict observation of the Lord's-day, the present House of Commons thought fit to enforce them by another, dated April 9th, 1650, in which they ordain, "'that all goods cried, or put to sale on the Lord's-day, or other days of humiliation and thanksgiving appointed by authority, shall be seized. No wagoner or drover shall travel on the Lord's-day, on penalty often shillings for every offense. No persons shall travel in boats, coaches, or on horses, except to church, on penalty often shillings. The like penalty for being in a tavern. And where distress is not to be made, the offender is to be put in the stocks six hours. All peace officers are required to make diligent search for discovering offenders; and in case of neglect, the justice of peace is fined five pounds, and every constable twenty shillings.'" (Neale, Hist. Puritans, Vol. 2, p. 118.)"

A few years later, in 1656, Parliament made another effort to enforce the strict observance of Sunday, stimulated no doubt, in part, by the lawlessness of the Quakers, who were growing numerous, and who opened their shops, and otherwise violated the civil laws relative to Sunday observance. The enactment as given by Neale is as follows:

As new inroads were made upon the ordinances for observation of the Sabbath, the Parliament took care to amend them. This year they ordained that the Sabbath should be deemed to extend from twelve of the clock on Saturday night to twelve of the clock on Lord's-day night," and within that compass of time they prohibited all kinds of business and diversions, except works of necessity and mercy. No election of magistrates is to be on the Lord's-day; no holding of courts or return of writs, but if according to their charters they fall upon the Lord's-day, they are to be deferred to Monday. It is further enacted, that all persons not having a reasonable excuse, to be allowed by a justice of the peace, shall resort to some church or chapel where the true worship of God is performed, or to some meeting place of Christians not differing in matters of faith from the public profession of the nation, on a penalty of two shillings and sixpence for every offense. It is further ordered, that no minister shall be molested or disturbed in the discharge of his office on the Lord's-day, or any other day when he is performing his duty, or in going and coming from the place of public worship. Nor shall any willful disturbance be given to the congregation, on penalty of five pounds, or being sent to the workhouse for six months, provided the information be within one month after the offense is committed. This ordinance is to be read in every church or chapel in this nation annually, the first Lord's-day in every March." (Ib., Vol. 2, p. 166.)

Soon after this came the "Restoration," under Charles II., and Puritanism, as a controlling power in the government, passes out of sight. Whatever may be said concerning the course of the Puritan party as a political power, it is evident that the moral character of the people was much improved during its supremacy. Rigid and intolerant, it nevertheless possessed much more of true religion and vital piety than the formalists did who preceded and followed it. Many of the corrupt elements in church and state which could not be

reformed were exiled. But with the restoration under Charles II. these came swarming back, and in turn harrassed and drove out the Puritans. Mr. Neale sums up the case in these words:

"And here was an end of those distracted times which our historians have loaded with all the infamy and reproach that the wit of man could invent. The Puritan ministers have been decried as ignorant mechanics, canting preachers, enemies to learning, and no better than public robbers. The Universities were said to be reduced to a mere Munster, and that if the Goths and Vandals, and even the Turks had overrun the nation, they could not have done more to introduce barbarism, disloyalty and ignorance; and yet in these times, and by the men who then filled the university chairs were educated the most learned divines and eloquent preachers of the last age, as the Stillingfleets, Tillotsons, Bulls, Barrows, Whitbys and others, who retained a high veneration for their learned tutors after they were rejected and displaced. The religious part of the common people have been stigmatized with the character of hypocrites; their looks, their dress and behavior have been represented in the most odious colors; and yet, one may venture to challenge these declaimers to produce any period of time since the Reformation wherein there was less open profaneness and impiety and more of the spirit, as well as appearance of religion. Perhaps there was too much rigor and preciseness in indifferent matters: but the lusts of men were laid under a visible restraint, and though the legal constitution was unhappily broken, and men were governed by false politics, yet better laws were never made against vice, or more vigorously executed.

The dress and conversation of the people were sober and virtuous, and their manner of living remarkably frugal. There was hardly a single bankruptcy to be heard of in a year, and in such a case the bankrupt had a mark of infamy set upon him, that he could never wipe off. Drunkenness, fornication, profane swearing, and every kind of debauchery were justly deemed infamous, and universally discountenanced. The clergy were laborious to excess, in preaching and praying, in catechising youth, and visiting their parishes. The magistrates did their duty in suppressing all kinds of games, stage plays and abuses in public houses. There was not a play acted in any theater in England for almost twenty years. The Lord's-day was observed with unusual reverence; and there were a set of as learned and pious youths trained up in the University as had ever been known. So that if such a reformation of manners had obtained under a legal administration, they would have deserved the character of the best times.

But when the legal constitution was restored, there returned with it a torrent of debauchery and wickedness. The times which followed the Restoration were the reverse of those that preceded it; for the laws which had been enacted against vice for the last twenty years, being declared null, and the magistrates changed, men set no bounds to their licentiousness. A proclamation, indeed, was published against those loose and riotous cavaliers, whose loyalty consisted in drinking healths, and railing at those who would not revel with them. But, in reality, the King, was at the head of these disorders, being devoted to his pleasures, and having given himself up to an avowed course of lewdness. His bishops and chaplains said that he usually came from his mistresses' apartments to church, even on sacrament days. There were two playhouses erected in the neighborhood of the court. Women actresses were introduced into the theaters, which had not been known until that time; the most lewd and obscene plays were brought on the stage, and the more obscene, the King was the better pleased, who graced every new play with his royal presence. Nothing was to be seen at court but feasting, hard drinking, reveling and amorous intrigues, which engendered the most enormous vices. From court, the contagion spread like will-fire among the people, insomuch that men threw off the very profession of virtue and piety, under color of drinking the King's health. All kinds of old cavalier riotings and debauchery revived. The appearance of religion, which remained with some, furnished matters of ridicule to libertines and scoffers. Some who had been concerned in the former changes thought they could not redeem their credit better than by deriding all religion, and telling or making stories to render their former party ridiculous. To appear serious, or make conscience either of words or actions, was the way to be accounted a schismatic, a fanatic, or a sectarian, though, if there was any real religion during the course of this reign, it was chiefly among those people. They who did not applaud the new ceremonies were marked out for Presbyterians, and every Presbyterian was a rebel. The old clergy who had been sequestered for scandal, having taken possession of their livings, were intoxicated with their new felicity, and threw off all restraints of their order. Every week, says Mr. Baxter, (*Life*, part 2, p. 288) produced reports of one or other clergyman, who was taken up by the watch, drunk, at night, and mobbed in the streets. Some were taken with lewd women; and one was reported to be drunk in the pulpit. Such was the general dissoluteness of manners which attended the deluge of joy, which overflowed the nation upon his majesty's restoration. (*Id.*, Vol. 2, p. 208.)"

For twenty-five years (until 1683) did this profligate king, surrounded by a court like himself, carry on his ruinous rule. Sunday-observance shared largely in the general decline, specially since it had been maintained before in a great degree by the civil power. Popery, secretly favored by the King, grew strong. The Puritan or Parliament party, now known under the general name of Non-conformists, was divided into Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, etc., all of whom were bitterly persecuted. Among these, the Quakers, holding within their number many educated and influential men, though extremely strict in other respects, ignored all ideas of a Sabbath, or any obligation to observe days. (For their views, see Dymond's essays on the Principles of Morality, essay 2, chap. 1, and the Doctrines of Friends, by Elisha Bates, chap. 13.) Thus between the reigning dissoluteness and the revival of the earlier doctrine of "no sacred time," the strict observance of Sunday passed away.

It was not until the fifth year of the reign of George I. (1719) that a complete recognition of the Nonconformists, and a general toleration of dissenters was obtained. There was little or no improvement in the observance of Sunday until the middle of the eighteenth century. The Church of England still retains her old standards concerning Sunday. The English Dissenters are now much less rigid in their observance of Sunday than the Puritans were. The Church of Ireland has always been too nearly allied to the church

of England on this point to need any separate notice here. The Church of Scotland has been, and yet is more Puritanic concerning Sunday. The following, from the pen of Doctor Hessey, will sufficiently illustrate its most rigid features:

"Meanwhile, in Scotland, the Sabbatarian doctrines had taken deep root, and were improved into an elaborate system. Four examples shall suffice. In the year 1644 the Six Sessions ordained public intimation to be made that no person, man nor woman, shall be found vaging, walking, and going upon the streets upon the Lord's-day after the afternoon's sermon, keeping idle, and entertaining impertinent conferences."" In the next year, the same court ordained that ""the magistrates, attended by the ministers by course, shall go up and down the streets upon the Lord's-day after the afternoon sermon, and cause take particular notice of such as shall be found forth of their houses vaging abroad upon the streets, and cause cite them before the Session to be rebuked and censured." And on the 5th of April A.D., 1658, this direction was issued: "The magistrate to cause some English soldiers go along the streets, and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold upon both young and old whom they find out of their houses or out of the church."

My fourth instance shall be taken from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6, A.D., 1658: The said day, Alexander Cairnie, in Tilliochie was delatit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit that it was of necessitie for saving of the beast's lyfe in tyme of storme; was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke."" (Sunday, Lect. 7, p. 216, 217.)

Those who wish to follow the legislation concerning Sunday in England and Scotland will do well to refer to my "History of Sunday Legislation," published by D. Appleton & Co., New York.

The Sabbath In Europe Since The Reformation.

THE descendants of the Waldenses in Bohemia, Holland and other parts of Northern Europe, formed the material for Sabbath-keeping churches which came to light when the rays of Reformation began to illumine the long-continued night of Papal apostacy. These Sabbath-keepers were Baptists, and hence were classed with the despised "Anabaptists" during the early part of the sixteenth century. Most writers have, therefore, passed over the history of those years by saying of Sabbath-observance that it was "revived by some sectaries among the Anabaptists." When Sabbath-keepers were persons of prominence, more definite notice was taken of them. Enough can be gathered, however, to show that Sabbath-keepers were not uncommon on the continent of Europe from the opening of the sixteenth century forward. We have given all necessary details concerning these Sabbath-keepers in chapter fifteen of this volume. All the prominent writers concerning the Reformation in England recognize the connection between the English Seventh-day Baptists and the Sabbath-keeping Dissenters, of whom we have spoken in the fifteenth chapter. This connection is also recognized by writers since the English Reformation.

Mr. Gilfillan, a Scotch author, quotes a writer of the year 1585, one John Stockwood, who states that in those times there were "manifold disputations among the learned, and a great diversity of opinion among the vulgar people and simple sort, concerning the Sabbath-day, and the right use of the same, some maintaining the changed and unchangeable obligations of the Seventh-day Sabbath," etc. (Sabbath, etc., p. 60.)

Chambers' Cyclopedia refers to the Bohemian Sabbath-keepers and their successors as follows;

Accordingly, in the reign of Elizabeth, it occurred to many conscientious and independent thinkers, (as it had previously done to some Protestants in Bohemia,) that the Fourth Commandment required of them, the observance, not of the first, but of the specified seventh day of the week, and a strict bodily rest, as a service then due to God. They became numerous enough to make a considerable figure for more than a century in England, under the title of Sabbatarians" - a word now exchanged for the less ambiguous appellation of "Seventh-day Baptist." ... They have mostly disappeared in England, though in the seventeenth century so numerous and active as to have called forth replies from Bishop White, Warner, Baxter, Bunyan, Wallis and others." (Article, Sabbath Vol. 8. London, 1866.) Thus it is seen that there were Protestant Sabbath-keeping Baptists in Bohemia, Holland and England in the beginning of the sixteenth century. This link unites the past with the present, and gives an unbroken chain of Sabbath-keepers from the days of Christ, Lord of the Sabbath, to the present hour. The church has never been without witnesses for the truth concerning God's holy day.

The development and organization of Seventh-day Baptists in England is easily traced. In these pages this will be done by noting some of the Seventh-day Baptist authors and martyrs whose names appear in history.

Among the notable ones who taught the truth relative to the Sabbath, and suffered for it, was John Trask spelled also Trasque and Thraske. Ephriam Paggitt, in his "Church Herisiography," devotes more than fifty pages to the history of Trask, his wife and his followers. From this it appears that he first began to observe Sunday according to the law of the Fourth Commandment. One of his comrades, Lackson, (Hessey says Jackson) carrying the question on to its legitimate results, taught that the day mentioned in the law

must be observed - the seventh and not the first day. Trask accepted this, and many more with him. Paggitt mentions William Hillyard, Christopher Sands, Mrs. Mary Chester, who was afterwards imprisoned, and Rev. Mr. Wright and his wife. He also mentions in the same connection "One Mr. Hebden, a prisoner in the new prison, that lay there for holding Saturday Sabbath." Mrs. Chester was kept in prison for some time, but was finally released upon her apparent conversion to the church. But her tendency to the truth was too strong, and "twelve months after she was set at liberty she relapsed into her former errors." Paggitt charges Trask and his followers with Judaical opinions concerning Christ; but the charge grew out of the fact that they observed the Sabbath, and no "official" charge of this kind was made against them on their trials. Mrs. Trask, before her imprisonment, kept a private school for children, having one assistant teacher who was also a Sabbath-keeper. Attention was drawn to her Sabbatarian principles, from the fact that she would not teach upon the Sabbath, and on the trial she was condemned to imprisonment, (See Paggitt, p. 209.) concerning which Paggitt speaks as follows:

His wife, Mistress Trask, lay for fifteen or sixteen years a prisoner for her opinions about the Saturday-Sabbath; in all which time she would receive no relief from anybody, notwithstanding she wanted much, alledging that it is written, it's a more blessed thing to give than to receive." Neither would she borrow. She deemed it a dishonor to her head, Christ, either to beg or borrow. Her diet for the most part of her imprisonment, that is till a little before her death, was bread and water, roots and herbs. No flesh, nor wine, nor brewed drink. . . . She charged the keeper of the prison not to bury her in church nor churchyard, but in the fields only; which accordingly was done. All her means was an annuity of forty shillings a year; what she lacked more to live upon, she had of such prisoners as did employ her sometimes to do business for them. But this was only within the prison, for out of the prison she would not go, so she sickened and died. So there was an end to the sect in less than half a generation. 'Tis true it begins of late to be revived again; but yet faintly. The progress it makes is not observed to be much; so that of all gangrenes of spirit, with which the times are troubled, as yet it spreads little; and therefore it is hoped a short caveat (such as this is) may suffice against it." (p. 196. This was written in 1661, forty years after the trial of Trask.)

Trask was brought before the infamous "Star Chamber" in 1618, and tried upon the following charges, which appear in the speech of Bishop Andrews against him. (See Paggitt, p. 199.) The Bishop states that his fault consisted in trying to make "Christian men, the people of God, His Majesty's subjects, little better than Jews. This he doth in two points, and when he takes it in his head, he may do it in two and two and two more."

These are the specifications:

"One is, Christians are bound to abstain from those meats which the Jews were forbidden in Leviticus. The other that they are bound to observe the Jewish Sabbath."

Bishop Andrews labors, in a lengthy speech, to prove both these positions heretical. There is no argument of importance adduced in the speech. It does however contain that somewhat noted passage, *Dominicum Servasti*," etc. (see chapter vii.), which leaves no shadow of doubt that he was the author of it, and shows also that he gives no authority for it. This trial resulted in the following sentence, which was executed upon Trask: "Set upon the Pillory at Westminster, and from thence to be whipped to the fleet, there to remain prisoner."

He afterwards made a recantation and was released, whereupon he wrote a book in 1620, as evidence of his conversion, entitled,

A Treatise of Liberty from Judaism, or an Acknowledgement of True Christian Liberty. Indited and Published by John Trask, of the late Stumbling, now Happily Running in the Race of Christianity. (See Heylyn Hist. Sab., part 2, chap. 8, sec. 10; Cox Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, pp. 152, 153.)

Thus did the hand of persecution suppress the first prominent development of Sabbath truth in England. The suppression was, however, neither complete nor of long duration. Eight years later Theophilus Brabourne, of Norfolk, published his first book, entitled, "A discourse upon the Sabbath-day; Wherein are handled these particulars ensuing: 1. That the Lord's-day is not the Sabbath-day by divine institution. 2. An exposition of the Fourth Commandment, so far forth as may give light unto the ensuing discourse; and particularly here it is shown at what time the Sabbath-day should begin and end, for the satisfaction of those who are doubtful on this point. 3. That the Seventh-day Sabbath is not abolished. 4. That the Seventh-day Sabbath is now still in force. 5. The author's exhortation and reasons that nevertheless, there be no Rent from our Church as touching practice. - 1628, 18mo. p. 238."

Cox says:

Brabourne is a much abler writer than Trask, and may be regarded as the founder in England of the sect at first known as Sabbatarians, but now calling themselves Seventh-day Baptists. This sect arose in Germany in the sixteenth century. Heylyn holds that in setting up their doctrine they built fairly on the Puritan foundations, and ploughed with no other than their heifers." ...

Towards the conclusion of the treatise, he thus appeals to the prudence of his readers: "And now let me propound unto your choice these two days, the Sabbath-day on Saturday, or the Lord's-day on Sunday; and keep whether of the twain you shall in conscience find the more safe. If you keep the Lord's-day, but profane the Sabbath-day, you walk in great danger and peril (to say the least) of transgressing one of God's eternal and inviolable laws, the Fourth Commandment; but on the other side, if you keep the Sabbath-day, though you profane the Lord's-day, you are out of all gunshot and danger, for so you transgress no law at all, since Christ nor his apostles did ever leave any law for it. (Brabourne, p. 290. Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 157, 158.)

Two years later Brabourne issued a more exhaustive work, the first edition of which was published in 1630, and the second in 1632. A copy of the first edition is before us, wanting only the title page, which we copy from Cox's notice of the second edition. It is as follows:

"A defense of that most ancient and sacred Ordinance of God's, the Sabbath-day. . . . Undertaken against all Anti-Sabbatarians, both of Protestants, Papists, Antinomians and Anabaptists; and by name and especially against these X Ministers: M. Greenwood. M. Hutchinson, M. Furnace, M. Benton, M. Gallard, M. Yates, M. Chappel, M. Stinnet, M. Johnson, and M. Warde. The Second Edition, corrected and amended; with the supply of many things formally omitted. 1632, 4to, pp. 633. (Cox, Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 162.)

Through this book the name of Brabourne became inseparably connected with the true Sabbatarianism of those times. The character and influence of the work is shown in the fact that Bishop Francis White, by order of the King, prepared an answer to it, entitled, *A Treatise on the Sabbath-day, Containing a Defense of the Orthodoxal Doctrine of the Church of England, against Sabbatarian Novelty.*" - London, 1635. In his dedication to Archbishop Laud, White speaks of Brabourne as follows:"

"A certain Minister of Northfolk, where I myself of late years was Bishop, published a Tractate of the Sabbath; and, proceeding after the rule of Presbyterian principles, among which, this was principal: That all religious observations and actions, and among the rest, the ordaining and keeping of Holy days, must have a special warrant and commandment in Holy Scripture, otherwise the same is superstitious; concluded from thence, by necessary inference, that the seventh day of every week, to wit, Saturday, having an express command in the Decalogue, by a precept simply and perpetually moral, (as the Sabbatarians teach) and the Sunday or Lord's-day being not commanded, either in the Law or in the Gospel the Saturday must be the Christian's weekly Sabbath, and the Sunday ought to be the working day." "...."

Now because his *Treatise of the Sabbath* was dedicated to his Royal Majesty, and the principles upon which he grounded all his arguments, (being commonly preached, printed and believed, throughout the kingdom,) might have poisoned and infected many people, either with this Sabbatarian error, or with some other of like quality; it was the King our gracious Master, his will and pleasure, that a treatise should be set forth to prevent further mischief, and to settle his good subjects (who have long time been distracted about Sabbatarian questions) in the old and good way of the ancient and Orthodoxal Catholic Church." (Introduction, near the close.)

Bishop White was well qualified to write, and he produced a work which, except the *History of the Sabbath* by Peter Heylyn, was stronger than any of the books put forth by the churchmen of those times. Brabourne was summoned before the "High Commission, whose well tempered severity herein so prevailed upon him that, submitting himself to a private conference, and perceiving the unsoundness of his principles, he became a convert, conforming himself quietly to the Church of England." (See Fuller's *Church History*, Book 10, century XVII., section 32; also Brook's *Lives of Puritans*, Vol. 2, p. 362, and White, p. 305.)

This "quiet conformity to the Church of England" on the part of Brabourne was evidently only a temporary wavering, for he "wrote after-wards, and a composition of his against Cawdrey, which came out in 1654, gives evidence that he was still a Seventh-day Baptist." He was overborne for the moment, rather than permanently changed, since his "preface" contained a candid and calm discussion of the causes which impelled him to write and the consequences which might follow. On this very point he says:

The soundness and clearness of this my cause, giveth me good hope that God will enlighten them [the magistrates] with it, and so incline their hearts unto mercy. But if not, since I verily believe and know it to be a truth, and my duty not to smother it, and suffer it to die with me, I have adventured to publish it and defend it, saying with Queen Esther, If I perish, I perish;" and with the Apostle Paul; "neither is my life dear unto me, so that I may fulfill my course with joy." What a corrosive would it prove to my conscience, on my death-bed, to call to mind how I knew these things full well, but would not reveal them. How could I say with St. Paul, that I had revealed the whole counsel of God, had kept nothing back which was profitable? What hope could I then conceive that God would open his gate of mercy to me, who, while I lived, would not open my mouth for him." (This "Introduction" is not pagged. This passage is from his address to the reader.)

There is further evidence that he held to the Sabbath, for Mr. Cox (*Sabbath Literature*, Vol. 2, p. 6,) notices another book from his pen in reply to two books against the Sabbath, one by Ives and the other by Warner. This last work by Brabourne was published at London, in 1659. It thus appears that he published four books in favor of the Sabbath. Next upon the list stands the name of James Ockford, a follower of Brabourne, who issued a work in 1642, entitled "*The Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment.*" Something concerning its

character and history may be gleaned from a work in favor of Sunday by Cawdrey and Palmer, published in 1652. In part third, section thirty-three, is found the following:

"But before we conclude this chapter, we shall take a brief survey of what a later Sabbatarian hath written, being, it seems, unsatisfied (as well he might) with all that hath been said by the Bishop, (referring to Bishop White's answer to Brabourne and others in his way, in answer to the Sabbatarian arguments. One James Ockford (as we hinted above) hath revived the quarrel, and makes use of his adversaries weapons to beat themselves withal. There hath been a sharp confutation of his book by fire, it being commanded to be burnt, as perhaps it well deserved. Yet lest he should complain of harsh dealing, no answer being given him, for his satisfaction, though all his arguments are already confuted in this present discourse, we shall give him a brief account of our judgment concerning his whole book - we think to a full satisfaction. (p. 446.)"

Cawdrey and Palmer were members of the Assembly of Divines, and wrote from the Puritan standpoint. Their review of Ockford's book, and the book itself, show that his arguments were well sustained. About ten years later, Edward Fisher published a book in favor of the Sabbath, entitled "A Christian Caveat," etc. This work passed through at least five editions. Cox speaks of it as "A pithy, clever treatise directed against the opinions held by the Puritans, of whom he affirms that, because they are neither able to produce direct Scripture nor solid reason for what they say, they labor to support their conceits by fallacies, falsities and wrestling of God's Holy Word, as upon scanning, their proofs will be manifest to the meanest capacity." (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 237.) Portions of this Caveat, by Fisher, were republished by the American Sabbath Tract Society, in 1853, as No. 5 of a Bound Volume of Tracts.

The name Edward Stennet stands next upon the list; his first work in favor of the Sabbath was entitled,

"THE ROYAL LAW CONTENDED FOR; OR, Some brief Grounds serving to prove that the Ten Commandments are yet in full force, and shall so remain till Heaven and Earth pass away, etc. (London, 1658.)

By a Lover of Peace with Truth, Edward Stennet.

They that forsake the Law praise the wicked, but such as keep the law contend with them."" Prov. 28:4."

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter, Fear God and keep His Commandments, for this is the whole duty of man. Ecc. 12:13.

The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath. Mark 2: 27, 28.

Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all Thy Commandments. Psa. 119:6."

This work was republished by the American Sabbath Tract Society in 1848. From the preface to that edition we extract the following notice concerning the author:

"The friends of the Sabbath will doubtless receive this little volume as a valuable relic of the past - as a word from one of the tried and faithful friends of the truth, one who not only loved the day of God's weekly rest, but greatly delighted in the promise of a future and glorious Sabbathism with the people of God. Edward Stennet, the author, was the first of a series of Sabbatarian ministers of that name, who for four generations continued to be among the foremost of the Dissenters in England, and whose praise is still in all the churches. He was an able and devoted minister, but dissenting from the Established Church, he was deprived of the means of support; and his family being large, he applied himself to the study of medicine, by the practice of which he was enabled to give his sons a liberal education. He suffered much of the persecution which the Dissenters were exposed to at that time, and more especially for his faithful adherence to the cause of the Sabbath. For this truth, he experienced tribulation, not only from those in power, by whom he was kept a long time in prison, but also much distress from unfriendly dissenting brethren, who strove to destroy his influence, and ruin his cause. He wrote several treatises upon the subject of the Sabbath besides this, but they are very rare, and perhaps cannot all be found in a perfect state of preservation.

It would be well, no doubt, to revive all of them, and, if practicable, republish them in the same form as this, that they might be bound together, and placed, as they deserve to be, in every Sabbath-keeper's library. They all breathe the genuine spirit of Christianity, and in their day were greatly conducive to the prosperity of the Sabbath-keeping churches."

Another work from his pen, entitled "The Seventh-day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and published in 1664, is before us. It is an able reply to a book by one Mr. Russel, entitled "No Seventh-day Sabbath Recommended by Jesus Christ."

Next comes a book by William Sellers, published in 1671, the title of which runs as follows: "An examination of the late book published by Doctor Owen, concerning a Sacred Day of Rest. Many Truths therein, as to the morality of a Christian Sabbath, assented to. With a Brief Inquiry into his Reasons for the Change of it from the seventh day to the first, by way of denial. As also the consent of Doctor Heylyn and others, touching the time and manner of the change. With an Inquiry into the nature of the assertions about the first and second covenants." 4to, pp. 56.

Next in order is the name of an author whose works were prominently associated with the history of the Seventh-day Baptists in England during the last half of the seventeenth century, Francis Bampfield. He wrote at least two works upon the Sabbath, besides others of a scientific and literary character. The first work on the Sabbath is entitled, "The Judgment of Mr. Francis Bampfield, late Minister of Sherbourne in Dorsetshire, for the Observation of the Jewish or Seventh-day Sabbath; with his Reasons and Scripture for the same. Sent in a letter to Mr. Ben of Dorchester. Together with Mr. Ben's sober Answer to the Same, and a Vindication of the Christian Sabbath against the Jewish, Published for the satisfaction of divers friends in the West of England." London, 1672, 12mo., pp. 86. His second work bears the following title:

Sabbatike hemera hemera hiera, Septima Dies Desiderabilis, Sabbatum Jehovahae. The Seventh-day Sabbath the desirable day, the closing, completing day of that first created week, which was, is, and will be, the just measure of all succeeding weeks in their successive courses, both for working in the six foregoing days, and for rest in the Seventh, which is the last day, by an unchangeable law of well established order, both in the revealed Word and in created Nature. (1677, Fol., pp. 149.)

The character of this man and his sufferings in behalf of the truth, are shown in the words of an English author of later time, Edmund Calamy, who gives the following account of him:

"He was descended from an ancient and honorable family in Devonshire, and being designed for the ministry from his birth, was educated accordingly; his own inclination concurring with the design of his pious parents. When he left the university (where he continued seven or eight years) he was ordained a Deacon of the Church of England by Bp Hall and afterwards Presbyter by Bp Skinner, and was soon after preferred to a living in Dorsetshire, of about one hundred pounds per annum, where he took great pains to instruct his people, and promote true religion among them. Having an annuity of eighty pounds a year settled upon him for life, he spent all the income of his place in acts of charity among his parishioners, in giving them Bibles and other good books, setting the poor to work, and relieving the necessities of those that were disabled; not suffering a beggar, knowingly, to be in his parish: While he was here he began to see that in many ways the Church of England needed reformation, in regard to doctrine, worship and discipline; and therefore, as became a faithful minister, he heartily set about it, making the laws of Christ his only rule. But herein he met great opposition and trouble. (Non-Conformists Memorial, Vol. 1, p. 468, London, 1775.)

When the Act of Uniformity was passed, in 1662, being unable to conform to its requirements, Mr. Bampfield gave up his place, and though he was strictly loyal in all the political troubles of those times, he nevertheless suffered much on account of his nonconformity. Soon after his ejection he was imprisoned for worshipping God in his own family. "Injustice and cruelty were shown him in these minor imprisonments; but he was doomed to much greater trials and sufferings, for we learn from Calamy that Mr. Bampfield afterward suffered eight years imprisonment in Dorchester jail, which he bore with great courage and patience, being filled with the comfort of the Holy Ghost. He also preached in the prison, almost every day, and gathered a church there. Upon his discharge in 1675, he went about preaching the Gospel in several counties. But he was soon taken up again for it in Wiltshire, and imprisoned at Salisbury; where, on account of a fine, he continued eighteen weeks. During this time he wrote a letter which was printed, giving an account of his imprisonment, and the joy he had in his sufferings for Christ. Upon his release he came to London, where he preached privately several years with great success, and gathered a people; who, being baptized by immersion (Mr. Bampfield having become a Baptist), formed themselves into a church, and met at Pinner's Hall, which, being so public, soon exposed them to the rage of their persecutors."

On Feb. 17, 1682, a constable and several men with halberds, rushed into the assembly when Mr. Bampfield was in the pulpit. The constable ordered him in the king's name to come down. He answered that he was discharging his office in the name of the King of kings. The constable telling him he had a warrant from the Lord Mayor, Mr. Bampfield replied: "I have a warrant from Christ, who is Lord Maximus, to go on," and so proceeded in his discourse. The constable then bid one of the officers pull him down; when he repeated his text; Isa. 63d., "The day of vengeance is in his heart, and the year of his redeemed ones is come;" adding, "He will pull down his enemies." They then seized him and took him with six others, before the Lord Mayor, who find several of them 10 pounds, and bid Mr. Bampfield begone. In the afternoon they assembled at the same place again, where they met with a fresh disturbance, and an officer, though not without trembling, took Mr. Bampfield and led him into the street; but the constable having no warrant, they let him go, so he went with a great company, to his own house, and there finished the service.

On the 24th of the same month, he met his congregation again at Pinner's Hall, and was again pulled out of the pulpit, and led through the streets with his Bible in his hand, and great multitudes after him; some reproaching him, and others speaking in his favor: one of whom said, "See how he walks with his Bible in his hand, like one of the old martyrs." Being brought to the sessions where the Lord Mayor then was he and three more were sent to prison. The next day they were brought to the bar, and being examined were remitted to Newgate. On March 17, 1683, he and some others, who were committed for not taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, were brought to the Old Bailey, indicted, tried, and by the jury (directed by the Judge) brought in guilty. On March 28, being brought again to the sessions to receive their sentence, the recorder, after odiously aggravating their offense, and reflecting on scrupulous consciences, read their sentence, which was: "That they were out of the protection of the King's Majesty; that all their goods and chattels were forfeited, and they were to remain in jail during their lives, or during the King's pleasure." Upon this Mr. Bampfield would have spoken, but there was a great uproar - "Away with them, we will not hear them," etc., and so they were thrust away; when

Mr. Bampffield said, "The righteous Lord loveth righteousness; the Lord be judge in this case." They were then returned to Newgate, where Mr. Bampffield (who was of a tender constitution) soon after died in consequence of the hardships he suffered, much lamented by his fellow prisoners, as well as by his friends in general. Notwithstanding his peculiar sentiments, all who knew him acknowledged that he was a man of serious piety, and deserved a different treatment from what he met with from an unkind world. He was one of the most celebrated preachers in the West of England, and extremely admired by his hearers, till he fell into the Sabbatarian notion, of which he was a zealous asserter. (Non-conformists Memorial, Vol. 1, pp. 470-472. London. 1775.)

Thus even the enemies of the Sabbath bear highest testimony in favor of this noble martyr for the truth.

In 1692 there appeared a work from Thomas Bampffield, a brother of the man mentioned above. Its title runs as follows:

An enquiry whether the Lord Jesus Christ made the world, and be Jehovah, and give the Moral law, and whether the Fourth Commandment be repealed or not.

This work was answered by John Wallis, D.D., Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford, which elicited a second book in reply by Mr. Bampffield, entitled, A Reply to Dr. Wallis, his Discourse concerning the Christian Sabbath. (London, 1683.)

An examination of these works shows that he was a writer of no mean ability. He was a Barrister, and being less connected with the church and theological matters than his brother, does not appear as prominently in history. He is however noticed by both Calamy and Cox. Wallis wrote a second book in reply to Thos. Bampffield's second work, which was published in 1694.

Passing into the next century, another book comes before the public in 1724, from the pen of George Carlow, entitled, "Truth defended, or Observations on Mr. Ward's expository discourses from the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, concerning the Sabbath." This work was reprinted in America, at Stonington, Conn., in 1802, and again by the American Sabbath Tract Society, in New York. The following historic notice of the author is taken from the American edition of 1847.

Of the personal history of George Carlow, but little is known. He was a member of the Sabbath-keeping church which once flourished at Woodbridge, Suffolk, Eng. Having visited London, probably for purposes connected with the publication of his book, he was recommended to the fellowship of the church of Mill Yard, in Goodman's Fields. Hence his name appears upon the records of that church as a transient member. He was evidently a man of plain parts, not schooled in the rules of logic, but learned in the Scriptures. From that fountain of true wisdom, the Word of God, he had imbibed a spirit which gives a pungency and heart-searching character to his writings not often found in books of controversy. The argumentative part of the subject is not perhaps so well managed in this book as in some more modern publications. But as the author was well read in the controversies concerning the Sabbath, the historical information which he presents is very valuable. The whole work is characterized by a spirit of evangelical piety and earnestness which must make its influence powerful and salutary wherever read.

A pastor of the "Mill Yard Seventh-day Baptist church," in London, Robert Cornthwaite, published five books upon the Sabbath question. The first was published about 1733, and the last in 1740. These are their titles in order:

1. Reflections on Dr. Wright's Treatise on the Religious observation of the Lord's-day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment, showing the inconclusiveness of the Doctor's reasoning on that subject, and the impossibility of grounding the First-day Sabbath on the Fourth Commandment, or any other text of Scripture produced by him for that purpose.

2. The Seventh-day of the week the Christian Sabbath. (London, 1735.)

3. The Seventh-day Sabbath farther vindicated, or a Defense of some Reflections on Dr. Wright's Treatise on the Religious observation of the Lord's-day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment; as, also, of the Seventh-day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, against the exceptions of Mr. Caleb Flemming. [An Unitarian minister whose work was published the same year. London, 1736.]

4. A Second Defense of some Reflections on Dr. Wright's Treatise on the Religious observation of the Lord's-day, etc., against the exceptions of Mr. Caleb Flemming, in which his explication of Gen. 2:2,3, is considered, and shown to be as inconsistent as the Doctor's Explication of the Fourth Commandment; and the Seventh-day Sabbath is proved to oblige all Christians on Protestant principles. (London, about 1737.)

5. An Essay on the Sabbath, or a modest attempt towards a plain, Scriptural resolution of the following questions. 1. Whether the Seventh-day Sabbath was given to Adam in Paradise. 2. Whether the same now obliges Christians, occasioned by the following pieces lately wrote upon the subject, viz.: Mr. Hallett's Discourse on the Lord's-day; Mr. Jephson's Discourse concerning the Religious Observation of the Lord's day, etc. Mr. Chubb's Dissertation concerning the Time of Keeping a Sabbath. Mr. Killingworth's Appendix to his Supplement to the sermons preached at Salter's Hall, against Popery; Mr. Dobels Seventh-day Sabbath not obligatory on

Christians, and his Appendix; and Dr. Watts' Holiness of Times, Places and People. In which everything judged material, offered by any of these gentlemen on the negative side of either of the above mentioned questions, is impartially considered. (London, 1740.)

Robert Cox (Sabbath Literature, Vol. 2, p. 198) quotes largely from this work, and says:

Mr. Cornthwaite is one of the ablest defenders of the positions taken up by Seventh-day Baptists.

It will be seen by the titles that Mr. Cornthwaite's books were mostly controversial. They were widely circulated, and the replies to them were written by some of the most eminent men of those times.

ORGANIZATION OF SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST CHURCHES IN ENGLAND.

The Seventh-day Baptists were the most radical reformers, and the most fearless dissenters who took part in the English Reformation. Every influence opposed the organization of such men into churches; even their public meetings were prohibited at times by law. Hence not many churches were permanently organized until about 1650.

Between that time and the close of the century, at least eleven churches were organized, and there were many unorganized groups of Sabbath-keepers scattered through the kingdom. These churches were located at Braintree, in Essex, Chersey, Norweston and Salisbury, in Wiltshire, Sherbourne, in Buckinghamshire, Tewksbury, or Natton, in Gloucestershire, Wallingford, in Berkshire, Woodbridge, in Suffolk; and three in London, viz.: the Mill Yard church, the Cripplegate church, and the Pinner's Hall Church. We have space only to add that from the English churches the Seventh-day Baptists were planted in America, as will be seen in a succeeding chapter. These English Seventh-day Baptists connecting with their Waldensian ancestors keep the links unbroken between the Seventh-day Baptists of the United States and the Apostolic church, as it was before the Sunday made war on God's Holy Day, through the help of the civil law and Pagan cult.

Sunday In America - Colonial Period.

ABOUT the beginning of the seventeenth century, certain dissenters fled from England to Holland. Failing to succeed in propagating their views among the Hollanders, and finding their own purity on the decline, they determined to seek a home in the New World. They reached America in 1620, and settled at New Plymouth. In 1629 a large colony from England joined them. This was the birth of New England, and the establishing of Puritanism in America. The civil government which these men adopted was the direct outgrowth of their religion. The theocracy of the Hebrews under Moses furnished the model after which it was patterned. The result was more than a union of church and state; it was rather a state in the church. In the civil laws of those time we find the practical expression of the orthodox theology; and in the execution of those laws, an index to the vitality and power of the prevailing religion. It is, therefore, suited to the purposes of this chapter to collect the laws of the early colonists concerning Sunday, and, as far as may be necessary, to sketch the history of their execution.

There were no direct statute laws concerning the observance of Sunday during the earlier years of the Plymouth Colony. There was, however, a rigid common law, founded on the laws of the Jewish Theocracy. In 1650, June 10th, the general court enacted the following:

Further be it enacted, that whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day by doing any servile work, or any such like abuse, shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings, or be whipped.

In 1651, June 6th:

It is enacted by the court that whatsoever person or persons shall neglect the frequenting the public worship of God that is according to God, in the places where they live, or do assemble themselves upon any pretense whatsoever, contrary to God and the allowance of the government, tending to the subversion of religion and churches, or palpable profanation of God's holy ordinances, being duly convicted, viz., every one that is a master or dame of a family, or any other person at their own disposing, to pay ten shillings for every such default. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, pp. 57, 58.)

It is also

"Enacted by the Court, that if any in any lazy, slothful or profane way doth neglect to come to the public worship of God, they shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings, or be whipped. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, p. 58.) In 1658, we have the following:

Whereas, complaint is made of great abuses in sundry places in this government of profaning the Lord's day by travelers, both horse and foot, by bearing of burdens, carrying of packs, etc., upon the Lord's-day, to the great offense of the godly, well-affected amongst us: It is therefore enacted by the court, and the authority thereof, that if any person or persons shall be found transgressing in any of the precincts of any township within this Government, he or they shall be forthwith apprehended by the constable of such town and fined twenty shillings to the colony's use, or else set in the stocks four hours, except they can give a sufficient reason for their so doing; and they that transgress in any of the above said particulars, shall only be apprehended on the Lord's-day; and on the second day following shall either pay their fine, or sit in the stocks as aforesaid. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, p. 100.)"

The general laws concerning attendance on public worship passed in 1651 were repealed in 1659, and the following was enacted, and repeated in 1661.

"It is enacted by the court, that whatsoever person or persons shall frequently absent or neglect, upon the Lord's-day, the public worship of God that is approved of by this government, shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, p. 122.)

The following Sunday Excise Law"" was enacted in 1662:"

"Whereas, complaint in made of some Ordinary keepers, in this jurisdiction, that they do allow persons to stay on the Lord's-day, drinking in their houses in the interims of times between the exercises, especially young persons and such as stand not in need thereof: It is enacted by the court and the authority thereof, that no Ordinary keeper in this government, shall draw any wine or liquor on the Lord's-day, for any, except in cases of necessity, for the relief of those that are sick, or faint, or the like, for their refreshing, on the penalty of paying a fine of ten shillings for every default. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, p. 137.)

In 1662 the court urges the strict enforcement of the laws against traveling and unlawful meetings on Sunday. (Ib., p. 140.)

In 1682 the general court, sitting at Plymouth, enacted the following:

To prevent profanation of the Lord's-day by foreigners, or any others, unnecessarily traveling through our towns on that day: It is enacted by the court, that a fit man in each town be chosen, unto whom, whomsoever hath necessity of travel on the Lord's-day in case of danger of death or such necessitous occasions, shall repair and making out such occasions satisfyingly to him, shall receive a ticket from him to pass on about such like occasions, which if the traveler attend not unto it shall be lawful for the constable or any man that meets him, to take him up, and stop him until he be brought before authority, or pay his fine for such transgression, as by law in that case is provided. And if it after shall appear that his plea was false, then may he be apprehended at another time, and made to pay his fine as aforesaid. (Ib., p. 258.)"

In 1674 further legislation against liquor selling took place as follows:

It is enacted by the court, that as to the restraining of abuses in ordinaries," that no ordinary keeper shall sell or give any kind of drink to inhabitants of the town upon the Lord's-day; and also that all ordinary keepers be required to clear their houses of all town dwellers and strangers that are there (on a drinking account), except such as lodge in the house, by the shutting in of the daylight, upon the forfeiture of five shillings, the one-half to the informer, and the other half to the town's use. (Ib., p. 236.)

In the year 1665 the following law was enacted against Sleeping in Church:

"Whereas, complaint is made unto the court, of great abuse in sundry towns of this jurisdiction, by persons there behaving themselves profanely, by being without doors at the meeting house on the Lord's-days in time of exercise, and there misdeameaning themselves by jesting, sleeping, or the like: It is enacted by the court and hereby ordered that the constables of each township in this jurisdiction shall, in their respective towns, take special notice of such persons, and to admonish them; and if notwithstanding, they shall persist on in such practices, that he shall set them in the stocks, and in case this will not reclaim them, that they return their names to the Court. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, p. 214.)

Four years later, July, 1669, this law was further added to as follows:

It is enacted by the court, that the constable or his deputy in each respective town of this Government, shall diligently look after such as sleep or play about the meeting house in times of the public worship of God on the Lord's-day, and take notice of their names, and return such of them to the court who do not, after warning given to them, reform."

As also that unnecessary violent riding on the Lord's-day the persons that so offend, their names to be returned to the next court after the said offense.

It is enacted by the court, that any person or persons that shall be found smoking of tobacco on the Lord'sday, going to or coming from the meetings, within two miles of the meeting house, shall pay twelve pence for every such default to the colony's use." (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, pp. 224, 225.)

In 1668 the matter of attendance on public worship was again taken up, and the following law enacted:

"Whereas, the court takes notice of great neglect of frequenting the public worship of God on the Lord'sday; it is enacted by the court and the authority thereof that the selectmen in each township of this Government shall take notice of such in their townships as neglect, through profaneness or slothfulness, to come to the public worship of God, and shall require an account of them; and if they give them not satisfaction, that then they return their names to the court. (Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. 11, pp. 217, 218.)

This not having the desired effect, the following was enacted in June, 1670:

For the further prevention of the profanation of the Lord's-day, it is enacted by the court and the authority thereof, that the selectmen of the several towns of this jurisdiction, or any one of them, may, or shall, as there may be occasion, take with him the constable or his deputy, and repair to any house or place where they may suspect that any slothfully do lurk at home, or get together in companies, to neglect the public worship of God, or profane the Lord's-day; and, finding any such disorder, shall return the names of the persons to the next court, and give notice also of any particular miscarriage that they have taken notice of, that it may be inquired into. (Ib., p. 228.)"

In 1652, and again in 1656, laws were passed prohibiting Indians from hunting, working or playing on Sunday within the limits of the colony. (Ib., pp. 60, 184.)

In 1691 Plymouth became united to Massachusetts under a new charter, from which time their histories are identical.

MASSACHUSETTS-BAY COLONY.

There were no formal statutes concerning Sunday by the local authorities of this colony during the first years of its existence. The First General Letter from the governor and deputy of the Company in England, dated April 17, 1629, contained the following instruction:

"And to the end the Sabbath may be celebrated in a religious manner, we appoint that all that inhabit the plantation, both for the general and particular employments, may surcease their labor every Saturday throughout the year, at three of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catechising, and preparations for the Sabbath, as the ministers may direct. (Mass. Col. Rec., Vol. 1, p. 395.)

This instruction and the Common Law, like that of the Plymouth Colony, formed the basis of the earliest customs. In the formation of the government, upon those points wherein the civil authorities were in doubt concerning any question, the matter was referred to the Elders. Among the Answers of the Reverend Elders to certain questions propounded to them, November 13, 1644, is the following, which, as the reader will see, suggests the death penalty for profaning Sunday:

The striking of a neighbor may be punished with some pecuniary mulct, when the striking of a father may be punished with death. So any sin committed with an high hand, as the gathering of sticks on the Sabbath-day, may be punished with death, when a lesser punishment might serve for gathering sticks privily, and in some need. (Ib., Vol. 2, p. 93.)"

Concerning this point, Hutchinson, the historian, says:

"In the first draught of the laws by Mr. Cotton, which I have seen, corrected with Mr. Winthrop's hand, diverse other offenses were made capital, viz., profaning the Lord's-day in a careless or scornful neglect or contempt thereof. Numbers 15:30-36. (Hist. Mass., Vol. 1, p. 390.)

On the 4th of November, 1646, the general court decreed:

That wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established, according to the order of the gospel, throughout this jurisdiction, every person shall duly resort and attend thereunto, respectively upon the Lord's-days, and upon such public fast days and days of thanksgiving as are to be generally held by the appointment of authority. And if any person within this jurisdiction shall, without just and necessary cause, withdraw himself from learning the public ministry of the Word, after due means of conviction used, he shall forfeit for his absence from every such public meeting five shillings. (Mass. Col. Rec., Vol. 2, p. 178.)

Some questions having arisen concerning the meaning of the passage "after due conviction used," in the above law, it was explained May 10, 1649, as meaning "legal conviction." A little later, a general court, sitting at Boston, on the 30th of August, 1653, enacted the following:

Upon information of sundry abuses and misdemeanors committed by several persons on the Lord's-day, not only by children playing in the streets and other places, but by youths, maids and other persons, both strangers and others, uncivilly walking the streets and fields, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, frequenting common houses and other places to drink, sport, and otherwise to misspend that precious time, which things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, and the profanation of his holy Sabbath, the sanctification whereof is sometimes put for all duties immediately respecting the service of God, contained in the first table: It is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that no children, youths, maids or other persons, shall transgress in the like kind on penalty of being reputed great provokers of the high displeasure of Almighty God, and further incurring the penalties hereafter expressed, namely, that the parents and governors of all children above seven years old, (not that we approve of younger children in evil,) for the first offense in that kind, upon due proof before any magistrate, town commissioner, or selectman of the town where such offense shall be committed, shall be admonished; for a second offense, upon due proof, as aforesaid, shall pay a fine of five shillings; and for a third offense, upon due proof, as aforesaid, ten shillings; and if they shall again offend in this kind, they shall be presented to the county court, who shall augment punishment, according to the merit of the fact. And for all youths and maids, above fourteen years of age, and all elder persons whatsoever that shall offend and be convicted as aforesaid, either for playing, uncivilly walking, drinking, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, sporting or any way misspending that precious time, shall, for the first offense, be admonished, upon due proof, as aforesaid; for a second offense, shall pay as a fine five shillings; and for a third offense, ten shillings; and if any shall farther offend that way, they shall be presented to the next county court, who shall augment punishment according to the nature of the offense; and if any be unable or unwilling to pay the aforesaid fines, they shall be whipped by the constable not exceeding five stripes for ten shillings fine; and this to be understood of such offenses as shall be committed during the daylight of the Lord's-day. (Ib., Vol. 3, pp. 316, 317.)

In volume four another record of this action may be found with this addition:

"This law is to be transcribed by the constables of each town, and posted upon the meeting house door, there to remain the space of one month, at least. (Ib., Vol. 4, Part I., p. 151.)"

On the 18th of October of the following year, 1654, a general court, sitting at Boston, enacted that:

Whereas, experience gives us cause to complain of much disorder in time of public ordinances, in the meeting houses in several congregations in this jurisdiction, through the unreverent carriage and behavior of diverse young persons, and others, notwithstanding the best means that have been hitherto used in the said assemblies, for the reformation thereof, it is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that it shall be in the liberty of the officers of the congregation, and the selectmen of such towns together, to nominate some one or two meet persons, to reform all such disordered persons as shall offend by any misdemeanor, either in the congregation or elsewhere near about the meeting house, either by serious reproof, more private or public, or other the like warning and meet correction of the magistrate or commissioners of that town judge meet. And we are not doubtful but the reverend elders of the several congregations, according to their wisdom, will so order the time of their public exercise, but none shall be ordinarily occasioned to break off from the congregation before the full conclusion of public exercises. (Ib., pp. 200, 201.)

At the second session of the general court for 1658, held at Boston on the 19th of October, in view of the increase of Sunday profanation, the following action was taken:

"Whereas by too sad experience it is observed, the sun being set, both every Saturday and on the Lord's day, young people and others take liberty to walk, and sport themselves in the streets or fields in the several towns in this jurisdiction, to the dishonor of God and the disturbance of others in their religious exercises, and too frequently repair to public houses of entertainment and there sit drinking, all which tends, not only to the hindering of due preparation for the Sabbath, but as much as in them lies renders the ordinance of God altogether unprofitable, and threatens rooting out the power of godliness, and procuring the wrath and judgments of God upon us and our posterity: for the prevention whereof it is ordered by this court, and the authority thereof, that if any person or persons henceforth, either on the Saturday night or on the Lord's-day night after the sun is set, shall be found sporting in the streets or fields of any town in this jurisdiction, drinking or being in any houses of entertainment (unless strangers or sojourners, as in their lodgings), and can not give a satisfactory reason to such magistrate or commissioner in the several towns as shall have cognizance thereof, every such person so found, complained of and proved transgressing, shall pay five shillings for every such transgression, or suffer corporal punishment, as authority aforesaid shall determine. (Mass. Col. Rec., Vol. 4, Part I., p. 347.)

At a general court called by order of the council and held at Boston the 1st of August, 1665, the following was enacted:

This court being sensible that through the wicked practices of many persons who do profane God's holy Sabbaths, and condemn the public worship of his house, the name of God is greatly dishonored, and the profession of his people here greatly scandalized, as tending to all profaneness and irreligion, as also that by reason of the late order of Oct. 20th, 1663, remitting the fines imposed on such to the use of the several towns, the laws made for reclaiming such enormities are become ineffectual, do therefore order and enact, that henceforth all fines imposed according to law for profanation of the Sabbath, contempt or neglect of God's public worship, according to his Majesty's charter, shall be to the use of the several counties as formerly, anything in the above said law to the contrary

notwithstanding; and in case any person or persons so sentenced do neglect or refuse to pay such fine or mulct as shall be legally imposed on them, or give security in court, to the treasurer for payment thereof, every such person or persons, so refusing or neglecting to submit to the court's sentence, shall for such his contempt be corporally punished according as the court that bath cognizance of the case shall determine, and where any are corporally punished, their fines shall be remitted. (Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 4, Part II., p. 395.)"

Three years later, October, 1668, the General Court, sitting at Boston, took up this matter again, and passed the following:

"For the better prevention of the breach of the Sabbath, it is enacted by this court and the authority thereof, that no servile work shall be done on that day, viz., such as are not works of piety, of charity, or of necessity; and when other works are done on that day, the persons so doing, upon complaint or presentment, being legally convicted thereof before any magistrate or county court, shall pay for the first offense ten shillings fine, and for every offense after to be doubled; and, in case the offense herein be circumstanced with profaneness or high-handed presumption, the penalty is to be augmented at the discretion of the judges. As an addition to the law for preventing profaning of the Sabbath-day by doing servile work, this court doth order, that whatsoever person in this jurisdiction shall travel upon the Lord's day, either on horseback or on foot, or by boats from or out of their own town to any unlawful assembly or meeting not allowed by law, are hereby declared to be profaners of the Sabbath, and shall be proceeded against as the persons that profane the Lord's-day by servile work. (Ib.. p. 395.)

At a general court held in Boston in 1667, the Sunday laws were further amended by an act of the 24th of May, running as follows: This Court, being desirous to prevent all occasions of complaint, referring to the profanation of the Sabbath, and as an addition to former laws, do order and enact, that all the laws for sanctification of the Sabbath and preventing the profaning thereof, be twice in the year, viz., in March and in September, publicly read by the minister or ministers on the Lord's-day in the several respective assemblies within this jurisdiction, and all people by him cautioned to take heed to the observance thereof. And the selectmen are hereby ordered to see to it that there be one man appointed to inspect the ten families of his neighbors, which tything man or men shall, and are hereby, have power [this language is badly arranged, but such is the record] in the absence of the constable, to apprehend all Sabbath-breakers and disorderly tipplers, or such as keep licensed houses or others that shall suffer any disorders in their houses on the Sabbath-day, or evening after, or at any other time, and to carry them before a magistrate or other authority, or commit to prison as any constable may do, to be proceeded with according to law."

And for the better putting a restraint and securing offenders that shall any way transgress against the laws, tittle Sabbath, either in the meeting house by abusive carriage or misbehavior, by making any noise or otherwise, or during the day time, being laid hold on by any of the inhabitants shall, by the said person appointed to inspect this law, be forthwith carried forth and put into a cage in Boston, which is appointed to be forthwith by the selectmen, to be set up in the market-place and in such other towns as the county courts shall appoint, there to remain till authority shall examine the person offending and give order for his punishment, as the matter may require, according to the laws relating to the Sabbath." (Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 5, p. 133.)

The same court made additional laws concerning Quaker meetings, ordering all constables, on penalty of the forfeiture of forty shillings, to "make diligent search" for such gatherings, especially on the Lord's-day, and if denied admittance, to break down the doors and arrest the frequenters according to law. It also ordered that persons complained of, as being absent from public service on Sunday, who would neither affirm that they were present nor that they were "necessarily absent by the providence of God," should be thereupon adjudged as convicted, and punished accordingly. (Ib., p. 134.)

October 15, 1673, the foregoing laws were amended as follows:

"As an addition to the law of the Sabbath, Sect. the second, it is ordered by the court and the authority thereof besides the penalty upon the persons there offending, the public house-keeper, where any such person or persons are found so transgressing (as in the said law is expressed), shall pay five shillings to the treasury of the county where the offense is committed. (Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 4, Part II., p. 562.)

On the 10th of October, 1677, the general court in session at Boston made the following additions to this law: As an addition to the late law made in May last for the prevention of profanation of the Sabbath, and strengthening the hands of tything men appointed to inspect the same, it is ordered that those tything men shall be and are hereby appointed and empowered to inspect public licensed houses, as well as private and unlicensed houses, houses of entertainment, as also ex-officio to enter any such houses and discharge their duty according to law; and the said tything men are empowered to assist one another in their several precincts and to act in one another's precincts with as full power as in their own, and yet to retain their special charges within their own bounds. (Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 5, p. 155.)"

Two years later, October 15, 1679, the general court, at Boston, enacted certain local laws, of which the following is a copy:

"For prevention of profanation of the Sabbath, and disorders on Saturday night, by horses and carts passing late out of the town of Boston, it is ordered and enacted by this court, that there be a ward, from sunset on Saturday night, until nine of the clock or after, consisting of one of the selectmen or constables of Boston, with two or more meet persons, who shall walk between the fortification and the town's end, and upon no pretense whatsoever suffer any cart to pass out of the town after sunset, nor any footman or horseman, without such good account of the necessity of his business as may be to their satisfaction; and all persons attempting to ride or drive out of town after sunset, without such reasonable satisfaction given, shall be apprehended and brought before authority to be proceeded against as Sabbath breakers; and all other towns are empowered to do the like as need shall be. (Ib., pp. 239, 240-) By the same court, the reading of the Sunday laws was placed in the hands of the town clerks, to be done at some public meeting of the town, instead of being done by the ministers on Sunday. (Ib., p. 243.)

Thus the laws stood with little or no change until the new charter and the provincial government.

In 1691, Massachusetts, including Plymouth Colony and other territories lying north and east, was reorganized under a new charter from King William and Queen Mary. The change did not, however, materially affect the status of the Sunday laws.

On the 22d of August, 1695, a general act was passed which embodied the substance of all the former colonial laws. By this, all labor and sporting"" was prohibited under penalty of five shillings fine. All ""traveling"" except in cases of great necessity was punishable by a fine of twenty shillings. The keepers of public houses were forbidden to entertain any except travelers and boarders, on penalty of five shillings fine. Any one justice of the peace was empowered to try the cases, and on his judgment to pass sentence, and the fines, if not forthcoming, were to be collected by distraint. If the offender was unable to pay the fine, he was to be ""set in the stocks,"" or ""caged,"" not to exceed three hours."

These acts were in force from sunset on the seventh day forward. All civil officers and parents were enjoined to carefully enforce these acts. (Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass. Bay, from 1692 to 1719, folio edition, London, 1724, pp. 15, 16.)

In May, 1711, this law was added to, in that twelve hours imprisonment was made one of the penalties of transgression, and constables were especially empowered and instructed to labor diligently to prevent profanation of the Sunday. (Ib., p. 277.)

In 1716 we find Sunday-desecration on the increase, since, although many laws have been passed, it is said: "Many persons do presume to work and travel on the said day;" so that the authorities saw fit to increase the penalty for "working or playing " to ten shillings, and that for traveling to twenty shillings for the first offense. For the second offense these fines were doubled, and parties made to give "sureties" for good behavior in the future. A month's continued absence from the public Sunday services was also made finable in the sum of twenty shillings, or "three hours in the stocks or cage." (Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass. Bay, p. 328.)

In 1727, the fine for "working or playing" was increased to fifteen shillings, and that for traveling to thirty shillings for the first offense, and for the second three pounds. If the offender failed to pay, he was liable to the stocks or the cage for four hours, or to imprisonment in the county jail, not to exceed five days. At this time, also, funerals, since they induced "great profanation" of Sunday, by the traveling of children and servants in the streets, were prohibited, except in extreme cases, and then under license from a civil officer of the town. The director of a funeral transgressing this was to be fined forty shillings, and the sexton or grave digger twenty shillings. Shops for the retailing of strong drinks were also to be searched by the proper officers, and if any were found there drinking, the proprietor and the drinker were each to pay five shillings. (Acts and Resolves of the Province of Mass. Bay, Vol. 2, p. 456. Boston edition, 1874.)

In 1741, an additional act was passed against slothfully loitering in the streets or fields, making the penalty twenty shillings for the first offense and forty for the second, with costs, and imprisonment until paid. Appeal to the next court was allowed. (Ib., p. 1,071.)

In 1760, a general amendment was made by repealing all former laws relative to Sunday, and enacting a new code. The reasons for repealing are thus stated:

Whereas by reason of different constructions of the several laws now in force relating to the observation of the Lord's-day, or Christian Sabbath, the said laws have not been duly executed, and, notwithstanding the pious intention of the legislators, the Lord's-day hath been greatly and frequently profaned, therefore, etc.

The preface to the new law is as follows:

And whereas, it is the duty of all persons, upon the Lord's-day, carefully to apply themselves publicly and privately to religion and piety, the profanation of the Lord's-day is highly offensive to Almighty God; of evil example, and tends to the grief and disturbance of all pious and religiously disposed persons, therefore. etc.

The main features of the new code were the same as those of the former laws. The provisions were these:

1. Work or play, on land or water, is fined not less than ten nor more than twenty shillings.
2. Traveling by any one except in extremity, and then only far enough for immediate relief is liable to the same penalty.
3. Licensed public house keepers are forbidden to entertain any except "travelers, strangers and lodgers" in their houses or about their premises, for the purpose of drinking, playing, lounging, or doing any secular business whatever, on penalty often shillings; the person lounging, etc., also paying not less than five shillings. On the second conviction the inn-keeper is made to pay twenty shillings, and on the third offense to lose his license.
4. Loitering, walking, or gathering in companies in "streets, fields, orchards, lanes, wharves," etc., is prohibited on pain of five shillings fine; and on a second conviction, the offender is required to give bail for future obedience.
5. Absence from public service for one month is fined ten shillings.
6. No one is to assist at any funeral, not even to ring a bell, unless it be a licensed funeral, on penalty of twenty shillings fine. In Boston, however, a funeral might be attended after sunset without a license.
7. The observance of the Sunday was to commence from sunset on the seventh day.
8. Twelve wardens were appointed in each town to execute these laws; these were to look after all infringements of the laws, enter all suspected places, examine or inquire after all suspected persons, etc. In Boston, they were to patrol the streets every Sunday (very stormy or cold days excepted), and diligently watch and search for offenders. In case any one convicted on any point in this code failed to pay his fine at once, he was to be committed to the common jail, not less than five nor more than ten days. These laws were to be read at the March meeting of the towns each year. (Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass. Bay, folio edition, pp. 392 to 396. Boston, 1759.) In 1761, this code was supplemented by another act making it five pounds fine to give any false answers to a warden, or to refuse him aid or information when called upon. These were all carried over, in essence, to the state laws when the state was organized in 1780.

NEW HAVEN COLONY.

The primary compact formed by the colonists at New Haven shows that they took the Bible as their guide in all things. The Common law, based upon the Sabbath law of the Jewish theocracy, was the accepted authority concerning the Sunday. In December, 1647, the transactions of certain ship masters in the harbor of New Haven on Sunday brought the matter before the civil court. The offenders, after examination, were dismissed, but the case created considerable interest, and the times seemed to demand some definite legislation. Hence, on the 31st of January, 1647, the court took the following action:

"It was propounded to the court to consider whether it were not meet to make a law for restraining of persons from their ordinary outward employments on any part of the Sabbath, and the rather, because some have of late taken too much liberty in that way, and have been called to answer for it in the particular court. The court, considering that it is their duty to do the best they can that the law of God may be strictly observed, did therefore order that Whosoever shall, within this plantation, break the Sabbath by doing any of their ordinary outward occasions, from sunset to sunset, either upon the land or upon the water, extraordinary cases, works of mercy and necessity being excepted, he shall be counted an offender, and shall suffer such punishment as the particular court shall judge meet, according to the nature of his offense. (New Haven Colony and Plantation Records, from 1638 to 1649, p. 358.)

The New Haven Code,"" published for the use of the colony in 1656, embraces all the general laws which were enacted previous to the union between New Haven and Connecticut colonies. This code contains the following, relative to attendance on public worship:"

"And it is further ordered that wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established within this jurisdiction, according to the order of the gospel, every person, according to the mind of God, shall duly resort and attend thereunto, upon the Lord's-day, at least, and also upon days of public fasting or thanksgiving ordered to be generally kept and observed. And if any person within the jurisdiction shall without just and necessary cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall, after due means of conviction used, for every such sinful miscarriage, forfeit five shillings to the plantation, to be levied as other fines. (New Haven Col. Rec., 165365, p. 588.)

The following statute on the Profanation of the Lord's-day"" is worthy of careful notice:"

Whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, recreation, or otherwise, whether willfully or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally, according to the nature and measure of the sin and offense. But if the court upon examination, by clear and satisfying evidence, find that the sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand, committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person

therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death, that all others may fear and shun such provoking, rebellious courses. Numb. 15, from 30 to 36 verse. (New Haven Colonial Records, 1653-65, p. 605.)

In 1665, the colony of New Haven was united with that of Connecticut under the latter name. Its history will therefore be traced under that head from this point forward.

THE COLONY OF CONNECTICUT.

Here, again, there were at first no special statutes relative to Sunday. In 1650 a general code of laws was established in which is the following provision, as a part of the law against burglary:

And if any person shall commit [such burglary, or] rob, in the fields or houses on the Lord's-day, besides the former punishments, he shall, for the first offense, have one of his ears cut off; and for the second offense in the same kind, he shall lose his other ear in the same manner, and if he fall into the same offense the third time, he shall be put to death. (Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut, prior to 1665, p. 514.)

At a general court, held Sept. 8, 1653, the following was enacted relative to maritime matters:

Whereas, it is observed that many seamen divers times weigh anchors in the harbors of several plantations within these liberties, and pass out on the Lord's-day, to the grief and offense of the beholders, for the preventing whereof it is ordered: That after the publishing this order, no vessel shall depart out of any harbor within this jurisdiction, but the master of the boat or vessel shall first give notice of the occasion of his remove to the head officer of the town next the said harbor where they so anchor, and obtain license, under the hand of the said officer, for his liberty therein. Otherwise they shall undergo the censure of the court. (Colonial Records of Conn. prior to 1665, p. 247.) The law relative to the attendance on public worship is the same, in essence, as those already noticed. It is as follows:

It is ordered and decreed by this court and authority thereof, that wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established according to the gospel, throughout this jurisdiction, every person shall duly resort and attend thereunto, respectively upon the Lord's-day and upon such public fast days and days of thanksgiving as are to be generally kept by the appointment of authority. And if any person within this jurisdiction shall, without just and necessary cause, withdraw himself from hearing the public ministry of the Word, after due means of conviction used, he shall forfeit for his absence from every such public meeting five shillings, all such offenses to be heard and determined by any one magistrate or more, from time to time. (Ib., p. 524.)

Two years after the union of the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut under one government, a law was passed forbidding Indians to profane Sunday on penalty of five shillings fine, or one hour in the stocks.

On the 19th of May, 1668, a general law was enacted as follows:

Whereas, the sanctification of the Sabbath is a matter of great concernment to the weal of a people, and the profanation thereof is that as pulls down the judgments of God upon that place or people that suffer the same: It is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that if any person shall profane the Sabbath, by unnecessary travel, or playing thereon in the time of public worship, or before or after, or shall keep out of the meeting house during the public worship unnecessarily, there being convenient room in the house, he shall pay five shillings for every such offense, or sit in the stocks one hour; any one assistant or commissioner to hear and determine any such case; and the constables in the several plantations are hereby required to make search after all offenders against this law, and make return thereof to the commissioners or assistants:

In 1676 the above was strengthened by the following:

"Whereas, notwithstanding former provisions made for the due sanctification of the Sabbath, it is observed that by sundry abuses the Sabbath is profaned, the ordinances rendered unprofitable, which threatens the rooting out of the power of godliness, and the procuring of the wrath and judgments of God upon us and our posterity; for prevention whereof it is ordered by this court that if any person or persons henceforth, either on the Saturday night or on the Lord's-day night, though it be after the sun is set, shall be found sporting in the streets or fields of any town in this jurisdiction, or be drinking in houses of public entertainment or elsewhere, unless for necessity, every such person so found, complained of, and proved transgressing, shall pay ten shillings for every such transgression, or suffer corporal punishment for default of due payment. Neither shall any sell or draw any sort of strong drink at any time, or be used in any such manner, upon the like penalty for every default.

It is also further ordered that no servile work shall be done on the Sabbath, viz., such as are not works of piety, charity or necessity; and no profane discourse or talk, rude or unreverent behavior shall be used on that holy day, upon the penalty of ten shillings fine for every transgression hereof, and in case the offense be circumstanced with high-handed presumption as well [as] profaneness, the penalty to be augmented at the discretion of the judges. (Col. Rec., Conn., from 1665 to 1677, pp. 88, 280.)

Under date of May, 1684, is found an act referring to the foregoing laws and their enforcement in the following words:

Whereas, this court, in the calamitous time of New England's distress by the war with the Indians in the Years seventy-five and seventy-six, were moved to make some laws for the suppression of some provoking evils which were feared to be growing up among us, as viz., profanation of the Sabbath, neglect of catechising of children and servants, and family prayer; young persons shaking off the government of parents or masters; boarders and inmates neglecting the worship of God in families where they reside; tippling and drinking; uncleanness; oppression in workmen and traders; which laws (for want of due prosecution of offenders that are guilty of the breach of them) have little prevailed to the suppressing of the growth of said evils amongst us, and not answered that expectation of reformation which this court aimed at; it is therefore ordered by this court, that the selectmen, constables and grand jurymen in the several plantations shall have a special care in their respective places to promote the due and full attendance of those forementioned orders of this court, by the several inhabitants of their respective towns, and the selectmen, constables, and grand jurymen shall, at least once a month, make presentment of all breaches of such laws as are come to their knowledge, to the next assistant or commissioner, under their hands."" (Colonial Records of Conn., from 1678 to 1689, pp. 147, 148.)"

Any failure on the part of these officers to perform the above mentioned duties was made finable to the amount of ten shillings for every neglect. Two years later this act was renewed in nearly the same words. (Ib., p. 203.) Thus did Sabbath desecration, so-called, increase in spite of these stringent laws, guarded by severe and often-executed penalties.

Soon after this came the interruption of the government by Andros, which lasted between one and two years. When the Government was restored, the general court declared all laws to be binding which were in force before the interruption. After this restoration of the colonial government in 1689, little appears concerning the Sunday laws for several years. In 1715, an especial act was passed concerning the movements of vessels in the harbors, and a general one requiring the officers to execute the existing law against vice and immorality, among which the Sunday laws are mentioned. The power of these officers to search after delinquents was also increased. (Acts and Laws of Conn., folio edition, pp. 206-208. New London, 1715 and 1737.) In 1721, additional laws were passed under the following preamble:

"Whereas, notwithstanding the liberty by law granted to all persons to worship God in such places as they shall for that end provide, and in such manner as they shall judge to be most agreeable to the Word of God; and notwithstanding the laws already provided for the sanctification of the Lord's-day, or the Christian Sabbath, many disorderly persons in abuse of that liberty, and regardless of those laws, neglect the public worship of God on the said day, and profane the same by their rude and unlawful behavior; therefore, etc. By this law,

1. Non-attendance on lawful public worship was subjected to a fine of five shillings.
2. The same penalty was incurred by going forth from one's place of abode for any reason except to attend worship or perform works of necessity.
3. A fine of twenty shillings was imposed for assembling at any meeting house on Sunday without the consent of the congregation to whom it belonged and the minister who usually officiated in it.
4. Disturbing any meeting for public worship on Sunday was made punishable by a fine of forty shillings.
5. Failure to pay or secure a fine imposed for any of these offenses within one week was punished by labor in the houses of correction for one month or less.
6. No appeal from a justice's court was allowed.
7. All charges were to be preferred within one month from the time of the offense. (Acts and Laws of Conn., folio, pp. 261, 262. New London, 1715 - 1737.)

Other supplementary acts were also passed, relating mainly to the duties of the civil authorities in executing these laws. In 1726, all assistant justices of the peace were empowered, on their own plain view or personal knowledge,"" of profanity, drunkenness, or Sabbath-breaking, to make out a judgment accordingly against the offender, ""any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."" (Ib., p. 319.)"

In 1733, a more extensive code was established, of which the following is an outline:

1. Non-attendance on public worship for a specified time was punished by a fine of three shilling.
2. Ten shillings was made the penalty for assembling in a meeting-house without the consent of the congregation and minister for whom it was provided. No persons were allowed to neglect public worship and meet in private houses, on penalty often shillings.
3. All work or play, on land or water, on Sundays, fast, or thanksgiving days, was prohibited under a fine often shillings.
4. Disturbing public worship by rude or clamorous behavior, in or within hearing of the assembly was fined forty shillings.

5. All traveling, except in great extremity, was forbidden on pain of twenty shillings fine, and all absence from one's house, except for church attendance or "necessity," incurred a fine of five shillings.

6. Staying outside at the meeting house (there being room inside), or going out unnecessarily during service, or playing or talking around places of worship, was finable in the sum of three shillings. Gathering in companies in streets, or elsewhere, on the evening before or the evening after the Sunday, or on the evening after any fast day, was liable to a penalty of three shillings, or two hours in the stocks, religious gatherings excepted.

7. Loitering or drinking in or about any public place after sunset on Seventh-day night subjected both the offender and the keeper of the place to a fine of five shillings.

8. No vessel was allowed to put to sea from any harbor, river or creek within the colonial limits without license, granted only in extreme emergency, nor to weigh anchor within two miles of any place of meeting unless to get nearer to that place, under forfeiture of thirty shillings.

9. Posting notices or publishing them in any way was declared illegal, and the proper officers were instructed to destroy all such as should be put up, and the one putting up the same was subjected to a fine of five shillings.

10. Two "tything men" were ordered to be appointed for every parish; these were empowered and instructed, after the usual manner, to execute these provisions. Whipping, twenty stripes or less, was the penalty for non-payment of a fine. (Acts and Laws of Conn., 1750 to 1772, p. 139-142.)

In 1761, in spite of all that had been done, traveling is declared to be a "growing evil," and all assistant justices of the peace are empowered to arrest, without a written warrant, any person traveling unnecessarily, and every sheriff, constable, grand jurymen and tything man was empowered to take such persons into custody, "upon sight, or present information of others." Refusal to aid in any such arrest, when called upon, incurred the usual penalties. (Ib., p. 259.) In 1770, an act was passed allowing all sober persons who conscientiously differed from the established worship and ministry of the colony, to meet together for worship without incurring the penalties provided for in the preceding law against such meetings, and against action from the recognized services. (Ib., p. 351.) Connecticut became one of the United States in 1788, and the Colonial Sunday Laws passed into the state government. They have been modified as to rigidity from that time to this.

RHODE ISLAND COLONY LAWS.

The land of Roger Williams must of necessity have produced Sunday laws different from those of the other New England colonies. What these laws were will be clearly seen by the following extracts. The General Assembly, sitting at Newport, on the second day of September, 1673, enacted as follows:

Voted, this assembly considering that the King hath granted us that not any in this colony are to be molested in the liberty of their consciences who are not disturbers of the civil peace, and we are persuaded that a most flourishing civil government with loyalty may be best propagated where liberty of conscience by any corporal power is not obstructed that is not to any unchasteness of body, and not by a body doing any hurt to a body neither endeavoring so to do, and although we know by man not any can be forced to worship God, or for to keep holy or not to keep holy any day; but forasmuch as the first days of the weeks it is usual for parents and masters not to employ their children or servants, as upon other days, and some others also that are not under such government, accounting it is a spare time, and so spending it in debaistness or tippling and unlawful games and wantonness and most abominably there practiced by those that live with the English at such times to resort to towns. Therefore, this Assembly, not to oppose or propagate any worship, but as by preventing debaistness," although we know masters or parents cannot and are not by violence to endeavor to force any under their government to any worshiper, or from any worship, that is not debaistness, or disturbant to the civil peace, but they are to require them, and if that will not prevail, if they can, they should compel them not to do what is debasing or uncivil, or inhuman, not to frequent any immodest company or practices.

Therefore, by his Majesty's authority it is enacted, that on the first days of the weeks whoever be he that doth let any have any drink, that he or any other is drunk thereby, besides all other forfeitures, therefor, for every one so drunk, they shall forfeit six shillings, and for every one that entertains in gaming or tippling upon the first day of the week he shall forfeit six shillings, and by his Majesty's authority, thereby it is enacted, that for to prevent any such misdemeanors, if they are so guilty to discover them that every first day of the week, in every town in this colony, there shall be a constable's watch for every inhabitant fit to watch to take his turn that belongeth to the town, or pay for hiring of one, so for one or more to watch in a day as the Town Council judge necessary to restrain any "debaistness," or immodesty or concourse of people tippling or gaming or wantonness, that all modest assemblies may not be interrupted; especially all such that profess they meet in the worship of God; if some of them will be most false worshipers they should only be strove against, therefore with spiritual weapons if they do not disown that they should not be condemned, whoever they be that be unchaste with their bodies or with their bodies oppress or do violence to what is mortal of any man, but as they should be

subject to such, to suffer for such transgressions, parents may thereof correct their children and masters their servants; and magistrates should be a terror to such evil doers. (R.I. Colonial Records, Vol. 2, pp. 503, 504.)

At a general assembly held at Newport, May 7, 1679, the following action was taken:

"Voted, whereas there hath complaint been made that sundry persons being evil minded, have presumed to employ in servile labor, more than necessity requireth their servants and also hire other men's servants and sell them to labor on the first day of the week; for the prevention whereof be it enacted by this assembly and the authority thereof that if any person or persons shall employ his servants or hire and employ any other man's servant or servants and set them to labor as aforesaid, the person or persons so offending shall upon proof thereof made pay for every offense by him or them committed five shillings in money to the use of the poor of the town or place in which the offenses are committed; which said five shillings if the person offending refuse upon conviction before one magistrate to pay a warrant under the hand of one magistrate directed to the sergeant of the town where the offense was committed, shall be his sufficient warrant to take by distraint so much of the estate of the offending party, together with two shillings for his service therein.

And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid that if any person or persons shall presume to sport, game or play at any manner of game or games or shooting on the first day of the week as aforesaid, or shall sit tippling and drinking in any tavern, ale house, ordinary or victualing house on the first day of the week more than necessity requireth, and upon examination of the fact it shall be judged by one justice of the peace the person offending as aforesaid upon conviction before one justice of the peace shall by the said justice of the peace be sentenced for every of the aforesaid offenses to sit in the stocks three hours, or pay five shillings in money, for the use of the poor of the town or place where the offense was committed. (Ib., Vol. 3, p. 31.)

Various modifications or simple re-enactments of the Rhode Island Sunday laws were made in 1750 and 1784. In 1790 the colony became one of the United States, although the original charter of 1633 remained in force until 1843. No important change has taken place in its Sunday law since 1798. (See Public Laws of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Providence, 1798, pp. 577 to 579.)

NEW YORK.

There was no representative Government in what is now the state of New York until nearly a century after the first settlements were made within its limits. The records of the first half century of the existence of the Colony of New Netherlands, as it was called, are very meager. The government was administered by officers appointed in Holland. The religious views of the Hollanders made it impossible that such an observance of Sunday should obtain in New Netherlands as was common in New England.

In 1647, Peter Stuyvesant was made Dictator"" of the Colony. According to the statements of Mr. Broadhead, the social, civil, and religious affairs of the Colony were in a sad state of decline. The preceding administration of Kieft had been ruinous in many respects. On the arrival of Stuyvesant, says Mr. Broadhead,"

Proclamations were immediately issued with a zeal and rapidity which promised to make a thorough reformation." Sabbath-breaking, brawling and drunkenness were forbidden. Publicans were restrained from selling liquors, except to travelers, before two o'clock on Sundays, "When there is no preaching," and after nine o'clock in the evening. (History of New Netherlands, first period, p. 466.)

Stuyvesant was a member of the Reformed church at home, and was probably more strict than the most of his countymen. In 1673, each town was empowered to make laws against Sabbath-breaking and other immoralities. (Documents relating to the Colonial History of New York, Vol. 2, p. 621.) The administration of Stuyvesant was the beginning of efforts at Sunday legislation. In 1691, a representative government was established under the English crown. In 1695, Oct.22d, the first Sunday law was passed by that Government. It was prefaced by the following preamble, which gives an idea of the state of the country at that time:

Whereas the true and sincere worship of God, according to his holy will and commandments, is often profaned and neglected by many of the inhabitants and sojourners in this province, who do not keep holy the Lord's-day, but in a disorderly manner accustom themselves to travel, laboring, working, shooting, fishing, sporting, playing, horse-racing, frequenting of tippling houses and the using many other unlawful exercises and pastimes, upon the Lord's-day, to the great scandal of the holy Christian faith, be it enacted, etc.

These are the provisions of the law:

1. Six shillings fine for any of the above named crimes, or any manner of work or play.

2. Any justice of the peace might convict offenders, "on his own sight," "on their confession," or on the testimony of "one or more witnesses;" fines were to be collected by distraint, if necessary. In default of payment, the offender was to sit for three hours in the "stocks." If any master refused to pay the fine imposed upon a Negro or Indian slave or servant, said slave or servant was to be whipped "thirteen lashes." All complaint against offenders were to be made within one month.

3. It was lawful to travel any distance under twenty miles, for the privilege of attending public worship. It was also lawful to "go for a physician or nurse." These exemptions were not good in favor of unchristianized Indians. (Laws of New York from 1691 to 1773, large folio edition, Vol. 1, pp. 23, 24. New York, 1774.)

No other law concerning Sunday-observance appears until after the establishment of the state government, in 1777. A state law of 1778 contained the essential features of the present law.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The early Sunday laws of Pennsylvania were far less strict than those of the New England States. In 17001, a general law was passed, John Evans being Lieutenant Governor, under William Penn, of which the following is the substance:

1. All general servile work on Sunday was prohibited on pain of twenty shillings fine. The exceptions under this provision were quite numerous. They allowed the preparing of food in public houses, the dressing and selling of meat by butchers and fishermen during the months of June, July and August, the selling of milk before nine o'clock in the morning and the landing of passengers by watermen during the entire day.

2. No civil process was servable on Sunday.

3. Any person found "tippling" in public drinking houses was fined one shilling and six pence. Any dealer who allowed persons to drink and lounge about his premises was liable to pay ten shillings fine. "Taverns" were however allowed to sell to regular inmates and travelers "in moderation." (Acts of the Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania, Vol. 1. pp. 19-21, folio edition. Phila., 1762.)

There were various minor changes and modifications of this law from time to time before the adoption of the State Constitution, 1776-78. The present state law has been in force since 1794.

VIRGINIA.

Instructions to Captain Woodleaf.

Ordinances, direccions and Instructions to Captaine John Woodleefe for the government of or men and servants in the Towne and hundered of Bearkley in Virginia given by us Sr. Willm Throkmorton Knight and barronet Richard Bearkley Esq; George Thorpe esq; and John Smyth gent whereunto our commission of the date hereof made to the said captaine Woodleefe hath reference, the fourth day of September 1619 Anno xvijo Jac. regis Angliae &c.

2. Item wee doe ordaine that the Lord's-day be kept in holy and religious order and that all bodily labour and vaine sports and scandalous recreations be refrained, and that morning and evening prayer (according to the English booke of common prayer) be Dayly read and attended unto and such other divine exercisses of preaching and reading to be on the said day used, as it shall please God to enable the minister for the tyme there being to perform. And that all such other fastivalls and holidayes be observed and kept which are authorised and appoynted by the laws and statutes of this realme of England, And the rites and ceremonies authorized perscribed or apoynted by the ecclesiasticall lawes or channons of this realm of England and booke of common prayer (established by authority) be in all things observed and kept, according as it is used in the church of England. (From Bulletin of the New York Public Library for May, 1899, Vol. 3, No. 5, in article "Virginia Papers," 1619, under caption "Instructions to Captain Woodleaf.")

The early laws of Virginia have some resemblance to those of New England.

Hon. R. W. Thompson, Secretary of the Navy, in an address delivered in Washington, May 16, 1880, makes the following statement concerning a law made before the organization of the regular Assembly in 1619:

"The very first statute passed by the Cavaliers of Virginia provided that he who did not attend church on Sunday, should pay a fine of two pounds of tobacco. This was the first law ever enacted in the United States, and was passed in 1617, three years before the Puritans landed at Plymouth. (Sabbath Doc. No.45, p.15. New York.)

In 1623 a law was passed in these words:

Whosoever shall absent himself from divine service any Sunday without an allowable excuse, shall forfeit a pound of tobacco; and he that absents himself for a month shall forfeit fifty pounds of tobacco."" (Laws of Virginia, Statutes at Large, Henning, Vol. 1, p. 123. New York, 1823.)"

In 1629 the authorities were ordered to take care that the above law was carefully executed, and to "see that the Sabbath-day be not ordinarily profaned by working in any employments, or by journeying from place to place." (Ib., p.144.)

In 1642, "church wardens" are bound by their oath of office to present to the civil authorities all cases of "profaning God's name, and his holy Sabbaths." In the same year it was "enacted for the better observation of the Sabbath that no person or persons shall take a voyage upon the same, except it be to church, or for other causes of extreme necessity upon the penalty of the forfeiture for such offense of twenty pounds of tobacco." (Ib., pp. 240 and 261.) In 1657-8 this law was extended so as to prohibit "traveling, loading of boats, shooting of game, and the like," and the penalty was increased to "one hundred pounds of tobacco," or a place in the "stocks." The execution of any ordinary civil process is also forbidden during this year. (Ib., pp. 434 and 457.) In 1691 the penalty was changed to "twenty shillings," and in 1696 to "thirty shillings or two hundred pounds of tobacco." In 1705 the specifications of the law were increased, and all general acts of profanation by working, playing drinking, etc., and also absence from church for one month, were included in one class, the penalty being "five shillings or fifty pounds of tobacco." In default of payment, the offender was subjected to "ten lashes." (Ib., Vol. 3, pp. 73, 138 and 361.) This law was in force when the colony, which took a prominent part in the Revolutionary War became a state, and a more elaborate code was adopted by the state in 1786.

ENFORCEMENT OF SUNDAY LAWS IN THE COLONIES.

Such was the Sunday Legislation during the Colonial period and in the leading colonies out of which grew the United States. The history of that period gives ample proof that the Sunday laws were not a dead letter. It would be tedious and useless to note every instance in which these laws were executed. The majority of the cases were, doubtless, disposed of by the common magistrates, and hence do not appear upon the records of the higher courts. A few representative instances are given. October 6, 1636, John Barnes was found guilty of "Sabbath-breaking" by a jury, and fined "thirty shillings," and "made to sit in the stocks one hour." In 1637 Stephen Hopkins was presented for "suffering men to drink at his house upon the Lord's-day." Two years later, Web Adey was arraigned for working in his garden on Sunday. Before the year closes he repeats the offense and is "set in the stocks" and "whipped at the post." (Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. 1, pp. 44, 68, 86, 92.)

In 1649 John Shaw was set in the stocks for "attending tar pits" on Sunday, and Stephen Bryant was arrested, and "admonished," for carrying a barrel to the same pits on the same day. The next year, 1650, Edward Hunt was arrested for shooting at deer on Sunday, and Cowan White and Z. Hick were called to account for "traveling from Weymouth to Scituate on the Lord's-day." In 1651 Elizabeth Eddy was arrested for "wringing and hanging out clothes on the Lord's-day in time of service." Aurther Howland, for not attending church, and Nathaniel Basset and Joseph Pryor, for "disturbing the church of Duxburrow," were also called to answer the demands of the law. (Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. 2, pp. 140, 156, 165, 173, 174.)

In 1651-2, Abraham Pierce, Henry Clarke and Thurston Clarke, Jr., were arrested for lazily spending Sunday, and staying away from public service. Two or three years later, Peter Gaunt, Ralph Allen, Sen., and George Allen appeared to answer to a similar charge, and William Chase was called to answer for having driven a pair of oxen in the yoke "about five miles on the Lord's-day, in time of exercise." In 1658 Lieutenant James Wyatt was "sharply reprov'd" for writing a business note on Sunday "at least in the evening somewhat too soon." At the same time, Sarah Kirby was "publicly whipped" for disturbing public worship, and Ralph Jones paid ten shillings fine" for staying at home when the authorities thought he ought to have been at church. (Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. 3, pp. 5, 10, 52, 74, 111, 112.) Similar cases might be quoted until many pages were filled, in which the reader would see that not only ordinary manual labor on Sunday was punished, but "whipping of servants," "playing at cards," "smoking tobacco," etc., were sharply dealt with. Those were times when laws were made to be executed. Duty was the central idea in the Puritan system, and zeal was ever on the alert to perform what conscience or law demanded. The "Blue-Laws" which exist in tradition, though sometimes exaggerated, and facetiously misrepresented, are an index to the rigid spirit of those days.

The compilations of the "Blue Laws" by Barber and Smucker are mainly, if not entirely, correct. At the time of the adoption of the state Constitutions, corporal punishment in the "stocks" and the "cage" and at the "whipping post" was becoming obsolete.

During the nineteenth century the enforcement of the Sunday laws in New England, and elsewhere in the United States, has been in name rather than in fact. The verdict of history declares that Sunday-keeping - and the same would be true of Sabbath-keeping - cannot be secured by civil legislation. On the contrary, history demonstrates that the introduction of civil legislation touching the Sabbath question has always borne the ultimate result of holidayism. The decline of regard for Sunday as a religious institution, and for Sunday laws, is now so nearly absolute that thoughtful men are beginning to consider the necessity, and therefore the wisdom, of removing civil legislation entirely and leaving the Sabbath question to be settled on religious grounds alone. For the last twenty-five years or more, every attempt to enforce even minor features of the Sunday laws has been set aside through failure and the pressure of public opinion, or, if the effort to enforce them has been temporarily successful, it has resulted in a direct modification of the laws through legislative action. The history of the past declares that but two courses are open for the future: one is to allow Sunday legislation to fall into complete disuse, by common consent. If this is not done, Sunday laws will be modified by legislative action, making them less and less stringent in proportion as they are enforced, until they cease to be.

The Sabbath In America.

THE same Divine hand which guarded the Sabbath through the dark centuries between the first great apostasy and the Reformation transferred it from England to America, the last battle ground whereon the great reforms of modern times are being carried forward. True Sabbath reform could not find a place among the masses until that second great error, the "Puritan Sunday," had borne its fruit, decayed in weakness, and crumbled from the hands of the church. This trial could best be made in America. Hence, guided by that divinity which shapes our ends, in 1664 Stephen Mumford emigrated from England to Newport, Rhode Island. He brought with him the opinion that the Ten Commandments as they were delivered from Mount Sinai were moral and immutable, and that it was an anti-Christian power which changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. He united with the Baptist church in Newport, and soon gained several of its members to the observance of the Sabbath.

This led to much discussion, and finally an open separation took place, and the first Seventh-day Baptist church in America was organized by these Sabbath-keepers in the month of December, 1671. (A full account of the formation of this church, with a complete account of the discussions and final separation, may be found in Vol. I of the Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, pp. 22 to 46.) William Hiscox was ordained its pastor, which office he filled until his death, in 1704. He was succeeded by William Gibson, a minister from London, who continued to labor as pastor until he died, in 1717. Joseph Crandall, who had been his colleague for two years, was selected to succeed him, and presided over the church until he died, in 1737. Joseph Maxson and Thomas Hiscox were evangelists of the church about this time, the former having been chosen in 1732; he died in 1748. John Maxson was chosen pastor in 1754, and performed the duties of the office until 1778. He was followed by William Bliss, who served the church as pastor until his death in 1808, at the age of 81 years. Henry Burdick succeeded to the pastorate of the church, and occupied that post until his death. Besides its regular pastors, the Newport church ordained several ministers, who labored with great usefulness, both at home and abroad. The church also included among its early members several prominent public men, one of whom was Richard Ward, Governor of the State of Rhode Island.

For more than thirty years after its organization, the Newport church included nearly all persons observing the Seventh-day in Rhode Island and Connecticut; and its pastors were accustomed to hold religious meetings at several places, for the better accommodation of the widely-scattered membership. In 1708, however, the brethren living in what was then called Westerly, R. I., comprehending all the south-western part of the state, thought best to form another society. Accordingly they organized a church, now called the First Hopkinton-Ashaway, R. I. - which had a succession of worthy pastors, became very numerous, and built three meeting-houses for the accommodation of the members in different neighborhoods. (See Manual of the Seventh-day Baptists, pp. 40, 41, also Backus's History of New England, Vol. 1, p. 411, and Vol. 2,

p. 507.) In this last place Mr. Backus adds the following notice in connection with his list of the pastors of what he calls the "Third Church in Newport who keep the Seventh-day. Mr. Ebenezer David (who was first converted in Providence College, and took his first degree there in 1772) belonged to this church; and having been a chaplain, much esteemed, in our army, died therein, not far from Philadelphia, a few days after Mr. Maxson."

The agitation concerning the Sabbath which the early Seventh-day Baptists induced was not confined to Newport. Mr. Backus says (Hist. of New England, Vol. 1, p. 411) that the Baptists in Boston sent a kind letter to these Sabbath-keepers before their separation from Mr. Clarke's church, urging them not to chide, as apostates, certain ones who had left the Sabbath, and not to separate themselves from their church relations with the First-day Baptists. In another place (Vol. 1, pp. 411, 412) Mr. Backus gives a long letter from Roger Williams to Mr. Hubbard, a member of the Newport Seventh-day Baptist church, who had called Mr. Williams's attention to the claims of the Seventh-day as the only Sabbath. Mr. Williams professes to have studied the subject carefully, but to be unable to agree with Mr. Hubbard's views concerning it. The following letter from a prominent Seventh-day Baptist in London, which was written because of the persecution of Sabbath-keepers in Connecticut, is a specimen of the correspondence on this question at the time:

"Peter Chamberlain senior doctor of both Universities, and first and eldest physician in ordinary to his majesty's person, according to the world, but according to grace, a servant of the Word of God, to the excellent and noble governor of New England; grace, mercy, peace and truth, from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ; praying for you that you may abound in heavenly graces and temporal comforts."

The letter goes on to say that the first design of the men of New England was to establish a system of civil and religious liberty, a system to "suppress sin, but not to suppress liberty of conscience." He argues, showing great familiarity with the Scriptures, that "whatever is against the Ten Commandments is sin," and closes as follows:

"While Moses and Solomon caution men so much against adding to or taking from - Deut. 4: 2, Prov. 30:5,6 - and so doth the beloved apostle Rev. 22:18,19, what shall we say of those that take away of those ten words, or those that make them void, and teach men so! Nay, they dare to give the lie to Jehovah, and make Jesus Christ not only the breaker of the law, but the very author of sin in others, also causing them to break them. Hath not the Little Horn"" played his part lustily in this and worn out the saints of the Most High, so

that they became ""Little Horn"" men also? If you are pleased to inquire about these things and to require any instances or informations be pleased by your letters to command it from your humble servant in the Lord Jesus Christ. PETER CHAMBERLAIN."

Mr. Backus also notices a similar correspondence between Dr. Chamberlain and one Mr. Olney, about the same time. (Ibid.)

In Felt's Ecclesiastical History of New England is found the following under date of April 3, 1646:

"John Cotton writes an argument to Thomas Sheppard to prove that the first day of the week, and not the seventh, should be observed as the Christian Sabbath. This subject was much discussed by New England ministers against objectors. (Vol. 1, p. 569.)

On page 614 of the same volume is a similar notice of a letter from one Mr. Hooker to Mr. Sheppard on the same theme. Copies of a small book on the Sabbath, written by this same Thomas Sheppard and published at an early day in Connecticut, are still extant. These facts, and the one already referred to, that many prominent and learned men both in the colony of Rhode Island and in England were Seventh-day Baptists, show that the agitation, concerning the Sabbath was neither feeble in character nor meager in extent.

Such was the beginning of the Seventh-day Baptists in New England. Those who wish to read more concerning the foregoing points are referred to the different works quoted, especially the Seventh-day Baptist Memorial. (Vol. 1.) The second branch of the Seventh-day Baptist church in America was also planted by emigration from England. About the year 1684, Abel Noble, a Seventh-day Baptist Minister from London, settled near Philadelphia. The following extract from a late work by the Rev. James Bailey (History of the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference, pp. 11-15) gives the following:

Able Noble arrived in this country about the year 1784, and located near Philadelphia. He was a Seventh-day Baptist Minister when he came. About this time a difference arose among the Quakers in reference to the sufficiency of what every man has naturally within himself for the purpose of his own salvation. This difference resulted in a separation under the leadership of George Keith. These seceders were soon after known as Keithian Baptists. Through the labors of Abel Noble, many of them embraced the Bible Sabbath and were organized into churches near the year 1700. These churches were Newton, Pennepeck, Nottingham and French Creek, and probably, Conogochage. . . . The churches of Pennsylvania fraternized with the churches in Rhode Island and New Jersey, and counseled them in matters of discipline. Some of their members also united with these churches. Some of them with some members of the church of Piscataway, and others of Cohansey, near Princeton, emigrated to the Parish of St. Mark, S. C., and formed a church on Broad River in 1754. Five years later, in 1759, eight families removed from Broad River and formed a settlement and a church at Tuckaseeking, in Georgia. These churches have long since become extinct."" (Traces of these Sabbath-keepers are still found in the South.)"

Speaking again of the Pennsylvania churches, Mr. Bailey says: "Rev. Enoch David was, for several years,

connected with these churches as their preacher. . . . He was the son of Owen David, who emigrated from Wales. He lived some time in Philadelphia, and labored as a tailor. . . . The churches coming out from the Keithian Quakers, and known as the Keithian Baptists and Seventh-day Baptists, retained many of their former habits, and in a few years, by divisions and removals, ceased to exist as distinct churches. They were very numerous in their most prosperous days. There are, however, many of their descendants in connection with our Southern and western churches."

The third branch of the American Seventh-day Baptists originated from causes quite unlike those which gave birth to the two already mentioned. Edmund Dunham was the originator of this movement. He was a member of the First-day Baptist church, in Piscataway, Middlesex county, New Jersey. About the year 1700 he had occasion to rebuke one Mr. Bonham for laboring on Sunday. Mr. Bonham replied by demanding the divine authority for the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath. Eager to answer this demand, Dunham began to search God's Word for that which he supposed could easily be found. His investigations led him to discard the Sunday and to embrace the Bible Sabbath. Others soon followed his example, and in 1705 the Piscataway Seventh-day Baptist church was organized; Edmund Dunham was chosen pastor and sent to Rhode Island, where he received ordination. At his death, his son Jonathan Dunham succeeded him in the pastorate. This church still flourishes at New Market, New Jersey; and several other churches have been formed from it directly and indirectly.

Previous to 1745 a flourishing Seventh-day Baptist church existed on the east coast of New Jersey, at Shark River, near the present town of Belmar. It was organized by emigrants from New England.

The Seventh-day Baptists have spread from these three points westward and southward, slowly but steadily. The odds against which their existence has been maintained has made them much stronger than their numbers indicate. Their existence has been perpetuated and their growth secured under the conviction that God has commissioned them to uphold the doctrine of fealty to his law, until the Christian church through its repeated failures to establish and maintain the sacredness of Sunday, either by the attempted transfer of the Fourth Commandment, or by the aid of the civil law, shall come to see that on God's law alone can either the idea of the Sabbath or the day of the Sabbath be maintained. They have foreign missions in China, Holland and Africa.

Theologically, the Seventh-day Baptists have always been known as "thoroughly evangelical." In matters of general reform, moral and political, they have always been at the front. In the work of higher education they have done more than the average of other denominations in proportion to their numbers. Sabbath-keeping is not the product of sectarian bigotry in their case, but the fruitage of a settled conviction that a return to the observance of the Sabbath is the only salvation from the morass of Sunday holidayism and dissipation. Time alone can test their faith, and that test they patiently await.

THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

This body of Sabbath-keepers has arisen within the last fifty years. Although observing the Seventh-day, they differ from the Seventh-day Baptists in several respects. The advent movement of 1843-4, as believed and cherished by them, led to the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. That movement was based upon three leading ideas:

1. That the great outlines of prophecy in the books of Daniel and Revelation indicated the accomplishment of the long period of Gentile rule, and the immediate advent of Christ and the judgment.
2. That the prophetic periods which relate to the closing events of this dispensation, and especially the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14, pointed to 1843-4 as the Year of their termination.

When 1844 had passed without the expected advent of Christ, the entire subject of the advent faith was reexamined and new questions were raised. Is the course of earthly empire as marked by Daniel and John just ready to expire? This appeared to the Adventists an undoubted fact. Is the millennium before or after Christ's advent? After that event, said they. Have the signs of Christ's second coming made their appearance? So the Adventists decided. Have the 2,300 days been rightly reckoned? Is the earth the sanctuary? Is the sanctuary to be cleansed by fire? Does the Saviour cleanse the sanctuary when he comes the second time, or does this take place before that event?

The conclusion was arrived at through this reexamination that the 2,300 days were ended, and that they indicated, not the close of human probation, but the commencement of the great work in the sanctuary which should bring the work of mercy to a final termination.

So the advent movement led directly to the heavenly sanctuary; and with equal directness to the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. For it was seen that the heavenly tabernacle with its sacred vessels was the great original after which Moses copied in making the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. Exod. 25; Heb. 9. It was further seen that the heavenly sanctuary had the same grand central object as the earthly, viz.: the ark of God's testament. Rev. 11:19; Exod. 40:20, 21; Deut. 10:3,5. The ark containing the Ten Commandments, with the mercy seat for its top, was that over which the typical atonement was made; and hence the real atonement must relate to that law concerning which an atonement was shadowed forth. Lev.

16:15. And so the heavenly sanctuary contains the ark after which Moses patterned when he obeyed the mandate see that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount." Heb. 8:5; 9:23. And in that ark is the original of that law which the great Law-giver copied with his own finger for the ark of the earthly sanctuary. Exod. 20:24; Deut. 9:10. And this great fact clearly indicates that the Ten Commandments constitute the moral law to which the atonement relates; that they are distinct from the law of types and shadows; that they are unchangeable in their character, and of perpetual obligation; that our Lord, as high priest, ministers before a real law; that men in the gospel dispensation must obey the law of the Ten Commandments; and so the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment was found among the things which are as immutable as the pillars of heaven.

Thus the study of the heavenly sanctuary opened to their minds the Sabbath and the law of God. And so the ancient Sabbath of the Bible became with this people a part of the advent faith.

The Sabbath was introduced to the attention of the advent people first at Washington, N. H., by a faithful Seventh-day Baptist sister by the name of Preston.

A word relative to this woman may be in place. Rachel D. Harris was born in Vernon, Vt. When she was twenty-eight years of age she became a believer in the Bible Sabbath. She was faithful to her convictions of duty and united with the Seventh-day Baptist church of Verona, Oneida Co., N. Y. Her first husband bore the name of Oaks. Her second that of Preston. She and her daughter, Delight Oaks, were members of the Seventh-day Baptist church of Verona, N. Y., at the time of their removal to Washington, N. H. These sisters were faithful to the truth and were instrumental in raising up the first church of Sabbath-keeping Adventists, and from this church the light shone forth upon those who have been instrumental in turning thousands to the Sabbath. For further information concerning them and their work, address, Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House, Battle Creek, Mich.

Sunday In The Creeds Of The Churches.

IT is truly said that "men are often better than their creeds." It is equally true that formulas and statements remain in the written symbols of faith long after they have become dead letters. The reader must be left to decide how well the practice of the churches accords with their creeds as given below. We give, with little or no comment, the formulated faith of the representative denominations in the United States.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Concerning the "Rule of Faith," in general the Catholic church speaks as follows:

Q. What is the rule of our faith left us by Jesus Christ?

A. The Christian world, as it stands at present, is divided into two great bodies in regard to this point. All, indeed, agree in this, that the Holy Scriptures, being dictated by the Holy Ghost, are truly the Word of God, and therefore are infallibly true in what they teach, both as to what we are to believe, and as to what we are to do in order to be saved. But, as the divine truths contained in them cannot be known without understanding the true sense of these sacred writings, hence the great question arises: How is the true sense of the Scriptures to be known? One of the two great bodies of Christians, to wit, the Protestants, affirm that the true sense of the Scriptures maybe sufficiently known in all things necessary to salvation, by every man of sound judgment who reads them with humility and attention; and therefore they hold that the rule left by Jesus Christ to man for knowing what we are to believe, and what we are to do in order to be saved, is the written Word alone, as interpreted by every man of sound judgment. The other great body of Christians, namely the Roman Catholics, affirm that the true sense of the Scriptures cannot be sufficiently known by any private interpretation, but only by the public authority of the Church; and, therefore, they hold that the rule left us by Jesus Christ is the written Word as interpreted by the Church. (The Sincere Christian Instructed, etc., by Right Rev. Doctor George Hay, chap. 11, pp. 119, 120, Boston edition.)

The same writer defines the commands of the church as follows:

Q. What do you mean by the commands of the Church?

A. The commands of the Church, in general, signify all those laws, rules and regulations which the pastors of the Church have made, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and for the edification of the body of Christ; but what is meant in particular by the commands or precepts of the Church, are six general laws, which are of more eminent note in the Church, both on account of their antiquity (having been observed, as to their substance, from the very first ages) and on account also of their universality, as obliging every member of the Church without exception whom they concern. (Ibid., chap. 15, pp. 168, 169.)

Q. What is the first command of the Church?

A. To hear mass on Sundays and holidays, and to rest from servile work....

Q. Are these holidays of God's appointment under the old law binding upon Christians under the gospel?

A. By no means; they were instituted in memory of the particular temporal benefits bestowed on the people of Israel, and were binding on them alone; and, like the rest of the exterior of their religion, which was all a figure of the good things to come under the gospel, they were figures of the Christian holidays, which were to be ordained by the church of Christ, in memory of the spiritual benefits bestowed by him on Christians, and therefore were fulfilled and done away when the Christian religion was established. By whom are the Christian holidays appointed?

A. By the church of Christ; which also, by the authority and power given her by her Divine Spouse, ordained the Sunday or first day of the week, to be kept holy, instead of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was ordained to be kept holy among the Jews by God himself....

Q. In what manner does the Church command these holidays to be kept?

A. In the same manner as the Sundays; by abstaining from all unnecessary servile works, and employing such a portion of the day in the exercises of piety and devotion, that we may be truly said to keep the day holy, and particularly to assist at the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

Q. Why are the holidays commanded to be kept the same way as Sundays?

A. Because (1) the intention of instituting both Sundays and holidays is the same. (2) God commanded the holidays of the old law to be kept in the same way as the Sabbath; and as these were only figures of the Sundays and holidays of the new law, if this was done in the figure, where only temporal benefits were commemorated, much more ought it to be done in the substance, which regards the great spiritual benefits of our redemption. (The Sincere Christian Instructed. etc., chap. 15, sec. 1, pp. 170, 171.)

Such is the basis of Sunday-observance in the Roman Catholic church. This "Ecclesiastical" theory is prominent in all the reformed churches on the continent of Europe, and underlies all other theories of Sunday-observance among Protestants. The earlier laws of the Church of England made the same classification, placing Sunday with the other holidays. The present theory of that church, is defined by one of its most scholarly writers on the Sabbath question, Dr. Hessey, is a modified form of Romish theory, but yet resting on an ecclesiastical basis. He says:

"We are warranted then, I think, in concluding that so far as her fully authorized documents are concerned, the Church of England does not pronounce in favor either of the purely Ecclesiastical, or of the Sunday Sabbatarian view of the Lord's-day. Not of the former, for the day is of divine institution. Not of the latter, for though she presents the parable of the Jewish law as a reminder that the Sunday is of divine institution, she does not assert that the Sabbath is continued. So far as those documents are concerned we seem to be justified in standing in the ways"

and seeing, and asking for the old paths, where is the good way, and walking therein," if happily thereby we "may find rest for our souls." (Sunday, Lee. 7, pp. 195, 196.)

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

This church in America rests upon the same doctrinal basis as the Church of England. In a "Catechism on the Doctrines, Usages and Holy Days of the Protestant Episcopal Church," we find a number of questions and answers which form a sort of Puritan theory on an ecclesiastical basis. So far as these refer to the early history of Sunday, especially during the patristic period, they are remarkable for the ignorance they evince concerning the latest investigations in that department, or else for their indifference to the results which those investigations have reached.

The following are some of the questions:

SUNDAY, OR THE LORD'S-DAY.

What day of the week does the Christian Church keep holy?

A. The first day of the week, called Sunday.

Q. What authority have we for the change of this day from the seventh to the first day?

A. The authority and practice of the Holy Apostles, and the Church in all ages.

Q. Why was Sunday made the great day for Christian rest and worship?

A. Because the resurrection of Christ took place on the first day of the week.

Q. Would the Apostles have changed the day if Christ had not instructed them to do so?

A. No, they acted under his inspiration and by his authority.

Q. When did Jesus instruct his disciples? Acts 1:2,3.

A. In the three years of his ministry, and also during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, when he gave commandments to the Apostles whom he had chosen, and spake of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

Q. Did Christ claim to control the Sabbath? Luke 6:5.

A. Yes, he declared "the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

Q. Have Christians always kept the first day since our Saviour's time?

A. Yes, they have, in all ages of the Church, and this universal observance of the first day proves that it must have been so ordered by Christ and his Apostles.

Q. What happened on the first Lord's-day?

A. Jesus Christ arose from the dead, and on the evening of the same day appeared to his disciples, and gave them their commission. John 20: 21,20.

Q. What happened on the next Sunday? John 20: 27.

A. Jesus appeared to the disciples again, when he gave St. Thomas the proof he required to confirm his faith.

Then follow the usual references to the day of Pentecost, Acts 2:4; also the reference to Acts 20:7 and Rev.

1:10. (Catechism, as above, pp. 8-11, Church and Book Society, New York.)

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND THE SUNDAY.

The Westminster Confession forms the basis of the doctrines of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist branches of the church, which have been developed from the Puritan stock in England, Scotland, and America. The general modifications which have been made in the creed have not materially affected its statements concerning the Sabbath question. Chapter 21 treats of "Religious worship and the Sabbath-day." Sections 7 and 8 are as follows:

"As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so in his Word, by a positive, moral and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him (Ex. 20:8,10,11; Isa. 56:2,4,6,7), which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week (Gen. 2:2,3; 1 Cor. 16:1,2; Acts 20:7), which in Scripture is called the Lord's-day (Rev. 1:10), and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath. (Ex. 20:8,10, with Matt. 5:17,18.)

This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations (Ex. 20:8; 16:23,25,26,29,30,31; Isa. 58:13; Neh. 13:15-22), but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship and in the duties of necessity and mercy. Isa. 58:13; Matt. 12:1-13. (Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, Vol. 3, pp. 648, 649.)

Those branches of the church which have sprung from the Continental"" stock, and have found a home in America, are less positive and rigid in their Sunday creeds. The Reformed Church in America (Dutch) accepts the ""Heidelberg Catechism"" and the ""Canons of the Synod of Dort"" as doctrinal standards. The catechism, as issued by the Board of Publication, New York, varies slightly from the text as given by Dr. Schaff, (Creeds. etc., Vol. 3, p. 345) and adds references to the Scriptures which are assumed to support the statements made in answer to the 103d question. The following is from the American edition:"

"Q. 103. What doth God require in the fourth command?

A. First; that the ministry of the gospel, and the schools be maintained; and that I, especially on the Sabbath, that is, on the day of rest, diligently frequent the church of God, to hear his Word, to use the sacraments, publicly to call on the Lord, and contribute to the relief of the poor, as becomes a Christian; secondly, that all the days of my life I cease from my evil works, and yield myself to the Lord, to work by his Holy Spirit in me; and thus begin in this life the eternal Sabbath."

In the "Canons of Dort" and in the "Belgic Confession" as accepted by this church in America, no reference is made to the observance of Sunday.

The Lutheran Church, accepting the "Augsburg Confession," teaches the ecclesiastical theory. Witness the following:

"What shall we think, then, of the Lord's-day and church ordinances and ceremonies? To this our learned men respond, that it is lawful for bishops or pastors to make ordinances, that things be done orderly in the church; not that we should purchase by them remission of sins, or that we can satisfy for sins, or that consciences are bound to judge them necessary, or to think that they sin who without offending others break them....

Even such is the observation of the Lord's-day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and the like holy days and rites. For they that judge that by the authority of the Church, the observing of Sunday, instead of the Sabbath-day, was ordained as a thing necessary, do greatly err. The

Scripture points and grants that the keeping of the Sabbath-day is now free, for it teaches that the ceremonies of Moses' law, since the revelation of the gospel, are not necessary. And yet because it was needful to ordain a certain day that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the church did appoint Sunday, which day, as it appears, pleased them rather than the Sabbath-day, even for this cause, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the keeping and observance of either Saturday, or any other day, is not necessary.

There are wonderful disputations concerning the changing of the law, the ceremonies of the new law, the changing of the Sabbath-day, which all have sprung from a false persuasion and belief of men, who thought that there must needs be in the Church an honoring of God, like the Levitical law, and that Christ committed to the apostles and bishops authority to invent and find out ceremonies necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church when the righteousness of faith was not clearly taught. Some dispute that the keeping of the Sunday is not fully, but only in a certain manner, the ordinance of God. They prescribe of holy days, how far it is lawful to work. Such manner of disputations, whatever else they be, are but snares of consciences. (The Unaltered Augsburg Confession, pp. 174, 175, New York, 1850.)

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The Articles of Religion,"" as put forth by the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, contain no reference to the Sunday question. (See Schaff, Creeds, etc., Vol.3, p.807, seq.) Among its denominational publications are several"

Page 113

tracts on the Sabbath question. Two of these - one entitled "The Proper Observance of the Sabbath as taught in the Scriptures," and the other "The American Sabbath" indicate that their views thus expressed are of the modified Puritan or Anglo-American school. Two others put forth, one in 1878 and one in 1880, are especially intended to defend the Sunday against the Sabbath. The utterances of this church in its various organic forms are also in favor of the religious, orthodox observance of Sunday. So that although the creed per se does not affirm anything directly concerning the question under consideration, it is just to catalogue the Methodist Episcopal Church with those who believe in the Sabbatic observance of Sunday, on the general basis of the "Westminster" platform.

THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

The Baptist Church has already been classified with those branches which accept the Westminster platform concerning Sunday. The views of the "Regular" Baptists are put forth in detail in the following extracts from the "Directory," by Dr. Hiscox:

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

"We believe the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's-day or Christian Sabbath and is to be kept sacred to religious purposes; by abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreations, by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private and public; and by preparation for that rest that remaineth for the people of God.

PLACES IN THE BIBLE WHERE TAUGHT.

1. Acts 20:7, On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them. Gen. 2:3; Col. 2:16,17; Mark 2:27; John 20:19; 1 Cor. 16:1,2.

2. Exod. 20:8, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Rev. 1:10. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day. Psalms 118:24. This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it.

3. Isa. 58:13,14, If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob. Isa. 56:2-8.

4. Psalms 118:15, The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous.

5. Heb. 10:24,25, Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is. Acts 11:26, A whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. Acts 13:44, The next Sabbath-day, came almost the whole city together, to hear the Word of God. Lev. 19:30; Exod. 46:3; Luke 4:16; Acts 17: 2,3; Psalms 26:8; 87:3.

6. Heb. 4:3-11, Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest. (Baptist Church Directory, by E. T. Hiscox, D.D., pp. 171, 172.)

Very slight analysis is needed to show that all these theories are based on the parent theory of the Romish church, which was the first theory promulgated concerning Sunday-observance. It was not essentially modified until the Puritan movement, at the close of the sixteenth century. That movement added the claim that the Fourth Commandment had been, or might be, transferred to Sunday. But since candor and intelligence are forced to admit that the Scriptures do not authorize such a transfer, the Puritan theory only changes the place, and keeps the pain, and fails to lift Sunday-keeping above the level of human authority. The battle must still be kept in array around this vital issue, VIZ.: ARE THE SCRIPTURES, GOD'S WORD, THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY CONCERNING THE SABBATH, OR SHALL THESE BE SET ASIDE, AND THE CUSTOM OF THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL LAW BE ACCEPTED IN THEIR STEAD?

The undeniable fact that the Sabbatic observance of Sunday has become a thing of the past to so great an extent in the United States shows that the loose and indefinite creeds put forth by the churches have little power over the lives of those who assert them. Such disastrous results, must always come when men cut loose from the Word of God, or compromise between the demands of his law and their own theories.

Conclusion

AN analysis of the creeds examined in the preceding chapter shows that they are all based on a common theory, which was at first a combination of no-Sabbathism and of church-authority. This theory found its earliest full expression and its permanent development in the Roman Catholic Church. No-Sabbathism is self destruction, since it removes the elements of authority and obligation without which neither religious convictions nor religious institutions are possible. Hence it was a logical necessity that the doctrine of church-authority, as embodied in the Roman Catholic Church from the fifth century forward, should be added to the doctrine of no-Sabbathism. Otherwise no form of Sabbath-keeping could have continued. In so far as the creeds held by Protestant churches partake of the no-Sabbath elements they contain the seeds of self-destruction. It is because of this logic of events as wrought out in the history of the Sabbath question that regard for Sunday has decayed, and that holidayism has gained the field in the United States in much the same way that it has always held the field in Europe.

The Puritan movement in England adopted essentially the position held by the English Seventh-day Baptists. It attempted to restore the element of authority by claiming the right to transfer the Fourth Commandment from the seventh to the first day of the week. The result of this re-introduction of divine authority gave a marked vigor and a temporary sacredness to Sunday-observance wholly unknown before. The development of that theory has gone forward mainly in the United States; but the illogicalness and unscripturalness of the attempted transfer of authority made the Puritan theory inherently weak and self-destructive. In spite of the conscientious regard which Puritanism developed at first, and in spite of the rigid civil legislation which enforced this conscientious regard, Sunday has fallen into decline steadily and hopelessly. Certain conclusions are therefore unavoidable in the light of history, the progress of which marks the unfolding of fundamental facts and principles, that no human theories can counteract or set aside.

CONCLUSIONS.

1. The element of divine authority must be restored, and the whole Sabbath question must be left to religious convictions for adjustment.
2. Civil legislation must be eliminated from the Sabbath question. Whatever legislation is necessary to prevent immorality and disorder on Sunday or on any other day as a holiday should be continued, especially in connection with the liquor traffic; but such legislation should be entirely distinct from the Sabbath idea, and whether men engage in ordinary business or recreations on any day of leisure must be left wholly to religious convictions. If it be necessary to protect employed persons against the greed and injustice of employers, civil law may grant to each employed person one day of rest in each week, but the time of resting should be agreed upon mutually between the employer and those whom he employs. Aside from these demands which the verdict of history makes, the present disastrous results of enforced leisure on Sunday, which make it a prominent support of the liquor traffic, demand such legislation as we here suggest.
3. The Sabbath question for the future must be decided in accordance with the broad interpretation which Christ made of the Sabbath law and of Sabbath duties. This will bring the church again to the religious basis and to the Sabbath as a Christian institution in contrast with the Sabbath as it had become perverted among the Jews at the time of Christ. Christ's treatment of the Sabbath indicates the only genuine and true Christian Sabbath." "The fundamental error of disregarding the Sabbath and putting Sunday in its place must give way to the larger issue which is now at hand; namely, a return to the Sabbath as Christianized by Christ, or the loss of all Sabbathism through the tide of holidayism which now floods the world."

The Sabbath question is larger in its fundamental relations to religious life than men are wont to think. It is a vital issue in connection with all forms of religious life. As connected with Judaism, it has a history reaching back to the earliest times, and the present developments in the United States indicate an important struggle touching the Sabbath and its observance among the Jews of modern times. The Roman Catholic Church, so long dominant in the Christian world, and still the strongest politico-religious organization in

the world, is also directly involved in the larger issues of the Sabbath question. Protestants, whose nominal creed is "the Bible and the Bible only" as the standard of faith and practice, are yet more closely and seriously involved in the Sabbath problem. The success or failure of public religious services and worship, and therefore of religious culture, is a prominent part of the Sabbath problem. It is not strange that thoughtful men are constantly saying that the life of the church and of the nation rises or sinks with the Sabbath question. In an age of intense commercialism like the present, the necessity not only for physical rest, but for devotion and spiritual culture, is doubly important and imperative. Even if holidayism secures the necessary physical rest, the higher elements of spiritual and religious culture are lost unless the sanctions of religion become imperative in connection with Sabbath-observance.

Thus it is that intensely practical and supremely important truths are forced upon our attention by the history which has been detailed in the preceding chapters. What we have said in this book is far more than a compilation of interesting facts and historic summaries. These facts, and the results associated with them, compel every thoughtful man to recognize in Sabbath Reform a fundamental religious issue, which cannot be safely set aside, nor successfully ignored. Whatever conclusions the reader may adopt as he lays down this book will have an important bearing upon his own religious life and upon the great religious problems of the day.

Index Of Books And Authors.

A.

Acts of the Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania. Folio: 356-357.

Acts and Laws of Connecticut. Folio: 1715 & 1737, A. D. 346-350.

Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. 337-339.

Allix, Rev. Pierre. Ancient Piedmont Church. 197, 204.

Ancient Syrian Documents. 167, 168.

Andrews, Bishop Lancelot, On the Ten Commandments. 28.

Andrews, Rev. J. N. Testimony of the Fathers: 70, 71.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library: 47, 48, 49, 50, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 80, 81, 83, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168.

Apostles, The Teaching Of. 43, 44.

Apostolic Constitutions. 160-166.

Archelaus, Disputation with Manes. 102.

Athanasius. Letter to Sarapion. 136. Letter for Easter 334 A.D. 136.

Augustine. Commentary on Psalms 92, 140, 141, 142. On the Gospel of John: 142, 143.

Augsburg Confession. 231, 232, 234, 383, 384.

B.

Bakus, Rev. Isaac. History of New England. 336, 367, 368.

Bailey, Rev. James. History of the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference. 369, 370.

Bampfield, Rev. Francis. Observations on the Seventh-day Sabbath. 310. The Seventh-day Sabbath, etc. 310.

Bampfield, Rev. Thomas. The Fourth Commandment, etc. 314.

Barnabas. Catholic Epistle. 14, 15.

Baronius, Works. Tome II: 34, 35.

Bell, Table Talk of Lutlier. 229, 230.

Basil the Great. Letter Ninety-Three. 91.

Benedict, Rev. David. History of the Baptists. 192, 196, 200, 201, 202.

Beza. On Songs of Solomon. Homily 30. 247.

Bingham, Rev. Dr. Joseph. Antiquities of the Christian Church. 88, 89, 110, 112, 125, 145, 147.

Blair. History of the Waldenses. 201.

Bownde, Rev. Nicholas. Doctrine of the Sabbath, etc. 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280.

Brabourne, Rev. Theophilus. On the Sabbath. 305.

Brerewood, Rev. Edward. Treatise on the Sabbath. 110.

Broadhead. History of the Netherlands. 354.

Brooks. Lives of the Puritans. 304.

Bryennios. Teachings of the Apostles. 39-43.

Buchanan, Rev. Claudius. Christian Researches in Asia. 217, 218, 234, 235.

Bullinger, Rev. Heinrich. Sermons. Second Decade. 246, 247.

C.

Calamy, Rev. Edmund. Non-Conformists' Memorial. 310-314.

Calvin, Rev. John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 22, 78, 79, 80, 237, 241.

Calvin, Rev. John. Commentary on Gal. 241, 242.

Calvin, Rev. John. Sermons on Deuteronomy, 242.

Calvin, Rev. John. Commentary on Col. 243.

Calvin, Rev. John. Commentary on Acts. 244.

Carlow, Rev. George. The Truth Defended, etc. 314, 315.

Cassian, John. Institutes. 116.

Catechism of Protestant Episcopal Church. 380, 381.

Cave, Rev. William, D.D. Primitive Christianity. 112-114.

Chambers' Cyclopaedia. 297.

Chrysostom. Homily Twelve Concerning the Statutes. 138, 139, 140.

Clement, of Alexandria. Stromata. 73-76.

Clement, of Rome. Epistle to Corinthians. 8,9.

Codex Justinian. 123, 124.

Coleman, Rev. Lyman. Ancient Christianity Exemplified. 13, 22, 91, 92, 108, 109, 215, 216, 219.

Colonial Records of Connecticut from 1665 to 1677, A.D. 343-346.

Constantine the Great. Sunday Edict. 123.

Cornthwaite, Rev. Robert. Reply to Dr. Wright on the Sabbath. 316, 317.

Cox, Robert. Sabbath Literature. 59, 77, 78, 85, 86, 132, 133, 301, 302, 303, 305, 317.

Cox, Robert. Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties. 252.

Crantz, Rev. David. History of the United Brethren. 193.

Cranmer, Rev. Thomas. Catechism. 256.

Confutation on Unwritten Verities. 257.

Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. 12, 18, 19.

Cyprian. Epistle Fifty-Eight. 83.

Cyril. Catechetical Lectures. 137-139.

D.

Dellon, The Martyr. Account of the Inquisition at Goa. 225, 226.

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth. Letter to Soter. 53, 54.

Domville, Sir William. An Examination of the Six Texts. 13, 20, 30, 32, 51, 57, 59.

E.

Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles. 166.

Edwards, Rev. Justin. Sabbath Manual. 56.

Edwards, Rev. Jonathan. History of Redemption. 194.

Encyclopaedia Britanica. 152, 153, 158.

Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge. 14.

Erasmus. De Amabili Ecclesia Concordia. 198.

Eusebius. Church History. 12. De Vita Constantina. 89, 90. Commentary on Ninety-Second Psalm. 132.

F.

Felt, --. Ecclesiastical History of New England. 368.

Fortesque, E. F. K. The American Church. 222.

Frythe, Rev. John. Declaration of Baptism. 255, 256.

Fuller, Church History. 304.

G.

Geddes, Rev. Michael. Church History of Ethiopia. 212,213.

Gibbon, Edward. Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. 129, 212.

Giesler, Prof. J.C.I. Church History, Apostolic Age. 115.

Gilfillan, Rev. James. Sabbath. 26, 27, 297.

Gobat, Rev. Samuel. Journal of Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia. 208, 209, 210, 211.

Grant, Dr. Ashael. History of the Nestorians. 219, 220.

Gregory the Great. Epistle to Roman Citizens. 116-118.

Grovenor, Prof. E. A. Article on Teaching of Apostles, in Independent. 39-43.

Gully, W. S. The Valdenses. 203.

Gurney, Rev. John. Brief Remarks on the Sabbath. 27.

H.

Hackett, Prof. H. B. Commentary on Acts. 12.

Hallam, Sir Henry, Constitutional History of England. 271, 272.

Hase, Rev. Dr. Charles. History Christian Church. 114.

Hay, Right Rev. George. The Sincere Christian Instructed, etc. 376-379.

Hefele, Right Rev. Charles Joseph. History of Church Councils. 153, 154, 155, 156.

Hengstenberg. The Lord's Day. 177.

Hermas, Allegory of. 9.

Hessey, Rev. Dr. James Augustus. Bampton Lectures on Sunday. 19, 20, 85, 148, 149, 150, 151, 159, 169,

172, 219, 220, 228, 229, 235, 236, 245, 250, 252, 256, 262, 269, 270, 294, 295, 379.

Heylyn, Rev. Dr. Peter. History of the Sabbath. 90, 91, 109, 145, 146, 147, 148, 173, 174, 175, 176, 235, 248, 249, 252, 257, 260, 261, 262, 265, 266, 301.

Hitchcock, Rev. Dr. Roswell. Origin and Growth of Episcopacy. 22, 23.

Hilgenfeld. Article on the Teaching of the Apostles. 39.

Hiscox, Rev. Dr. E. T. Baptist Church Directory. 386, 387.

Hoveden, Roger de. Annals. 182, 187. (These Annals were formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris.)

Hutchinson, Rev. Thomas. History of Massachusetts. 326.

I.

Ignatius. Epistle to Magnesians. 16, 18,105, 106.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, Interpolated Epistle of. 59-60. Against Heresies. 61, 101, 102.

J.

John, Bishop of Lincoln. Writings and opinions of Clement. 73.

Jones, Rev. William. History of the Waldenses. 195, 199.

Jones, Rev. William. History Christian Church. 199, 200.

Jortin, Rev. John. Ecclesiastical History. 194.

Justin Martyr. First Apology. 46,47. Dialogue with Trypho. 47, 48, 49.

K.

Kaye, Bishop. Ecclesiastical History of Second and Third Centuries. 68, 69.

Killen, Prof. W. D. The Old Catholic, Church. 13. History of the Ancient Church. 13, 21.

King, Rev. Peter. Primitive Church. 109, 110.

L.

Lardner, Rev. Nathaniel. Credibility of the Gospel History. 58.

Laws of New York from 1691 to 1773. Folio, 355, 356.

Laws of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. 336.

Laws of Virginia. 359, 360.

Lewis, Rev. A.H. History of Sunday Legislation. 150,181, 295.

Luther, Rev. Martin. Works. 231. Table Talk. 229, 230.

M.

Massachusetts Bay Colony Records. 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335.

Massie, J. W. Continental India. 216.

Melito, Bishop of Sardis. A Book on the Lord's -- . 54.

Michelt, Prof. Karl Ludwig. Life of Luther. 229.

Milner, Rev. Joseph. Church History. Vol. 1. 12.

Millman, Rev. Henry Hart. History of Christianity. 125, 126. Historical Commentaries. 130.

Morer, Rev. Thomas. Dialogues on the Lord's-day. 177, 178, 179, 180.

Mosheim, Rev. John Lawrence. Church History. Vol. I. ii. Historical Commentaries. 11, 12. Ecclesiastical History. 202.

N.

Neal, Rev. Daniel. History of the Puritans. 253, 254, 263, 264, 266, 267, 268, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 293.

Neal, Edward V. Feasts and Fasts. 126, 127.

Neale, Rev. John Mason. History of Holy Eastern Church. 222.

Neander, Rev. Dr. John Augustus William. Church History of the First Three Centuries. 10, 11, 62, 92, 115.

New Haven Colony and Plantation Records. 340, 341, 342.

Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers. First Series. 12, 15, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143.

Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers. Second Series. 91, 106, 108, 116, 118, 136, 137, 139.

O.

Ockford, Rev. James. Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment. 306.

Origen. Twenty-Third Homily on Numbers. 77, 78.

Opera Omnia. 80. Against Celsus. 80, 81. Commentary on John. 81, 82.

Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly. 35, 38.

P.

Papias. Fragments. 10.

Paggitt, Ephraim. Church Herisiography. 299, 300.

Perkins, Rev. Justin. Residence of Eight Years in Persia. 221.

Pliny. Letter to Trajan. 24, 25.

Plymouth Colony Records. 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 360, 361, 362.

Polycarp. Epistle to Philippians. 9, 10.

Public Laws of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. 354.

Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut Prior to 1665, A.D. 342, 343.

Purchas, Rev. Samuel. Pilgrimages. 202.

R.

Robertson, Rev. Cragie. Church History. 114.

Rhode Island Colonial Records. 350-353.

Ross, Rev. Alexander. View of all Religions. 198.

S.

Sabbath Document, Number, 45. 349.

Schaff, Rev. Dr. Phillip. History Christian Church. 14, 114, 115, 120, 123.

Schaff, Rev. Dr. Phillip. Creeds of Christendom. 382, 383, 385.

Sellers, Rev. William. Reply to Dr. Owen on the Sabbath. 309.

Seventh-day Baptist Memorial. 365-369.

Sleidan, Rev. John. History of the Reformation. 197.

Socrates. Ecclesiastical History. 106, 107,

Sozomen. Ecclesiastical History. 90, 108.

Stanley, Dr. Arthur P. History Eastern Church. 131, 207, 208, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219.

Stennet, Rev. Edward. The Royal Law Contended For. 307-309.

T.

Tertullian. An Answer to the Jews. 62-65.

Tertullian. On Idolatry. 65-66.

Tertullian. On the Crown. 67.

Tertullian. On Prayer. 67-68.

Tertullian. Against Marcion. 70, 103, 104.

Thompson, Hon. R. W. Address, etc. 358.

Twisse, Rev. Dr. William. Morality of the Fourth Commandment. 110.

Tyndale, Rev. William. Reply to Sir Thomas Moore. 254-255.

U.

Uhlhorn, Rev. Dr. Gerhard. Conflict of Heathenism with Christianity. 94, 95, 96, 123.

V.

Virginia Papers, etc. 357, 358.

W.

Waddington, Dean. Church History. 193.

White, Bishop Francis. Treatise on the Sabbath, etc. 203, 303, 304.

Westminster Confession. 381.

Y.

Yeates. East Indian Church History. 217

Z.

Zwingle. Works. 236.