

The Sabbath

The Six Texts Commonly Adduced From The New Testament In Proof Of A Christian Sabbath.

By A Layman.
Sir William Domville, 1774-1860
London:

Chapman And Hall, 186 Strand.
1849

www.CreationismOnline.com

Contents.

CHAPTER 1.

Introductory remarks

CHAPTER 2.

Examination of the six texts adduced from the New Testament in reference to the observance of the Sunday as a sabbath

CHAPTER 3.

Examination of the six texts in reference to the observance of the Sunday, not as a sabbath, but as a stated day of assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction

CHAPTER 4.

Result of examination of the six texts

CHAPTER 5.

Counter-evidence

CHAPTER 6.

On the practice and example of the apostles with reference to the religious observance of the Sunday.

CHAPTER 7.

Examination of the non-scriptural evidence adduced in roof of a Christian sabbath

The Epistle ascribed to Barnabas

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians

The Epistle of Pliny to Trajan

The Apology of Justin Martyr

CHAPTER 8.

On the origin of Sunday observance

As a Sabbath

As a day of Public Worship only

NOTES

Chapter 1.

Introductory Remarks and Statement of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the Christian Scriptures in proof of a Christian Sabbath.

EVERY one who has been brought up, as most of us have been, in the unsuspecting belief that our Sunday Sabbath is an institution enjoined by Divine authority, and who may, nevertheless, become desirous of satisfying himself by inquiry, as to the sufficiency of the evidence in support of that belief, will in the very outset of his inquiry be forcibly struck by one remarkable fact; and that is, the advantage which the Jew possesses over the Christian with regard to the evidence in favor of their respective Sabbaths. Why should this be, if the Christian as well as the Jewish Sabbath be an ordinance of God? Why should the Jew be enabled to refer to his Scriptures as the authority for his Saturday Sabbath, and to point to an express command to keep it holy, whilst the Christian, for a command to keep a Sunday Sabbath, searches his Scriptures in vain? Why should the Jew be put in possession of positive proof, and the Christian be left to the fallible resource of argument? Upon what grounds are we called upon to believe anything so antecedently incredible, as that the God and Father of all mankind should deal so differently with Jews and Christians, as to give to the former a command so explicit, that it was their own fault if His will was disobeyed, and yet should leave Christians in uncertainty—not perverse, but painful uncertainty—what His will may be, and punish them, nevertheless, if they mistake it, and act upon their error?

True it is, that the Jews were once a peculiarly favored people. A Divine dispensation was vouchsafed to them, which gave them "statutes and judgments" for their guidance as to the duties of religion, whilst all the rest of mankind were left, in this respect, to their own unassisted reason. But in process of time there came a dispensation from heaven, which was extended to the whole human race, and the special object of it was to instruct all mankind in their duty towards God. We may surely, therefore, without presumption, believe it to be probable that the Divine will, as to every essential observance relating to that duty, would be made as plain by the new dispensation as it had been by the old. Yet under this new dispensation there is doubt and there is controversy upon the question, What is the will of God as regards the observance of a Sabbath? whilst under the previous dispensation no doubt or controversy respecting that observance did or could exist. For who can dispute what is the will of God, when it is made manifest by an express command? Such there was in the Jewish Scriptures for the observance of a Sabbath, but such there is not in the Christian Scriptures. Still it might be the will of God that there should be this difference in the nature of the proof for the Sabbath of the Jew and the Sabbath of the Christian. I presume not to say or to imagine otherwise; and all the use I seek to make of the a priori improbability that so vast a difference should on this point be made between Jews and Christians, and in favor of the former, is to establish this inference from it, namely, that as no command exists for the observance of a Christian Sabbath, the argument by which it is attempted to prove that Christians are, nevertheless, under a religious obligation to observe a Sabbath, ought to be irresistibly strong. Is it so? That is the question which it is my purpose in the following pages to discuss.

The argumentative proof deduced from the Christian Scriptures by those who advocate the obligation upon Christians to observe a Sabbath, and whom, for the sake of brevity, I shall henceforth designate as Sabbatarians, consists of Six Texts, which they select from the New Testament. These texts taken in connection with each other authorize, it is said, an inference so strong that the Christian Sabbath originated in a Divine command, as to be equivalent to direct and positive proof that such a command has been given, although it is now no longer extant.

p But before I enter upon an examination of this argument, it is desirable to affix precise meanings to words, and to inquire what Sabbatarians really mean, or ought to mean, when they speak of the Christian, or Sunday Sabbath, or, as they more usually call it, the Sabbath.

The actual signification of the word Sabbath is known to every one as being simply rest from labor; and a Sabbath-day should signify a day in which no labor is allowed. Whatever else, therefore, the Sabbatarians may think requisite to the due observance of their Sunday Sabbath, it is clear that abstinence from all manner of work throughout the day, excepting works of necessity and charity, is indispensable; and, consequently, unless the six texts prove, or afford an irresistible inference, that the first Christians observed the Sunday as a day of such entire rest from labor, it will avail nothing to the main question in the controversy, if there should appear in those texts, or in some of them, just grounds for believing that from the earliest times of Christianity a custom prevailed among Christians of meeting regularly on that day of the week for purposes of devotion. The main question at issue is this: whether or not the first Christians observed the Sunday as a Sabbath?

The following are the six texts on which the Sabbatarians rely as proving the Divine institution of a Sunday Sabbath:—

Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.—John, 20. 19.

And after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.—John, 20. 26.

And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.— Acts, 2. 1.

And we . . . came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.—Acts, 20. 6, 7.

Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.—1 Cor. 16. 1, 2.

I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day.—Rev. 1. 10.

These six texts constitute the whole of the evidence deducible from Christian Scriptures in proof of the Divine institution of a Christian Sabbath, and yet it is by this evidence that the Sabbatarians affirm the Divine institution of this Sabbath to be clearly and completely proved! By what process of reasoning can it be that they arrive at this conclusion? a conclusion which, to all appearance, is wholly unsupported by its premises, for not one of these texts makes mention of any Sabbath whatever. The Sabbatarians reason thus: they assert that the six texts, taken collectively, prove inferentially, if not positively, the actual observance of a new Sabbath by the first Christians, including, of course, the Apostles; from whose approbation, thus implied, it is inferred that some injunction was given by them, if not by Christ, for this observance. Nay, it is argued, from the two first of the six texts, that the celebration of the two first Christian Sabbaths is proved to have been sanctioned by the presence of Christ himself. What need, then, say the Sabbatarians, of any record of a Divine command to observe the Christian Sabbath, when such proof as this is afforded by the Christian Scriptures of its having been instituted and established by Divine authority?

This argument being based entirely on the assumption that the six texts prove the actual observance of the new Sabbath by the first converts to Christianity, the immediate question for discussion is, whether these texts do prove this alleged fact or not? and with that object in view I proceed to examine them.

Chapter 2.

Examination of the Six Texts adduced from the New Testament in reference to the observance of

THE two first texts must be considered together, on account of their connection with each other; and what do we learn from them? The first tells us that Jesus appeared to his disciples in the evening of the day of the resurrection, " being the first day of the week." The other text says, that Jesus appeared to them again a week afterwards (on that day week, say the Sabbatarians), which, therefore, was also the first day of the week, or Sunday as we call it. The utmost which this information can be properly alleged to prove is, that the disciples for some purpose or other, not expressly mentioned by the historian, assembled in the evening of the day of the resurrection, being Sunday, and that they met again on the Sunday following, probably also in the evening, and that at both these meetings Christ appeared to them. But there is nothing in these texts to show that either of these two Sundays had been observed by the disciples as a Sabbath; that is to say, by purposely abstaining throughout the day from doing " any work" therein. Both texts being wholly silent on that matter prove nothing one way or the other; but, so far from affording any inference that the day had been sabbatically observed, the inference, if any, from those texts is just the reverse. For as to the first of the two meetings, the time of meeting is expressly said to be the evening; of course, therefore, when the working hours of the day were past; and all that we know the disciples actually did on that day points to a time before the hours of work began, for it was at early dawn when some of them visited the sepulcher; and of the occupations of those, or of any other of the disciples during the intervening portion of that day, we know nothing, except, indeed, that two of the disciples went to Emmaus, which being distant from Jerusalem nearly eight times the length of a Sabbath-day's journey, proves either that those disciples were unconscious of its being a Sabbath-day, or that, if conscious of it, they were the first offenders on record in breaking the new Sabbath. But that the day had become a Sabbath-day, or was intended to become such, is contrary to all probability; for we should doubtless in that case have been informed by the sacred historian that the Lord of the Sabbath, when he discovered himself to the two disciples above-mentioned, as he sat at meat with them at Emmaus, had, in reference to their journeying on that day, either reproached them with their crime, if they were already apprised of the new Sabbath, or warned them of their error, if they were till then ignorant of it.

As to what the disciples did or did not do on the second Sunday we know nothing, save that they met together on that day. It seems probable that, as at their first meeting, so at this, it was not till the evening that they met, and, therefore, not till the working hours were past. But whether so or not, the question occurs upon this text, as it did upon the first, What proof does it contain that the day had been kept as a Sabbath? The same question is to be asked as to the day mentioned in each of the four remaining texts. The reply in every instance must be, that whatever proof the text may contain of the observance of a custom to meet on the first day of the week, it affords none whatever that the day mentioned

in it was observed as a Sabbath. If any probable inference on the subject could be drawn from any one of the four last of the six texts, it would be from that which relates to the meeting of the disciples at Troas; but the inference from that text (Text No. 4.) would not favor the Sabbatarian opinion, for as we are there told that they met "to break bread," and "that Paul preached unto them," and "continued his speech until midnight," it is not at all probable, and it cannot be assumed, that the meeting took place sooner than in the evening, and if not till the evening, then not till the working hours of the day were over.

As, therefore, the Christian Scriptures afford no proof, nor even any just ground for a conjecture, that the first Christians observed the Sunday as a Sabbath, it might be thought impossible that any Sabbatarian should contend that it was in fact so observed. But there is nothing impossible in theological controversy. Accordingly we find that this alleged fact is constantly and strenuously advocated by all true Sabbatharians. Not, indeed, that any of them attempt to give direct proof, or even venture in express terms to assert, that the first Christians abstained from work on the Sunday; but they must intend that we should understand them to assert this, why else do they invariably designate the Sunday by the name of the Sabbath? And what pretense have they to call upon us, as they do, to abstain from work on the Sunday as a Christian duty, unless they maintain, directly or indirectly, that the Christians did so in the time of the Apostles? As an illustration of this indirect but earnest advocacy of the tenet, that the first Christians observed a Sunday Sabbath, I shall quote some passages from an essay by the late Mr. Gurney.*

["Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath." By Joseph John Gurney. 3d edition, 1832.]

After remarking that the Sabbath-day of the Jews, which succeeded the day of the crucifixion, was "to the disciples of Jesus a day of sorrow, darkness, and dismay," Mr. Gurney thus announces the advent of the Christian Sabbath,— "But what a glorious morning was that which next dawned on the infant Church of Christ — the morning of the first day of the week! . . . The Sun of Righteousness, who had been hidden, even from the eye of faith, during a dark night of sorrow, was again appearing in his native splendor."

Mr. Gurney then relates the several appearances of Christ to his disciples on that day, the day of his resurrection, as also his subsequent appearance to his assembled disciples in the evening, and adds, "Thus arose, and thus concluded, the first Christian Sabbath. And when was the second?" This question Mr. Gurney answers by saying it was on "that day and night," and quotes in proof the text No. 2., "and after eight days again his disciples were within."

After some remarks in support of his argument from this text, Mr. Gurney says, "A third occasion on which the disciples came together after the resurrection of Christ, was that on which the Lord himself assembled with them at Bethany, or on Mount Olivet, a meeting which terminated with his glorious ascension."

Greatly to the advantage of Mr. Gurney's argument would it have been, could he have stated that this third and last recorded appearance to the assembled disciples was also on the day of the new Sabbath. But, alas! the Church has in all ages affirmed, that as the sojourn of Christ on earth after his resurrection was forty days (Acts, 1. 3), the ascension took place not on a Sunday but on a Thursday, and its anniversary is in consequence designated in the Calendar "Holy Thursday." Still, however, so desirous is Mr. Gurney to add one more to his scanty 13 muster-roll of Sabbath-days recorded to have been observed during that long period, that he raises a question as to the actual space of time intended by the phrase "forty days;" and makes the happy discovery that if his interpretation of it as meaning five weeks be well-founded, then Ascension-day must have been a Sunday, and consequently there will then have been three new Sabbath-days, which Christ sanctioned by his personal appearance to the disciples.

All that Mr. Gurney requires to make his calculation correct is, that the slight postulatam be granted to him of being at liberty to reckon two Sundays in every week. His argument is this:— 'An eight days,' and a week,' being synonymous, forty days' are a week five times repeated, each Sabbath day being twice reckoned in the enumeration. 'Forty days' is a period of which frequent mention is made in the Sacred History. The flood was forty days' upon the earth. Moses was forty days' in the mount. Elijah went forty days' in the strength of the meat which the angel provided for him. Christ fasted 'forty days' in the wilderness. Now as the Hebrews were accustomed to reckon their time by weeks, from Sabbath to Sabbath, it seems probable that the term forty days' may be a mere synonym for five Sabbaths or weeks. If so, the ascension took place five weeks after the resurrection, and therefore on the first day of the week.—Brief Remarks, p. 73.

How little Mr. Gurney is to be trusted for accuracy in his statements we have here a remarkable specimen. The whole value of his conjecture as to the meaning of the words forty days depends, one should imagine, upon their being the exact phrase found "in the Sacred History;" instead of which the phrase there used is almost without an exception "forty days and forty nights," and it is the phrase used in every instance to which Mr. Gurney refers. Thus, "the flood was forty days upon the earth," says Mr. Gurney; but what says the Bible? "I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (Gen. 7. 4). And again, verse 12, "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights;" and it is clearly to these two texts that Mr. Gurney refers, although his expression is, "the flood was on the earth." The flood, it is true, was not, strictly

speaking, the rain, as it fell, but the mass of waters which it brought upon the earth; but the flood, in this sense, was " upon the earth" for a period not of forty but of one hundred and fifty days " (v. 24). Again, " Moses," says Mr. Gurney, " was forty days in the mount." In the Bible we find it said, "And Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights," (Exod. 24. 18). This event is mentioned five other times, and in all these instances also the phrase used is " forty days and forty nights" (Exod. 34. 28; Deut. 9. 9; 9. 11; 9. 25; and 10. 10). In no instance is the phrase " forty days" used in reference to the stay of Moses in the mount.

Mr. Gurney next refers to Elijah, who, he says, " went forty days in the strength of the meat." The Bible says he went " forty days and forty nights " (1 Kings, 19. 8).

Lastly, Mr. Gurney says, " Christ fasted forty days in the wilderness." Now the only Evangelist who uses the expression " fasted,"—the only Evangelist, therefore, to whom Mr. Gurney directly refers—is St. Matthew, whose words are, " And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights " (4. 2). Mr. Gurney may be of opinion that " forty days" is a phrase perfectly synonymous with " forty days and forty nights." Of this, however, he should have given his readers the opportunity of forming their own opinion by quoting the phrase actually used; and as it is probable that most persons would think that the words " and forty nights," were added to mark emphatically the intention of expressing forty days complete (the full period of forty days), it seems not very uncharitable to surmise, that Mr. Gurney did not quote the phrase " forty days" with its usual accompaniment " and forty nights," because to deal thus fairly with the quotation might mar his hypothesis.

But, as Mr. Gurney is not so confident in his premises as to represent the conclusion which he draws from them as anything more than a conjecture, it follows, that of the six new Sabbath-days which occurred previous to the ascension, the greatest number which he can allege to have been observed is only two. No Sabbatarian but Mr. Gurney has ever attempted to prove more. The very attempt on his part shows how sensitively conscious he is of the weakness of this part of his argument.

Those two Sabbath-days, which still remain to him, Mr. Gurney very naturally endeavors to make the most of. In so doing, however, he has not scrupled, as

* The reader may possibly have noticed the rather quaint way in which Mr. Gurney begins his account of Christ's assembling with his disciples on the day of the ascension (Acts, 1. 4-12). " A third occasion," he says, " on which the disciples came together, after the resurrection of Christ, was that on which the Lord himself assembled with them at Bethany or on Mount Olivet, a meeting which terminated with his glorious ascension." It would have been more to Mr. Gurney's purpose, as giving greater force to his remark, if he had said it was the third occasion of meeting. But his cautious avoidance of the definite article was in deference, I presume, to the words used by St. John, in relating the previous appearance of Christ to Peter and others at the Sea of Tiberias, which that Evangelist expressly declares was the third occasion of his appearing to his disciples. " This is now the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples after that he was risen from the dead " (John, 21. 14).

It may be said that this appearance was not to all the disciples, but only to some of them. Yet why should Mr. Gurney entirely pass over this, though it was only to a few, when he so carefully enumerates all the appearances to disciples, which occurred on the day of the resurrection, two of which were to no more than two disciples, and another was to one only? The reason is obvious. All these last-mentioned appearances occurred, according to Mr. Gurney, on the day of the new Sabbath, and that at the Sea of Tiberias did not occur on the day of any Sabbath, new or old; for the disciples were occupied in their trade of fishermen when Christ appeared to them. The omission by Mr. Gurney of all notice whatever of this appearance at the Sea of Tiberias, and the general tenor of his account of those appearances which he does notice, render it difficult to refrain from suspecting that that account is purposely so framed as to give the impression that Christ never appeared to his disciples after his resurrection, except on days which were new Sabbath-days. And yet how stands the fact? We read in the Acts (1. 3), that after his passion Christ was seen of his disciples forty days, but the days on which his recorded appearances took place are only four. The two that are first recorded (the day of the resurrection, and, " again after eight days") we will here take for granted were Sundays, new Sabbath-days, but the two others, the day at Tiberias, and the day of the ascension, were not. These, therefore, being equal in number to those first-mentioned, completely neutralize the argument drawn by Sabbatarians from the frequency of the appearances of Christ to his disciples on days of the new Sabbath.

I shall presently show, to express himself in language which, in its ordinary acceptation, and as it would be understood, therefore, by the generality of his readers, is so entirely at variance with the truth, as to lay him open to the charge, whether deserving it or not, of intentional misrepresentation.

Mr. Gurney, as before remarked, admits, by not pressing his conjecture as to the day of the ascension happening on the new Sabbath, that only two new Sabbath-days (if any) had, so far as we know, been observed, namely, that of the day of the resurrection and that which occurred the eighth day after it. Yet, in his summary of the evidences in proof of the Christian Sabbath (p. 90), he has ventured to express himself as

follows:—" It appears then . . . with respect to the Christian Sabbath, that it arose on the very day of our Lord's resurrection," and " that it was supported from week to week by the sanction of his presence in the assemblies of his people."

From week to week! Is this an appropriate phrase to use in speaking of two weeks only From week to week implies a succession of weeks, three in number at least. The use of this expression, therefore, in reference to Christ's appearing to his assembled disciples on the two first of the six new Sabbath-days which occurred previous to his ascension, is, seemingly at least, a deliberate attempt by the author to impress his readers with the belief that Christ, during the forty days that he remained on earth after his resurrection, sanctioned by his presence every weekly recurrence of the new Sabbath. Nor has the objectionable phrase been carelessly adopted by Mr. Gurney, since he employs it also in another passage, where, from the context, it is scarcely possible to interpret it otherwise than as intended to mean every weekly recurrence during the forty days; for it comes in the middle of a sentence, that in point of time ranges from the day of the resurrection to the feast of Pentecost, which occurred a few days after the day of the ascension. After adverting (p. 76) to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost (which happened in that year to fall on the first day of the week), and adverting also to the great number of converts added to the church on that day, Mr. Gurney exclaims, " Thus was the first day of the week again pointed out by the Divine finger as the day of Christian worship, and was blessed and honored by the Lord of the Sabbath: He who had risen from the dead, and had appeared to his disciples on that day, and who, as it occurred from week to week, had assembled with their company, now completed the hallowing of the Christian Sabbath by the mission of the Comforter."

Let me suppose the case that I were residing at Norwich, and that on some occasion a highly-respected and beloved friend, who usually lived at a great distance from me, came to and spent five or six weeks in that city. I will further suppose that, from illness or some other inevitable cause, I was unable to call upon him, but that he called upon me on the day of his arrival; and " again, after eight days;" but never more during his long residence in my immediate vicinity, till he called to take leave on the day of his departure. No one can imagine that I should, in writing to a mutual acquaintance, say of these visits, " Our friend, during his stay of between five and six weeks in this city, was particularly attentive to me. He made a point of calling on me from week to week." Yet the supposed case, and that to which it alludes, are analogous; with this difference only, that the incidents in the actual case are so sacred in their nature as to render it the especial duty of a writer, who undertakes to give an account of them, not to employ in that account, even carelessly, much less deliberately, inaccurate or ambiguous phrases.

What confidence can be placed in an advocate, more especially in an historian—and such Mr. Gurney, in his " Brief Remarks," professes himself to be—who can thus, by the use of a studied form of words, gloss over facts unfavorable to his views? Such writers as Mr. Gurney do infinite mischief to the cause of truth. They sway the opinions of the many, but it is by deceiving and misleading them on matters of fact; whether designedly or not is of no moment to anyone but the writers themselves. I therefore confess to the satisfaction it would give me, could I feel assured that my strictures upon Mr. Gurney's " Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath," will prove effective in diminishing their credit, and by consequence their undue influence, with the public.

It may be said, that in using the phrase in question Mr. Gurney could not intend or expect to mislead any one,— that having mentioned the appearance of Christ on two Sundays only, he could not mean to speak of more, when he called this an appearance from week to week, and that, therefore, whatever the ordinary sense of that phrase may be, his readers, if they reflected but for a moment, would never interpret it otherwise than as meaning in this instance two weeks only. True, all this may be said; but did all this pass in the mind of Mr. Gurney? It is strange if it did, that he should not himself reflect how few there are who, as they read, reflect, even for one moment. It is well if the reader reflects at all, which, if it be sometimes the case, is in general only after closing the book he has been reading; and such retrospective criticism seldom effaces any erroneous impressions received during the perusal. Many of the readers of 20

Mr. Gurney's very popular work on the Sabbath* would no doubt be prepossessed in favor of his opinions, and many would be charmed with the easy flow of his style, surprised by the extent of his learning, affected by the fervor of his piety, and acquainted perhaps personally, or by report, with the excellence of his character in all the relations of life. Such readers are but little likely to pause at any equivocal expression, or to question the writer's honesty in employing it. An author who is thus influential, both from character and talent, should be especially cautious not to use language of a nature which, whether literally correct or not, cannot fail to mislead a confiding or a careless reader.

My copy is the third edition, printed in 1832, and I presume there have been other editions since.

It was not till the rough manuscript of this work, including strictures on Mr. Gurney's " Brief Remarks," was completed, that I heard of Mr. Gurney's death. My first inclination, upon becoming acquainted with that event, was to suppress the strictures altogether; but I must in that case have greatly changed the plan and rewritten a considerable portion of my work; for I had made Mr. Gurney's " Brief Remarks" my chief text-book, both for Sabbatarian tenets and Sabbatarian arguments; and to quote his book without censuring some of its misrepresentations, would be doing injustice to the cause which I most conscientiously advocate. It is my firm conviction, that Mr. Gurney's book on the subject of the

Sabbath not merely propagates erroneous and pernicious opinions on that grave subject, by perverting the truth of Sacred History, but, moreover, induces those who imbibe from his work, or who have previously entertained his opinions, to imagine that, through his statements as to facts, and his arguments founded on those statements, they can now give a reason for the faith that is in them, and they in consequence become more intolerant than ever to those who think differently.

With these sentiments, all that I have felt called upon to do, in consequence of the death of Mr. Gurney, is, in the revisal of my work, to withdraw every expression which, under present circumstances, might be considered unbecoming.

I have quoted thus largely from Mr. Gurney's essay, for the purpose of showing that the Sabbatarians actually (although indirectly) do maintain the unscriptural tenet, that the Sunday became a Sabbath-day to the Christians. It is very true that Sabbatarians occasionally express themselves in language which does not imply a Sabbatical observance of the day. Mr. Gurney himself, speaking of the Sabbath-day of the Jews, says (p. 70), "No wonder that this should cease to be the appointed period for the festal worship of God's children." The Sunday, in Mr. Gurney's opinion, has been appointed a day of festal worship in its stead, and undoubtedly it might be observed as such, without being also observed as a Sabbath. During the hours of Divine service, it would, in fact, be a day of rest to all who frequented the service. To that extent, therefore, it would be a Sabbath-day. But is it in this sense that the Sabbatarians call our Sunday the Christian Sabbath? Far from it. They insist that we are under a religious obligation to observe the whole of the day sabbatically. They want a Sabbath in the strictest sense of the word, as did the Puritans two centuries ago.

Hence they take especial care, on every possible occasion, to designate Sunday as the Sabbath; and they would willingly give it no other name. Mr. Gurney, as may be seen in the Preface to his "Brief Remarks," justifies the use of that name for the Sunday, by expressing a pious scruple to call it the Lord's Day! In adopting this course, the motive of the Sabbatarians can admit of no doubt. The more frequently they speak of Sunday as the Sabbath, the more certain is the phrase to pass into common use, and to disseminate and foster a belief, without the aid of argument, that Sunday is by Divine authority ordained to be observed by Christians as a Sabbath-day.

Thus to familiarize the public with their unscriptural name for the Sunday, they consider to be, as it certainly is, a step in advance towards realizing their great and ultimate object, that of making a strictly sabbatical observance of Sunday the law of the land.

"Among the early Christians," says Mr. Gurney, in his Preface, "the first day of the week was almost universally called the Lord's Day,—an appellation for which we have apostolic authority in the book of Revelation. Since, however, this title includes the sacred name, the familiar use of it appears to be undesirable, and I have, therefore, usually adopted the term Sabbath day."

Alas! what flimsy reasoning will satisfy the conscience when we are determining upon doing what we wish to do! "For we trust we have a good conscience." (Heb. 13. 18.)

There are, however, many advocates for Sunday observance, who are not so unreasonable as to contend that it is a day divinely appointed to be sabbatically observed. They are satisfied to prove from the six texts in question, as they think they can by fairly deduced inferences from those texts, that the Sunday was observed by the first Christians as a stated day of "assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction;" and that if so, such observance of it must have had the approbation of the Apostles, and probably originated in some injunction from them,—possibly in one from Christ himself. This class of Sabbatarians, if they may be called by that name, entirely repudiate the notion of the Sunday having been constituted a Sabbath-day for Christians. They object even to its being called the Sabbath. They are of opinion that the use of that unscriptural appellation of the day gives an advantage in the discussion to those who deny all religious obligation to observe the Sunday, and, therefore, prejudices what they, the moderate advocates for Sunday observance, deem to be the proper view of the subject, namely, that there is Scriptural authority for the observance of Sunday as a stated day for public worship and religious instruction.

Paley's "Moral Philosophy," vol. 2. p. 91, etc., 8th edition, 1791.

See a Letter from the Rev. T. S. Hughes to Godfrey Higgins, Esq. The title of this pamphlet is given more fully in a subsequent page.

Let us then proceed to consider the Six Texts with reference to this more candid and rational view of the Sabbath question. Those who entertain this view, however, I shall, for the sake of the brevity of the expression, occasionally call Sabbatarians; nor is that appellation, in fact, wholly inapplicable: for, although they maintain that the Sunday is not a Sabbath, many of them do all in their power to make it so; and some of them are but too prone to concur even in coercive measures to aid in that object, on the pretense of promoting what they call "the better observance of the Lord's Day."

For the sake of brevity, also, it is indispensable that I should occasionally employ in the ensuing discussion some short phrase, by which to designate the Sunday, when speaking of it . as a day of public prayer and religious instruction, yet not a Sabbath-day: the necessity of making this distinction will be of frequent recurrence.

I had at first intended to call the Sunday, when not considered as a Sabbath, " a holy day," that being a name given to it by our Church, and a name by which it was spoken of so early as in the second century.* This designation of the Sunday would, therefore, not have been inappropriate in itself; but so to designate it, in order to distinguish it from a Sabbath-day, when we recollect that the Sabbath-day is emphatically the " holy day" of Scripture, would have been in the highest degree incorrect. I intend in consequence to speak of the Sunday as a Prayer day, when not speaking of it as a Sabbath.

By Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about A.D. 170.

I had thought of borrowing Mr. Gurney's phrase, a day of " festal worship" (ante, p. 21). It is critically correct, as applicable to a day religiously, but not sabbatically, observed. There is, however, an air of quaintness in it, which renders it unsuitable to frequent repetition. On the other hand, a prayer day is a phrase in common use among us at that season of the year, when our churches are open on other days than Sundays. In Lent, we say of Wednesday it is a prayer day, and so of Friday. In our cathedrals, where the forms of Catholicism still linger among us, every day is prayer day, as it is in all churches in Catholic countries.

As, however, those who contend that the Sunday should be observed as a Sabbath, include public prayer in the duties of the day, it will be understood that, when speaking of the Sunday as a Sabbath, I mean by that phrase, the observance of it; not only as a day of rest, but also as a day of prayer. On the other hand, when using the phrase, a Prayer day, as the designation of Sunday, I am to be understood as meaning that prayer (the " assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction:" Paley, 2. 91,) constitutes the sole religious duty of the day.

With these prefatory notices I now resume the examination of the six texts.

Chapter 3.

Examination of the Six Texts in reference to the Observance of Sunday, not as a Sabbath, but as a stated Day of Assembling for the purpose of Public Worship and Religious Instruction.

THE TEXT, No. 1.

Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.—John, 20. 19.

I BEGIN by questioning the fact which is commonly assumed, that the meeting here mentioned took place on the first day of the week. If this be not the fact, the text affords no aid to the Sabbatarians,—not even to that class of them who look upon the Sunday merely as a stated day, appointed by Divine authority, for public worship and religious instruction. It is as incumbent upon these as it is upon the strict Sabbatarians to prove, beyond all doubt, that it was on the first day of the week that the meeting was held.

The text, as translated in our Bibles, says, " Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week." Accustomed as we are °to consider that the evening which follows the morning of any day is the evening of that day, we do not reflect, when reading the words of the text, that this was not so with the Jews. When, therefore, the Evangelist says that the disciples were assembled " the same day at evening, being the first day of the week," we naturally fall into the error of imagining it was in the evening which belonged to that day of the week; and it is only upon finding that an argument is attempted to be founded upon this assumed fact, that we begin to question ourselves whether it be the fact or not.

That it was not the evening belonging to the first day of the week, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, is so well known, that it may seem unnecessary and almost pedantic to cite authority in proof of it; but the point is of too much importance to the subject in discussion to be left without further notice.

The Jews and Athenians, says Mr. Wilson, in his "Archaeological Dictionary," " began their day at sunset." The same historical fact as to the

Jews is thus stated in Nicholson's " British Encyclopedia," " The Jews began their day at sunset; they divided it into twice twelve hours, as we do, reckoning twelve for the day, be it long or short, and twelve for the night; so that their hours continually varying with the day and night, the hours of the day were longer than those of the night for one half year, and the contrary the other, from whence their hours are called temporary; those at the time of the equinoxes became equal, because then those of the day and night are so."

["An Archeological Dictionary," by the Rev. T. Wilson, 2d edition, 1793: article, " Day."]

The curious fact of the length of the hour varying according to the time of the year is thus stated by Mr. Wilson: " The ancient Hebrews did not divide their day into hours. Their division of the day was into four parts,— morning, high day or noon, the first evening, and the last evening; and their night was divided into three parts,— night, midnight, and the morning watch: but afterwards they adopted the manner of the Greeks and Romans, who divided the day, 1. e. the space of time from sunrising till sunset, into twelve equal parts, which consequently differed in length at the different seasons of the year, though still equal to each other. The first hour, especially at the equinoxes, answered to our seven, the second to our eight, the third to our nine, etc., till we come to twelve, which answered to our six in the evening, and concluded their day."

["Their day." The author, of course, intends, as he had said before, " the space of time from sunrising till sunset;" so that it was only at the equinoxes that their twelfth hour exactly answered to our six o'clock in the evening.]

The Jews, in all probability, from their first origin as a nation, reckoned their day to begin in the evening; for we read in the Mosaic account of the creation, " And the evening and the morning were the first day." And as to the Sabbath-day in particular, there is an express command in Leviticus, " From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath" (23. 32).

There is, in truth, no difference of opinion among our divines on this subject. Bishop Pearce, in his " Comment on Matthew, 28. 1," says, " In the end of the Sabbath, 1.e. when the Sabbath was past (as in Mark, 16. 1), which was after sunset on Saturday evening."

In addition to these authorities, I shall quote Mr. Gurney. This may be thought superfluous; but, besides being directly to my purpose in this place, I intend to make some further use of the quotation hereafter.

Mr. Gurney speaks of the Sabbath day going out at six o'clock in the evening, as though the Jewish day invariably closed at our six o'clock. The inaccuracy is, however, of no real importance in discussing the time at which the meeting mentioned in the text under examination took place; for the day of the resurrection occurred very shortly after the vernal equinox.

Mr. Gurney, in his dissertation (at p. 75) to prove that the day of Pentecost mentioned in the Acts happened on a Sunday, resorts, and very properly, to the Jewish mode of reckoning the commencement of their day. He says (p. 76), " At six o'clock in the evening, when the seventh Sabbath-day went out, the Pentecost began." What is this but saying that at six o'clock in the evening the Saturday went out and the Sunday began? if so, at six o'clock in the following evening Sunday went out and Monday began. Let this be remembered. The fact then is indisputable, that in Judaea, at the time of Christ's resurrection, the day was reckoned to begin with the evening. Nor can the circumstance of the Evangelist seeming in the present instance to say otherwise, alter the fact itself, or in the slightest degree affect the point in discussion; for the Sabbatarian argument is this: the day on which Christ rose from the dead was the first day of the week, and the first meeting of the disciples after that event was held by them on the very day that it occurred, and their intention in holding the meeting on that day was to observe that and every succeeding first day of the week as an holy day in commemoration of Christ's resurrection. The point for consideration, therefore, is exclusively this: — If the disciples, who thus met together in the evening after the resurrection, had been asked at the time, what was the day of the week on which their meeting was held, —whether was it the first or the second? what would have been their answer? Doubtless they would all, the Evangelist himself included (for he was one of them), have replied that it was on the second. No other answer could they have given, for they were Jews by birth; they were then residing in Judaea; they were meeting in its metropolis; and as yet they had not departed from any one of their ancient national usages, civil or religious.

If such, then, would have been (and such must have been) the answer of those who held the meeting

in the evening mentioned in the text, it is clear that, whatever be the expressions used by the sacred historian, in speaking of that meeting with reference to the day of the week, they cannot do away with the fact, that the evening, in the opinion of those who held the meeting, belonged to the second day of the week, and not to the first.

I have met with but one author (the Rev. T. S. Hughes) who has made any attempt to overcome the difficulty which the Sabbatarians have thus

to encounter in regard to the day of the meeting in question; and I do not hesitate to say, that he has failed in the attempt. In his reply to the "Home Sabbatical" of Mr. Higgins, he tells his opponent that "the word (evening) had two meanings among the Jews; by the first of which the ninth hour of the natural day, about the decline of the sun, or three o'clock in the afternoon, was signified; and by the latter, the eleventh hour, or five o'clock." "This point," he adds, "being established, you will see that our Lord may easily be supposed to have appeared to his disciples on the first day of the week." (P. 34.)

Mr. Hughes's reply has been already referred to (ante, p. 23). The title is "A Letter to Godfrey Higgins, Esq. on the subject of his Hone Sabbatical; or, an Attempt to correct certain Superstitious and Vulgar Errors respecting the Sabbath. By the Rev. T. S. Hughes, B.D., late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Christian Advocate in that University, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Peterborough." Cambridge, 1826.

Now this, as I shall presently show, is not so easily supposed as Mr. Hughes seems to think it is. But I must first observe that Mr. Hughes differs materially in opinion from others of the learned as to the time of the commencement of those two evenings. A note on Exod. 12. 6, in D'Oyly and Mant's edition of the Bible, says, "Among the Jews there was a former and a latter evening. The first began at noon, as soon as the sun began to decline, the second began from sunset." The authorities quoted as giving this explanation of the two evenings are Bishops Patrick and Kidder, and Mr. Pyle, a canon of Salisbury.

"A former and a latter evening." In so calling them, the Bishops and Mr. Pyle must mean to speak of our mode of reckoning as to the day; for, with reference to the Jewish day, that evening which began from sunset was, strictly speaking, the former evening, and that which began from noon was the latter evening.

The word "noon" is generally supposed to be derived from nova, the ninth hour (three o'clock), though now used to signify midday.

I know not on what grounds the Bishops and Canon rest their assertion, that the former evening commenced at noon, "as soon as the sun began to decline." I should have thought it more likely to have commenced, as Mr. Hughes states, at three in the afternoon. But the fact, be it either way, is of no consequence to the present discussion: the important point, with reference to that discussion, is at what time the latter or second evening commenced, whether at five o'clock, as Mr. Hughes says it did, or at sunset, according to the account given of it by the Bishops and Canon. That their account, however, is in this respect to be trusted, there can, I apprehend, be no room for doubt, for it seems to be supported by every competent authority on the subject. The only authority which Mr. Hughes brings forward in justification of his opinion, that the second evening began at five o'clock, is the following passage from Josephus, which is not in point; for Josephus, in that passage, is not describing the precise commencement of the two evenings, but only the hours between which the sacrifices of the Passover were made, namely, between three and five. Josephus says, (De Bell. Jud., lib. 6. cap. 9. sect. 3.) which is thus rendered in Havercamp's edition, (But they, upon the coming of the feast, which is called the Passover, in which, from the ninth hour to the eleventh, they slay the victims).

Whether, however, the second evening began at five in the afternoon, or at sunset, the fact is undeniable, that the beginning of the second evening, whenever it took place, was with the Jews the beginning of a new day, so that if it can be made manifest (as undoubtedly it can on the best authority), that Christ did not appear to his disciples at the meeting mentioned in the text under examination, till after the second evening had begun, and, consequently, not till after the first day of the week was past, Mr. Hughes's argument from the two evenings of the Jewish day avails him nothing; and for this plain reason, that if Christ did not appear at that meeting till after the second day of the week had begun, the inference is certain, that his purpose in appearing on that occasion could not have been to sanction by his presence the religious observance of the day of his resurrection.

Mr. Hughes himself is so fully aware that this must be the inevitable inference from the fact that Christ did not appear at the first meeting of the disciples till it had become the second day of the week, that he provides for it by arguing the sanction of Christ to that first meeting, from his re-appearance to his disciples on the first day of the week following, without appearing to them in the interval. Mr. Hughes says to his opponent: "But even if . . . it were admitted that our Lord appeared to them after six o'clock, I see not what you would gain by it; at any rate his disciples had assembled together on the first day of the week (or Sunday), and it was their Lord's re-appearance to them on the first day of the week following (or the next Sunday), without mention being made of any intermediate appearance, which gave his sanction to the day." As Mr. Hughes's argument is thus made dependent upon the construction to be given to the text relating to the meeting, "after eight days" (Text, No. 2.), it is an admission on his part that the text No. 1., taken alone, fails to prove that Christ gave his sanction to the religious observance of the day of his resurrection. This is sufficient for my present purpose, and I now proceed to my proof of the fact that Christ did not appear to his assembled disciples on the day of his resurrection. This proof I adduce on Scripture authority, namely, the narrative which St. Luke has given of Christ's appearance to the two disciples who "went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs" (24. 13). He joined them on their way, discoursed with them without making himself known to them, and when they approached the

village he manifested an intention of continuing his journey beyond it; but the disciples pressed him to stop with them at Emmaus, urging as a reason, that it was too late for him to travel any further that day: for so, in familiar language, we may correctly paraphrase the account in St. Luke's Gospel. " And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went; and he made as though he would have gone further. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is towards evening, and the day is far spent."

It is obviously impossible that St. Luke can here have intended to refer to that earlier evening of the Jewish day which began at noon: for to say the day was far spent, when it was only toward mid-day, would be absurd; and it would be scarcely less unreasonable to suppose that St. Luke intended the earlier evening, if it began, as Mr. Hughes believes it did, at three o'clock in the afternoon: for it could never be said to a traveler, that at that hour, when there would still be more than three hours' sunlight remaining, it was too late in the day for him to pursue his journey. St. Luke, therefore, meant to speak of the latter evening of the Jewish day: this, according to Mr. Hughes, began at five in the afternoon; and I might, with perfect safety to my argument, take the fact to be so, but I shall continue to assume that, for the reasons already stated, the opinion of the Bishops and Canon on this point is the correct opinion, and that the latter evening, as they call it, did not begin till sunset. Now, it appears from the Gospel narrative, that Jesus yielded to the request made to him by the two disciples on their approaching the village of Emmaus, and that " he went in to tarry with them" there, and that he remained to be present at, and, it may be, to partake of their evening repast: for it is related that " as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them." Then were their eyes " opened and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." After some remarks to each other on what had occurred, they " rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem."

The journey to Emmaus was on the day of the resurrection. That event must have occurred shortly after the vernal equinox. The precise date assigned to it by the index to the Oxford quarto edition of our Bibles is the 5th of April.

That it was quite evening when Jesus sat at meat with the disciples at Emmaus is the generally received opinion. Dr. Hey, in one of his divinity lectures, makes it the ground of an argument on the curious question, whether Jesus rose from the grave with an unchanged body, or with one of a more spiritual nature, as his vanishing and other similar expressions relating to him after his resurrection would rather seem to imply. But this latter opinion being scarcely reconcilable with the strong language used to the contrary in the fourth of our thirty-nine articles, those persons who are inclined to solutions which keep clear of anything supernatural, might, says Dr. Hey, reason thus " Two disciples might walk with Jesus, side by side, and not know him; they might never look at him, or not see him clearly, especially in the dusk of the evening; their minds might be intent upon something else; he would speak in a style different from that in which they had usually heard him speak; why not purposely? and yet when lights were brought at supper, and they sat opposite to him, they might know him." (" Heads of Lectures in Divinity, delivered in the University of Cambridge, by John Hey, D.D., Norrisian Professor," vol. 2. p. 407, 4th edition.)

By the time that they set out on their return, the evening which was at hand before they reached Emmaus must no doubt have actually come on. If this be not admitted, it will, at least, not be denied, that it must have come on long before the two disciples arrived at Jerusalem, the distance being more than seven English miles.

Some critics are of opinion, and it seems not improbable, that the expression in the text, " found them . . . saying, the Lord is risen," means, found them conversing on that topic, and consequently the two disciples may have been the first to speak on joining the rest. The difference which would be made by this interpretation, as regards the question of time occupied in the transactions here narrated, is quite unimportant.

When they had joined the disciples who were there assembled, and had been told of Christ having risen, and of his having appeared to Simon, they in their turn told of his having joined them on their journey to Emmaus, and what things were done in the way; and though we are not to suppose that they did or could repeat all that Jesus expounded of himself, " beginning at Moses and all the Prophets," yet it would be equally unreasonable to suppose that they did not give a lengthened account of it to an audience who must have been intensely eager to know all that they could tell; and it was not till they had come to the very last fact which they had to relate, " how he was known of them in breaking of bread," that Jesus appeared to the assembled disciples, and " stood in the midst of them." The space of time that intervened between the sunset which had closed the day, and this appearance of Christ to the disciples assembled at Jerusalem, could not be less than two hours, and was more probably three; so that the first day of the week was then long past, and the second had begun to reckon its hours.

" Were done." These words are not in the original, which says merely, " and they told the things in the way," but which means, of course, all things that happened in the way, including, therefore, the ample expounding of the Scriptures.

Since, therefore, it is evident that Christ did not appear at this meeting of the disciples till it had become the second day of the week, it matters little to the argument of the Sabbatarians whether or not the disciples had assembled while it was yet the first day of the week. The narrative

however, implies, as I shall hereafter shew, that it was already evening when they met, and, consequently, the second day of the week, and not the first.

But supposing that the disciples had assembled while it was yet the first day of the week, what use could the Sabbatarians wake of this fact, unless they could, by the evidence of other facts, shew at least a reasonable probability that the motive of the disciples in thus assembling on the first day of the week was to do honor to the day of the resurrection? Now that such should have been their motive is impossible, absolutely impossible; for at the time when they met they did not believe in the resurrection. It was not till after they had assembled, that any one of them (Mark, 16. 14), or, if anyone, Peter only (Luke, 24. 34) knew of that event. The reports which

Christ had, indeed, appeared to the two disciples who went to Emmaus; but those disciples did not join the meeting of the disciples at Jerusalem till some considerable time after the latter had assembled. Christ had, also, according to St. Matthew's Gospel (28. 9), appeared to the women who went to the sepulcher, but they are not stated to have been present at the meeting, nor does it seem likely that they were so.

Or, if any, Peter only. I so state the fact, not as doubting it, but because it is remarkable that no one of the Evangelists relates the appearance of Christ to St. Peter; and were it not that we are informed by St. Luke's narrative, above referred to, that the two disciples who had been at Emmaus found the others gathered together, " saying, He hath appeared to Simon " (Peter), we should infer, from all the four Gospels, that Christ did not appear to Peter till he appeared to him and the rest of the disciples when they were assembled in the evening. St. Matthew mentions only one appearance of Christ during the day, and that was to the two women. He says nothing of Peter. St. Mark mentions Peter, but in a way that seems to imply it could not have been the intention of Christ to appear to him. For the young man whom St. Mark says the women found sitting in the sepulcher, said to them, " Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth . . . He is risen . . . Go your way; tell his disciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him." All that St. Luke relates of Peter is, that on hearing the report that Christ had risen, Peter ran unto the sepulcher, and that seeing only the clothes there he " departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." St. John says, that Peter and another disciple, supposed to be himself, went to the sepulcher, and that finding the clothes only, they " went away again unto their own home." He says not a word of Christ having appeared to them, although he immediately afterwards relates the appearance to Mary Magdalene. He says, indeed, that after Peter had gone into the sepulcher, and found there only the clothes, he himself went in, " and he saw and believed;" meaning, it may be presumed, believed that the body, as Mary Magdalene had supposed, had been taken away, for the next verse implies that he did not yet believe that Christ had risen. The Gospel narrative is this:—" Then cometh Simon Peter following him" (the other disciple who had outrun Peter in their way to the sepulcher, verse 3, 4), " and went into the sepulcher, and sees the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulcher, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto their own home." (John, 20. 6-10.)

Of the disciples who went to the sepulcher, it is expressly affirmed by the disciples who went to Emmaus, that the former " found it even so as the women had said; but him they saw not" (Luke, 24. 24).

they had heard of it during the day had been discredited. They met in the evening, after Christ had risen, inquiring and doubting. One of the eleven, as we learn from St. John's Gospel, was positive in his disbelief of the fact, and was absent from the meeting, and, not improbably, for that reason. St. Mark's account of this general incredulity is very emphatic. He relates that Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene in the morning of his resurrection, and that " she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept; and they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not" (16. 9, 10, 11). Even the report made by the disciples who had seen him at Emmaus appears, according to St. Mark, to have been discredited. For it must be to them, and to their report, that St. Mark refers, when, in continuation of his narrative, he says, " After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country, and they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them" (verses 12, 13).

Nay, more: in the verse which follows, St. Mark seems to assert that the disbelief of the disciples on their first meeting was universal. Referring to that meeting, St. Mark says, " Afterward he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen" (verse 14).

Now, if because St. Mark here states that the eleven were present, it should be thought that he refers not to the meeting in the evening after the resurrection, at which, according to St. John, only ten of the eleven were present when Jesus appeared; but to the meeting, " after eight days," at which St. John says (impliedly, compare verse 24 and 26), that all the eleven had assembled; then, what St. Mark relates of the continued prevalence of doubt and disbelief among the Apostles would be perfectly amazing. Whichever of the two meetings St. Mark intends to refer to (but that he intends the first there can be little question), it would seem from his account, that not one of the Apostles, when they met, believed in the resurrection.

It being for these reasons manifest beyond all contradiction, that the motive with the disciples for assembling in the evening after the resurrection, could not be to celebrate and sanctify the day of the resurrection, the question, what might be their actual motive, ceases to be of importance to the present discussion. It is not unlikely, as I shall hereafter have occasion to notice more particularly, that it was their usual custom to meet together in the evening, whilst they were all staying in Jerusalem. However this may be, there can be no difficulty in assigning as probable some special reasons why they should meet in the evening after the resurrection, for the narrative itself appears to suggest them. One might be a desire on their part to collect and consider the various and generally discredited rumors respecting Christ's resurrection, which had been current during the day. What the two disciples, who had returned from Emmaus, found them saying ("The Lord is risen, indeed, and hath appeared to Simon"), furnishes a clue to the subject on which they had been conversing, and seems to indicate, at the same time, the motive here assigned as one which had induced them to assemble. Another motive may very reasonably be supposed to have been a desire to consult together on their forlorn prospects, and even their personal safety. It is particularly noticed by St. John that they were then in "fear of the Jews;" and with respect to their future prospects, nothing could be more gloomy than they were at that time. "He which," as they trusted, "should have redeemed Israel" (Luke, 24. 21), had been put to death as a common malefactor—an event which had disappointed all their hopes, and struck them with dismay. "The disciples, after their Lord's crucifixion," says Bishop Porteus, "appear to have entertained no hopes of his resurrection. Shocked and confounded, dismayed at finding him condemned to the ignominious death of the cross, they forgot everything he had said to them respecting his rising again. Most of them seem to have remained concealed during the whole time of Jesus being in the grave, and to have given themselves up to sorrow and despair."—(Note on Matthew, 28. 7, in D'Oyly and Mant's Bible.)

But it was not only during the time that Jesus continued in the grave that they gave themselves up to sorrow and despair. We are expressly told that on the day of the resurrection, when Mary Magdalene went to inform "them that had been with him," of that event having occurred, she found them mourning and weeping; [Mark, 16.] and as they did not believe her report, but continued incredulous of the fact till he appeared to them all in the evening, they doubtless had mourned and wept throughout the day. Surely the then state of their feelings and apprehensions was such as may well be supposed to have been a sufficient inducement to them to meet together, in order to consult with each other on the condition of their affairs; and most preposterous is the Sabbatarian notion that they could have assembled to celebrate a day which to them, up to the very moment of their meeting, had been a day of "sorrow and despair."

That, therefore, from one or both of the motives which have been here suggested, if it was not their custom to meet in the evening, the disciples should assemble together in the evening following the resurrection, is a conjecture favored by the general tenor of the Gospel narratives; whilst not a single fact or circumstance therein related is opposed to it. This at least is evident, that the disciples met for purposes of their own, and not for any purpose of their crucified Master; certainly not by his command, nor for the purpose of establishing or observing any Christian rite; for as they did not yet believe in the resurrection, they were not yet Christians.

We do, indeed, read of a command which Christ sent to his disciples on the day when, and soon after, he had risen. It was not, however, to assemble in the evening at Jerusalem, but to go and seek him in Galilee. St. Matthew relates, that the angel at the sepulcher said to the women who came there, "Jesus . . . is risen . . . Go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goes before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him . . . And they departed quickly from the sepulcher . . . and did run to bring his disciples word. And as they went . . . Jesus met them . . . Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid; go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me," (Matthew, 28.)

It is remarkable that St. Matthew omits all notice of the meeting in the evening which followed the resurrection, and of that also which took place "after eight days," yet as one of the eleven he must have been present at both.

His silence on this subject contributes an additional inference that the disciples could not have met at either of these meetings for the purpose of instituting or celebrating a new religious rite.

Of the motives which induced Christ to appear to his disciples when they were assembled in the evening after he had risen, we are left in no uncertainty whatever, for they are obvious on the very surface of the Gospel narratives. He vouchsafed to appear to them in order to dissipate their doubts as to his resurrection, and to give them some instruction in the duties of their future mission as his Apostles, (Mark, 16.; Luke, 24.; John, 20.)

Surely these, testified as they are by the Evangelists themselves, were purposes worthy of Christ's appearing to his assembled disciples, and sufficient to account for it. How great is the presumption of the Sabbatarians, therefore, when they assert that Christ had a further object in view, to which the Evangelists do not testify, namely, that of sanctioning by his presence, and in effect, therefore, ordaining the institution of a new Sabbath, which was to be observed thereafter by his followers to the end of time. What is this but a conjecture, as improbable as it is

presumptuous? For it is past all belief, that if Christ had had that great purpose also in view, he should neither at the meeting in the evening after the resurrection, nor on any other occasion of his appearing to his disciples previously to his ascension, have said one word to them respecting it; or that if he did, his historians should not have related what he said. If ever Christ commanded a new Sabbath to be observed, or, what is in effect the same, commanded the old Sabbath to be observed on a new day, it must assuredly have been the bounden duty of the Evangelists to register that command in their narratives of his life and actions. St. Luke, we find, in the beginning of his Acts of the Apostles, thus makes profession of his design in writing his Gospel:—"The former treatise," meaning thereby his Gospel, "have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up." Now, although it would be unreasonable to maintain that St. Luke meant to use the phrase (all that Jesus said and taught) in its strictest sense, it would, on the other hand, be unreasonable not to allow that he must have meant to relate all that Jesus said and taught which would be of great importance to be known in after times. But what St. Luke thus professed to do in writing his Gospel, the other Evangelists, we may presume, intended to do in writing their Gospels; and to suppose, therefore, that all of them should, nevertheless, have omitted to put on record a command of Christ instituting a religious ordinance, which was to be perpetual in his Church, if he ever gave such a command, would be a supposition so directly opposed to all reason and probability, that it cannot be entertained by any person of sound understanding, not warped by prejudice. Nor will it make any difference in the case if it be supposed, as it is by some, that the alleged command of Christ did not enjoin the observance of a Sabbath, but merely the holding of religious assemblies upon the first day of the week.[The practice of holding religious assemblies upon the first day of the week was so early and universal in the Christian Church, that it carries with it considerable proof of having originated from some precept of Christ or of his Apostles.—PALEY's Philos. vol. 2. p. 87.] This would be equally a divine command for the observance of a religious rite, and if ever issued, might equally be expected to have been found recorded in the Christian Scriptures.

Before I conclude these remarks upon the Text, No. 1. ("Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week," etc.), I have to notice a circumstance which has undoubtedly caused much of the misconception that prevails as to its true meaning; and that is, that in our translation of the text the word "being" is introduced where it has no corresponding word in the original. As this word is not unfrequently used to signify "because" (for instance, "being Sunday we all went to church"), so it is by most persons who read the text only in our translation taken for granted, that the Evangelist meant to say the disciples met because it was the first day of the week; but there is nothing in the original to warrant such an interpretation, nor to authorize the introduction of the word "being," where it now stands in our translation. The word does, indeed, occur in the original, but not, as in the translation, in immediate connection with "the first day of the week." The text is, which, literally translated, is not, as we have it, "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week;" the literal translation is, "Then it being evening in that same day, the first of the week." So translated, we at once perceive that the emphatic meaning supposed to belong to the word "being," as applicable to the first day of the week, has vanished, and that the narrative in its more exact translation, instead of implying that the disciples met because it was the evening of the first day of the week, implies rather that they met because it was their custom to meet together in the evening.

Although I lay no great stress on the conjecture that it was the custom of the disciples to meet together in the evening, it may be worth noticing, that the probability of its being their custom is increased by another probable fact, and that is, that the eleven, while staying at this time in Jerusalem, occupied the same dwelling; for it would seem that they did so not long afterwards, as in the first chapter of the Acts (v. 13) we read, "And when they," the Apostles whom Christ had chosen (v. 2), "were come in," (from witnessing the ascension from Mount Olivet), "they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas, the brother of James."

The original phrase, is generally understood in the sense of dwelt, or were dwelling. Our Bible, as we see above, renders it by the word "abode." Wakefield's translation is, "where they usually abode." Mr. Sharpe, however, in his translation (London, 1840), has, "where were awaiting Peter, etc." But although *storaistherrick* may be properly translated awaiting, so to translate it here would imply that the Apostles were not the persons who had "come in" from witnessing the ascension, which would, be inconsistent with the narrative.

But whether it were their custom or not is of small importance, as regards the meeting in question, since the text, when correctly translated, clearly authorizes the inference that it was already evening when the disciples met. For when the historian says, "It being evening . . . and the doors being shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews," it is scarcely possible he can mean otherwise than that it was evening when the disciples met. It was, therefore, the second day of the week, not the first, on which they thus met. But even if this interpretation of the text could be considered as doubtful (which I think is scarcely possible), it would still remain a matter of certainty that Christ did not appear at the meeting till after the second day of the week had commenced, which fact, as I have before remarked, completely disproves the Sabbatarian assertion that Christ appeared in order to sanction the religious observance of the first day of the week, and, by consequence, it proves, independently of all the other proof here given of the fact, that the disciples did not meet for the purpose of religiously observing the day on which they met; so that whether the day of their meeting was the second day of the week or the first, the Sabbatarian argument drawn from Text, No. 1., which records the meeting, is in every point of view untenable.

THE TEXT, No. 2.

And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.—John, 20. 26.

The Text, No. 1. failing to support the Sabbatarian cause, the Text, No. 2. fails also: for if, as I have already proved, the meeting recorded in the Text, No. 1. did not take place on the first day of the week, what can it avail the Sabbatarians to be able to prove from Text, No. 2. that the meeting there mentioned took place on the same day of the week as the first meeting? Or if it be taken for granted that the first meeting, and consequently the second, took place on the first day of the week, what would even this concession avail, when, as I have also proved, the purpose of the first meeting could not be, as the Sabbatarians contend it was, to celebrate the day of the resurrection?

However, as I must not assume that a Sabbatarian advocate would admit the validity of my proofs on these points, I shall now proceed to discuss the Sabbatarian merits of Text, No. 2.

In itself that text proves nothing which bears upon the Sabbath question, except the fact that the disciples held a second meeting, at which Christ again appeared to them, and except, perhaps, the additional fact, that the second meeting took place exactly on the day week after the first.

I deny, however, that it is so clear as it ought to be in an argument of such importance as the present, that the second meeting did take place on the day week after the first meeting.

Supposing that the Greek phrase which our Bibles translate "after eight days" (and which is the literal translation), may mean, as some of the learned tell us it means, "a week after," just as the French say, *huit jours apres*, I am not aware that the French phrase does, and I am certain the English phrase "a week after," does not necessarily, and on every occasion, signify exactly that day week. When we say an event happened (as, for instance, that a friend called upon or wrote to us) "a week after," we have no idea of being pinned down by the use of that phrase to its strict meaning of exactly seven days. It might be a day more or a day less than seven, yet we should never scruple to use the phrase; but it is far from certain that the Greek phrase in the original text means "a week after," or, as some would translate it, "on the eighth day after." If it did so in the opinion of the very able divines, whose translation of the Bible is still our authorized version, they would surely, in order to avoid ambiguity, not have translated it literally, as they have done, "after eight days;" for no one can pretend to say that the phrase "after eight days" is, or ever was, idiomatic in our language to signify "on the eighth day after," or, "a week after."

Dr. Heylyn in his treatise on the Sabbath question, referring to the appearance of Christ to the apostle Thomas, says, "That the text tells us was after eight days from the time before remembered, which some conceive to be the eighth day after, or the next first day of the week . . . But where (whereas) the Greek text reads it *post octo dies* in the vulgar Latin, after eight days according to our English Bibles, that should be rather understood of the ninth or tenth, than the eighth day after."—(HEYLYN'S History of the Sabbath, A.D. 1636.)

"*Post octo dies* in the vulgar Latin," meaning the Latin translation of the New Testament, which is now usually called the Vulgate; and is so called because Latin was the vulgar or common language of the country at the time of the translation. It was made in the fourth century, by Jerome, the most learned of all the Latin fathers.

Thus we find our translators two hundred years ago, and Jerome above a thousand years before their time, agreeing in translating the original Greek phrase literally, and not as an idiom, by which the Evangelist intended to say, "on the eighth day after," or, "on that day week."

In a recent translation of the New Testament (published by Pickering, London, 1840), the phrase is translated "eight days after," with a notice that Archbishop Newcome translates it "within eight days."

Since, therefore, there unquestionably prevails some uncertainty as to the meaning which the Evangelist intended to give to the Greek phrase which he has used, it cannot properly be made the foundation of an argument; for it cannot establish any certain conclusion. And, indeed, it is hardly to be doubted that the Evangelist, instead of confining himself to the somewhat vague phrase, "after eight days," would, on this occasion, have added the words, "being the first day of the week," or other words of similar import, had he intended to make it known to all future times that it was on the first day of the week that the disciples held their second meeting, and that to celebrate the recurrence of that day was the purpose of the meeting.

It is, moreover, not to be taken for granted that this was their second meeting. The Sabbatarians lay great stress on the word "again" in the

text,—("And after eight days again his disciples were within")— as though it proved that the disciples had never met in the interval; but nothing can be more probable than that they had met on other evenings, — perhaps on every evening, — since the day of the resurrection. Nay, the probability is, as I have before suggested (p. 48), that it was their custom to meet in the evening: but, whether it was their custom or not, it is indisputable that they had many weighty reasons for conferring often together during that momentous period of their destiny which immediately followed upon the resurrection; yet it might happen, that if they had intervening meetings between the day of that event and the meeting " after eight days," nothing occurred at them which it was of importance to record for the information of future ages. At that meeting, however, the meeting " after eight days," a circumstance of the utmost importance did occur; that of the incredulous disciple coming to the meeting, and being there converted from his unbelief. "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them;" an incident which the historian seems himself to tell us is his inducement to notice the meeting: and if, as is here supposed to be probable, there had been intervening meetings, he could still with perfect propriety speak of this, the second meeting mentioned by him, in the words of the text, "Again his disciples were within." The Sabbatarians, therefore, to entitle themselves to lay any peculiar stress upon the word "again," ought first to prove, or at least show it to be most probable, that the disciples had never met together in the interval.

For the sake of argument, however, let us suppose that it was on the first day of the week that the meeting recorded in the Text, No. 2. was held; still that text affords no evidence that the disciples met and Christ appeared because it was the first day of the week, and, therefore, of itself it proves nothing to the point in controversy.

It is, indeed, only by considering the two texts in connection with each other, that the Sabbatarians are enabled to construct an argument in support of their assertion, that the meetings mentioned in those texts were held on the first day of the week, and were held on that particular day, for the purpose of religiously commemorating the day of the resurrection.

No Sabbatarian ever would have thought of inferring from the first text that the disciples had met in the evening after the resurrection, in order to celebrate the day of that event, if that text had not been followed by another, stating that, on the same day of the ensuing week " again " the disciples met. Nor would any Sabbatarian have thought of inferring from the second text that it was on the first day of the week that the meeting mentioned in it took place, if the first text, as our Bibles translate it, had not stated that the meeting there mentioned was held on that day.

Thus Dr. Paley says of the first meeting: " This, for anything that appears in the account, might, as to the day, have been accidental;" and adds, " but in the 26th verse of the same chapter we read, that after eight days,' that is, on the first day of the week following, again the disciples were within;' which second meeting upon the same day of the week looks like an appointment and design to meet on that particular day." This, be it remarked, is all that Dr. Paley has to urge as showing the relation which the two texts bear to each other. The meeting mentioned in the second text, he argues, looks like an intention upon both occasions to meet upon the first day of the week.

What Dr. Paley, however, considered as nothing more than a resemblance to proof, Mr. Hughes, as we have seen, considers to be proof itself. He connects the two texts by asserting of the two meetings of the disciples, that " it was their Lord's reappearance to them on the first day of the week following " (the first meeting), " without mention being made of any intermediate appearance which gave his sanction to the day."

This argument of the Sabbatarians, that the two texts thus aid each other in proving that the disciples twice met on the first day of the week in observance of that day, and that Christ appeared to them each time, in order to sanction their observance of it, is at least an admission, on the part of the Sabbatarians, of the insufficiency of each text by itself to prove those facts. But let us now look a little more closely to the question, what is the nature, and what the amount of the aid, which the two texts confer upon each other.

All that the Text, No. 2. can contribute to Text, No. 1. is the solitary fact, that the disciples met together a second time on precisely the same day of the week as that of their first meeting. The value of this fact, if indeed it be the fact, which is very doubtful, depends entirely upon the correctness of the inference which is, in consequence, attempted to be drawn from the two texts taken conjointly, namely, that the disciples met, as Dr. Paley argues they did, on the second occasion, by " appointment," and on both occasions with the " design " of observing the particular day on which they met. Now this is so large an inference, considering how slight are the premises from which it is drawn, that Dr. Paley himself only says of it, that it has some appearance of being a just one. But to be of any aid to Text, No. 1.

this inference from the two texts should be not merely probable, but indisputable; which it is not. The Text, No. 2., therefore, affords no effective aid to Text, No. 1.

On the other hand, the Text, No. 1., far from aiding, is decidedly injurious, to Text, No. 2., for the facts connected with Text, No. 1. show that, could we infer from Text, No. 2., or were we even to take for granted that Christ appeared to his disciples at their second meeting, while it was yet the first day of the week, Text, No. 1. would interpose and strip the fact of all its Sabbatarian value, by reminding us that Christ did not

appear to his disciples at their first meeting till after the first day of the week was past. For since Christ thereby made it plainly manifest that he did not then appear for the purpose of conferring a religious distinction upon that particular day of the week, it is a clear inference from Text, No. 1. that he did not appear for that purpose at the second meeting.

Thus, whether the Texts, Nos. 1. and 2. be viewed singly or together, they in neither case warrant the facts inferred from them by the Sabbatarians.

The whole argument of the Sabbatarians respecting these texts is built on mere conjecture. When they maintain, for instance, that the purpose of the disciples in their two meetings was the religious observance of the day on which they met, the Sabbatarians can produce no evidence from the texts to justify that opinion. A meeting in the evening can be no proof that the day had been observed as a Sabbath; and as to any religious rites having been performed by the disciples when they met, the texts are both wholly silent on the subject: no mention is made in either of them (as in Acts, 1. 14) of " prayer and supplication."

There is also that other instance of Sabbatarian conjecture upon these two texts, which has already been here so frequently brought into question, — a conjecture still more remarkable, and far more presumptuous, than that which has just been noticed; I allude to their conjecture that Christ, in appearing to his disciples at the two meetings mentioned in the texts, had a purpose in view beyond that which the Evangelist assigns, that secondary purpose being, say the Sabbatarians, to institute a religious rite which was thenceforth and forever to be observed as the Christian Sabbath.

If Christ had had that further purpose in view, it would seem to be utterly incredible that the Evangelist should not himself have made it known by an express statement of it, or so plainly indicated it as to leave no doubt whatever of the fact. But there is no such statement, nor any such indication, in either of the texts, or in the narrative to which they belong.

That, however, the only motive which the Evangelist does assign for Christ's appearing to his disciples at each meeting is all-sufficient to account for those appearances, no Sabbatarian can venture to dispute; for at the first meeting Christ appeared to convince his disciples of the reality of his resurrection, and at the second to convince that disciple of it who, not having been present at the previous meeting, had remained incredulous of the fact.

That the motive thus assigned by the Evangelist for the appearance at the first meeting is all-sufficient, who can doubt, that recollects it is stated on Scripture authority that most of the disciples present, nay, according to St. Mark, all of them, up to the time of their meeting, discredited the reports of Christ's resurrection? "Afterward (says St. Mark) he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." St. Mark then adds, " And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature " (16. 14, 15). How could they have done this? how could they have preached " Christ is risen," if he had not by his appearance to them removed their " unbelief " in the fact of his resurrection?

That the motive assigned by the Evangelist for the appearance of Christ at the second meeting is all-sufficient, who can deny, that considers what a serious check it must have given to the onward progress of the new religion, had one of the chosen disciples continued to disown his Master; and this, not from any base inducement, like Judas, but from an honest conscientious doubt of the important fact, that Christ had risen from the dead? On the other hand, what a triumph to the cause, that he who had once so strongly doubted, should afterwards so firmly believe!

With these amply sufficient reasons to account for the appearance of Christ to his assembled disciples in the evening after his resurrection, and " again after eight days," what amazing presumption is it in the Sabbatarians to conjecture, and to insist upon the conjecture, as though there were undeniable indications of its truth, that Christ had a purpose in thus appearing, which the historian does not mention, and to which he makes not the slightest allusion!

I conclude by challenging contradiction, so it be by direct argument and not by mere assertion, when I affirm, as I here do, that the texts now under examination, whether taken singly or together, afford no proof whatever of the alleged intention of Christ to institute the religious rite now called the Christian Sabbath; and this, whether it be considered as an institution obliging us to observe the first day of the week as an actual Sabbath, or only as a day appropriated to public prayer and religious instruction.

At what period of the Christian era the custom arose of observing the first day of the week as a stated day of prayer and religious instruction will be the subject of inquiry in a later stage of this discussion. In the mean time let it be borne in mind, that of all the Six Sabbatarian Texts, the Texts, Nos. 1. and 2. alone relate to the period during which Christ remained on earth after his resurrection; and that the examination of these two texts has shown beyond all reasonable doubt that his disciples never during that period met together on the first day of the week out of

regard for the day; and, consequently, that the custom of religiously observing that particular day of the week could not have originated till after Christ's ascension.* This is in many points of view a very material fact, and particularly so, as it effectually dissipates the idle fancy of all zealous Sabbatharians that Christ sanctioned by his presence the first and second observance of their Sunday Sabbath.

* As the Church Clergy of our times are in general staunch advocates of the opinion that Christ himself enjoined the religious observance of Sunday, and are prone to quote, in support of that opinion, the alleged fact, that Christ twice appeared to his disciples upon that day of the week, it will not be inopportune to remark here, that this is not a tenet of the Church of England. In the Homily entitled "Of the Place and Time of Prayer," it is argued from the fourth Commandment, and from God's rest on the seventh day of the creation, that "God's will and commandment was to have a solemn time and standing day in the week, wherein the people should come together, and have in remembrance his wonderful benefits, and to render him thanks for them." Then follows this passage: "This example and commandment of God, the godly Christian people began to follow immediately after the ascension of our Lord Christ; and began to choose them a standing day of the week to come together in; yet not the seventh day, which the Jews kept, but the Lord's Day, the day of the Lord's resurrection."

The last sentence in this passage is, in another point of view, not less remarkable than the first. A day which the godly Christian people were at liberty to choose, and did choose, for themselves, could not have been a day which they were commanded to observe.

THE TEXT, No. 3.

And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they [the Apostles] were all with one accord in one place.—Acts, 2. 1.

It would have been to me an enigma, what possible connection there is between this text and the Sunday-Sabbath question, had not the learned found out, by calculation, that the day of Pentecost therein spoken of happened (as I have already noticed, p. 17) on the first day of the week, therefore on a Sunday.

If this discovery was made by a Sabbatarian, it was a most unlucky one for his cause, and he was guilty of egregious indiscretion in not keeping it to himself, since, by divulging it, he has disclosed a fact which might never have become known in modern times, but which being known is most damaging to the Sabbatarian cause. For it now appears, that St. Luke makes express and particular mention of a meeting of the Apostles on a day which we find must have been Sunday (the first day of the week), and yet he not only takes no notice of any act then done by them in honor of that day, but he does not even notice the fact that it was on the first day of the week that their meeting was held. He tells us, indeed, that they met "with one accord in one place;" but that gives us no information of what they did when they met. Had the historian said, "And when the first day of the week was come, they [the Apostles] were all with one accord in one place," it would have been very fair to conjecture, and even to insist, that it was for some purpose connected with the day mentioned, and that consequently it was to do honor to the New Sabbath. But this is not what the historian has said: what he says is, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come." Therefore, by parity of reasoning, the fair conjecture, I might say the certainty, is, that the meeting was for some purpose connected with the day on which they are actually said to have met,—the day of a great Jewish festival, and consequently not for the purpose of observing a Christian festival.

It would seem, therefore, wholly unnecessary to pursue the subject any further; but as a large and influential portion of the Sabbatharians rely upon this text (No. 3.) as exhibiting an instance of the observance of the New Sabbath by the Apostles, I feel compelled to enter into a more formal refutation of the argument which is deduced from it.

The argument is this: Pentecost being proved, on calculation, to have happened on a Sunday, we learn, therefore (say the Sabbatharians), why the Apostles on the day of Pentecost were all with one accord in one place; and why the day of Pentecost was selected for the great miracle of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. It was on their part to do honor to the New Sabbath; and the Lord of the Sabbath, by selecting the day of the New Sabbath for the coming of the Holy Ghost, gave his further and final sanction to the observance of it. "Thus," says Mr. Gurney, in a passage before quoted more fully (p. 23),—"thus was the first day of the week again pointed out by the Divine finger as the day of Christian worship, and . . . He who . . . had appeared to his disciples on that day, and who, as it occurred from week to week, had assembled with their company, now completed the hallowing of the Christian Sabbath by the mission of the Comforter."

Mr. Gurney's mode of calculating the day is as follows:—"Our Savior's last Paschal Supper was on the evening which terminated, or, according to the reckoning of the Jews, succeeded, the fifth day of the week. That fifth day was the 14th of Nisan, on which the Passover was slain. He was crucified on the sixth day, and the following seventh day was . . . the second of the feast, and the 16th of Nisan, on which the wave-sheaf was offered to the Lord. Now from the time of this solemnity, seven complete weeks were to be numbered; and the day which followed," and which would be the first day of a week, "was the fiftieth day, or the Pentecost."—Brief Rem. p. 75.

The calculation is, I presume, correct; but I cannot forget, that when Mr. Gurney wished to compress forty days into five weeks, in order to prove that Ascension-day was a Sunday, he reckoned two Sundays to a week (see note, ante, p. 13): whilst here it suits his calculation to allow but one. Thus at Mr. Gurney's bidding a week expands into eight days, or shrinks into seven, as the fact which he undertakes to prove may happen to require.

How little the promised mission of the Comforter related to the institution of a Christian Sabbath may be seen in the statement of the purposes of that mission in the Gospel of St. John, 15. 26, and 16. 7-14.

As an answer to these gratuitous conjectures, it ought to be deemed sufficient to remark, that if the historian had considered this meeting of the Apostles on the first day of the week to be on that account of any importance, and, a fortiori, if of the vast importance ascribed to it in the passage just quoted, he would, we may safely take for granted, not have left it to be thereafter discovered only by calculation, that it was on the first day of the week that the meeting was held. Even when he wrote, which was not till thirty years after the event the precise day of the week on which this moveable feast of Pentecost occurred had become a subject of calculation rather than of recollection; and therefore, instead of stating that the Apostles assembled with one accord in one place on the day of Pentecost, the historian, if he there mentioned the day of Pentecost at all, was far more likely to have stated, in express terms, that the Apostles assembled on the day of that feast, because, happening as it did in that year on the first day of the week, it fell on the New Sabbath-day. But, as the narrative now stands, no ordinary reader would interpret it otherwise than as meaning to acquaint us that the Apostles, who, it is to be borne in mind, had not yet forsaken the rites and ordinances of the Jewish law, assembled on the day of Pentecost because it was the day of Pentecost, and as such a high Jewish festival; and that for some sufficient reason, and yet not because it happened to fall on the first day of the week, this day of Pentecost was selected as the appropriate day for the descent of the Holy Ghost. In this sense, and in no other, as I believe, has the narrative been read in all ages of the Christian Church, until the Sabbatarian controversy arose in this country rather more than two centuries ago, and the Puritans of that period, to whom we probably owe the first discovery that the day of Pentecost mentioned in the text happened on the first day of the week, made use of that fact as Scripture authority for their Sunday-Sabbath. That they did so make use of it appears from the circumstance that Dr. Heylyn, who was their contemporary, or nearly so, thus notices their argument upon it. He observes of Pentecost, that " it was a moveable feast, such as did change and shift itself according to the position of the Feast of Passover . . . and if the rule be true, as I think it is, that no sufficient argument can be drawn from a casual fact, and that the falling of the Pentecost that year upon the first day of the week be merely casual, the coming of the Holy Ghost upon that day will be no argument nor authority to state the first of the week in the place and honor of the Jewish Sabbath."

There is, besides, no difficulty whatever in accounting for the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the day of Pentecost, as being the day of Pentecost; for we find in the narrative a fact related which is of itself an all-sufficient reason why the day of Pentecost, as such, should be appointed for the occurrence of that great miracle; a reason which renders the gratuitous conjecture of the Sabbatarians on the subject entirely superfluous.

Pentecost being one of the three great annual festivals held at Jerusalem, it gave occasion to the assembling in that city of great multitudes of Jews from every part of the world: " There were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven," (Acts, 2. 5.) This afforded to the Apostles, in the very outset of their public career, an opportunity peculiarly favorable for making converts to the new religion, as was proved by the result; for " the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls," (Acts, 2. 41.)

" Some, perhaps, were constantly dwelling there; but the greater part, probably, were drawn thither by the feast of Pentecost, and that of the Passover, which preceded it."—Bishop PEARCE, in D'Oyly and Mant's Notes.

With this abundantly sufficient reason why the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, and the consequent gift imparted to them of the power of speaking to every man in his own language (Acts, 6), should occur on the day of Pentecost, whatever might be the day of the week on which the festival happened to fall in that year, what need is there to look out for any other reason? Yet such is the rash propensity of Sabbatarians to oppose their own fancies to the plain meaning of Scripture narrative, that (as we have just seen in the quotation from Mr. Gurney's "Brief Remarks") they assure us, in language as confident as though they spoke by inspiration, that by the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, the first day of the week was pointed out " by the Divine finger " as the day of Christian worship, and that Christ on that day " completed the hallowing of the Christian Sabbath."

Great stress is, I am aware, laid on the precise words of the historian, " with one accord in one place." This, say the Sabbatarians, implies, that the meeting was in a private dwelling, and the Apostles could not meet in a private dwelling to celebrate the Feast of Pentecost. Certainly they could not: but this point being agreed, we are still left as much as ever in the dark as to what their purpose was in thus meeting in private, if they really did so; for the historian has neither informed us of their purpose, nor given us any clue to it, beyond mentioning the fact that they met on

the day of the Jewish Feast of Pentecost;—a fact which, far from favoring, goes far to oppose, the Sabbatarian assertion, that the Apostles met on that day to celebrate a Christian rite.

Nor have the Sabbatarians any conclusive grounds for inferring, as they do, from the words of the text, that the meeting mentioned in it did take place in a private room or dwelling. There is high authority, and what is better still, there are strong reasons for believing that the fact was otherwise. The learned Bishop Pearce, upon this question, says: " There is no certainty about the place; but it is probable that the Apostles were in the temple, because it was then Me third hour of the day (v. 15), which was the Jewish hour of morning prayer in the temple, as the ninth hour was that of the evening prayer there (chap. 3. 1), and because it is said, that the Apostles were daily in the temple (v. 46), and that Peter and John went up to the temple (chap. 3. 1). For these reasons they were the more likely to have been in the temple at this third hoar (an hour of prayer), especially on such a solemn festival as the Pentecost was."—(Commentary on the Gospels, the Acts, 4-e., by Zachary Pearce, bishop of Rochester, published from his MSS. in 1777.)

To the opinion of Bishop Pearce, that the temple was the place of meeting spoken of in Acts, 2. 1, it may, perhaps, be objected, that it is afterwards said, " A sound from heaven . . . filled all the house where they (the Apostles) were sitting." It is, however, impossible to believe that this passage, occurring as it does in the very next verse (v. 2), should have escaped the Bishop's notice and consideration. He, therefore, thought it presented no material objection.

In a copy of the received version of the Bible, published in 1778, with explanatory notes " selected from the works of several eminent divines," I find the following note on ver. 2: —" And it filled all the house . . . That part of the temple where they were sitting." This remark, it will be observed, was made in a work published before the Bishop's work was published.

I cannot but think that the Bishop's interpretation of Acts, 2. 1, as to the place of meeting, receives stronger confirmation from ver. 46 of the same chapter than he appears to claim from it. ("And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple.") For we have here the same words, "with one accord," as in ver. 1. " With one accord in one place " (or in the same place), seems, therefore, to be there used as an equivalent phrase for "with one accord in the temple," the phrase used in ver. 46.

If, then, the place where the Apostles met with one accord on the day of Pentecost was the temple, and not, as supposed, a private room or dwelling, this circumstance would of itself offer a conclusive refutation of the Sabbatarian notion that the Apostles met on that day " with one accord in one place," because it was the day of the New Sabbath.

But although the opinion of Bishop Pearce is, for the reasons which he has assigned, in the highest degree probable, and, therefore, well worthy of notice, it is still, I am aware, nothing more than a conjecture. I consequently place no over-confident reliance upon it, nor have I need so to do; for I had on other grounds previously shown, that the inference which the Sabbatarians draw from the text in question is untenable.

I have, perhaps, dwelt too long upon this text, for a more flimsy conjecture than that which the Sabbatarians infer from it in proof of their tenet is scarcely to be met with in the annals of disputation. Dr. Paley has disdained to have recourse to such a mockery of proof. He has passed it by in silence; yet there are, as we have seen, injudicious Sabbatarians, who, in conscious weakness, cling to it for assistance. They find it, if I may use a simile now somewhat " over-worn,"* floating as a straw on the stream of controversy, and they catch at it in the struggle of despair.

The three texts which I have now examined (John, 20. 19; 26: Acts, 2. 1) confessedly contain all the evidence which the Sabbatarians can collect from Scripture in support of their assertion that Christ gave his personal sanction to the observance of the New Sabbath, and that, consequently, it must be presumed he expressly ordained it, although his command is not extant. A case depending on proof so weak should require no formal refutation. It ought to be considered as failing from its own insufficiency, although no counter-proof were brought against it. But, in the case before us, the counter-proof has been abundant. It has presented itself in every step of the discussion, and consisting, as it does, of obvious inferences from Scriptural facts, it is more than sufficient to annihilate the feeble inferences to which it is opposed. In this light I am persuaded the case would appear to every person capable of reasoning upon evidence, if the subject in question were unconnected with religious faith and feelings.

THE TEXT, No. 4.

And we [St. Paul and his companions] . . . came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.—Acts, 20. 6, 7.

Not till seven-and-twenty years after the Gospel had been proclaimed by the Apostles is there any instance recorded of a meeting of Christians upon the first day of the week. At length, we find one in the text before us. [A.D. 60] But it is a solitary instance; a very remarkable circumstance this, if, in the time of the Apostles, it was the constant custom of Christians to meet upon that day. But let us see what the Sabbatarians have to say of this one meeting.

The inference which Dr. Paley draws from the text I shall state in his own words. As he connects it with his comment upon the Texts, Nos. 1. and 2., I cannot avoid re-transcribing the latter part of that comment. " We read (he says), that after eight days, that is, on the first day of the week following, again the disciples were within; which second meeting upon the same day of the week looks like an appointment and design to meet on that particular day. In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we find the same custom in a Christian Church at a great distance from Jerusalem." After quoting the above text from that chapter, " And we came to them to Troas," etc., he adds, " The manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week, shows, I think, that the practice by this time was familiar and established," (vol. 2. 87.) This seems, till further investigated, to be a fair inference from the text. I must observe, however, that Dr. Paley is not justified in the use of the expression " the same custom;" for, as yet, he had given no proof that a custom previously existed, nor expressed any decided conviction of his own that it did exist. All the evidence he had offered in proof of it was the meeting of the disciples " after eight days," and all that he had ventured to assert of that meeting, in connection with the previous meeting, was, that it looked like a design to meet on the particular day. But Dr. Paley, we may be very sure, would not himself admit that what only looks like proof is proof itself. In other respects, Dr. Paley states the inference from the text with great fairness, and apparently much too feebly to satisfy the more zealous advocates in the same cause. Mr. Hughes thus amplifies the inference:—He first tells us that, in the 16th chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians, we have the testimony of St. Paul to the custom in the Christian Church of assembling together on the first day of the week; and he then adds, " We have also that of St. Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. 20. 6), who confirms the opinion, that it was customary to meet on that day for the purpose of religious worship, for expounding the Scriptures, and for breaking of bread, i. e. partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."—(Letter to G. Higgins, p. 27.)

So extraordinary an exaggeration of the facts stated by St. Luke, respecting the meeting of the disciples at Troas, could not have been expected from a writer so candid and so desirous of accuracy as Mr. Hughes appears to be; [I allude more particularly to his learned note at p. 14, which gives proof of much laborious research with a view to accuracy, and exhibits a degree of candor rarely to be found in controversial writings.] but such a mode of dealing with facts, by whomsoever employed, and although, as probably in this case, proceeding from inconsiderate haste in throwing off an argument from the pen, is very reprehensible.

That the meeting mentioned in the text was for the purpose of religious worship, is mere assertion: no reference is there made to prayer or any other act of worship.

That it was for the purpose of expounding the Scriptures is also mere assertion, there being nothing in the text, or in the narrative connected with it, to warrant the belief that the disciples met with that intention, although, as it happened, that when met, St. Paul preached, there can be no doubt that he expounded the Scriptures to them.

That the phrase " breaking of bread " means partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is another mere assertion. No proof is given, or authority cited, in support of it. The words " to break bread," in the text before us, are unaccompanied by any context which should give them any other than their primary meaning, that of taking an ordinary meal. For with the Jews the breaking and distributing of the bread by the master of the house or by some eminent person in the company, was a regular ceremony at their meals; so that to " break bread" is a very appropriate phrase to signify the taking of the usual meal; and the phrase " meeting to break bread," for the same reason, as appropriately describes the partaking of a meal in common.

That the ceremony above-mentioned was customary with the Jews is, I believe, not doubted; but it may, nevertheless, be proper that I should quote some authority for my statement.

Burder, in his " Oriental Customs" (vol. 2. p. 313, 5th edition), refers to the narrative of the Last Supper, as given in Matthew, 26. 26, 27, " And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples. . . . And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them." The author then extracts from the works of Gill and Picard the following remarks upon this narrative:—'And as they were eating, Jesus took bread.' Though this supper is distinct from the Passover, and different from any ordinary meal, yet there are in it allusions to both and to several Jewish customs. He that asked a blessing upon bread used to take it into his hands: this is a stated rule, that all may see that he blesses over it. It was also common with the Jews to ask a blessing upon their bread: the form in which they did it was this: Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the king of the world, that produces bread out of the earth.' If there were many at table, one asked a blessing for the rest. The blessing always preceded the breaking of the bread. The rules concerning the breaking of the bread are:—

The master of the house recites and finishes the blessing, and after that he breaks; he does not break a small piece, lest he should seem to be sparing, nor a large piece, lest he should be thought to be famished; it is a principal command to break a whole loaf.' He that brake the bread put a piece before every one, and the other took it into his hand. . . . The Jews blessed and gave thanks for their wine, as well as their food; they generally did it in this form: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the king of the world, who hast created the fruit of the wine.' (Gill, in loco.)

"Gill." I presume the writer here quoted is John Gill, a Divine of the Baptist persuasion. He was born in 1697. His education was limited, owing to the contracted circumstances of his parents; but by application he became a good classical and oriental scholar. His great work is "A Commentary on the Scriptures," in 9 vols. folio. He died in 1771. (Watkins's Biography.)

Picard (Bernard), an engraver, was born at Paris, in 1673. Being a Protestant, he went to Amsterdam, where he was chiefly employed by the booksellers. One of his greatest works is "An Illustration of the Religious Ceremonies of all Nations." (Watkins's Biography.)

Jesus took bread and blessed it.' The person of the greatest dignity amongst the Jews always pronounced the Baraca, or benediction on the bread and wine; for which reason our blessed Lord performed it himself, being with his disciples, as their master and doctor. (Picard's Religious Ceremonies, vol. 1. p. 124.)

A passage in the Acts (27. 35), which will be presently quoted for another purpose, is obviously consistent with the above statements.

Nothing, therefore, can in itself be more probable, than that the breaking of bread should become a phrase to signify taking an ordinary meal, and such apparently is its meaning wherever it is met with in Scripture. Thus, in the instance of the assembling to break bread at Troas, the phrase has no other apparent meaning; and that it is the real meaning is the more probable from what follows in the narrative, which goes on to relate, that "as Paul was long preaching," Eutychus, one of his auditors, had sunk into a deep sleep, and falling from the third loft was taken up dead; and that Paul went down and restored him. The narrative then adds, that when Paul "was come up again and had broken bread and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed."

No one can seriously believe the meaning of this passage to be that St. Paul a second time administered or partook of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It obviously imports nothing more than that, exhausted by fatigue, he took some further refreshment; yet here again occurs the phrase of breaking bread.

There is another instance of the use of this phrase in the Acts of the Apostles, to which scarcely any other than the simple meaning can be assigned; I allude to chapter 2. ver. 46, where it is said of the new converts;—"And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." In confirmation of the opinion that this could be nothing more than taking their daily meal together, it is to be recollected that in the verse next but one preceding we had been told that "all that believed were together, and had all things common." Hence we see why they should take their principal meal together one day in one house, the next day in another, and so on in succession; and that such was the fact the historian appears to tell us, when he speaks of them as "breaking bread from house to house."

A very remarkable instance of the use of the phrase in question, and where manifestly it can have no other signification than that of taking ordinary refreshment, occurs in the very interesting narrative given by St. Luke of St. Paul's shipwreck on his voyage to Rome. It does not appear that St. Paul was accompanied by any of the former companions of his travels besides St. Luke, the writer of the narrative, so that of the whole crew and passengers (two hundred and seventy-six in number: Acts, 27. 37), they were the only Christians. [There, perhaps, might be some unconverted Jews on board; but if so, on a question relating to the Lord's Supper, they may fairly be numbered with the Heathens.] A storm came on during the voyage; "But when the fourteenth night was come, as we were driven up and down in Adria, about midnight the shipmen deemed that they drew near to some country; . . . then fearing lest they should have fallen upon rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and wished for the day; . . . and while the day was coming on, Paul besought them all to take meat, saying, This day is the fourteenth day that ye have tarried, and continued fasting, having taken nothing; wherefore I pray you to take some meat; for this is for your health and when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all; and when he had broken it he began to eat (v. 35). Then were they all of good cheer, and they also took some meat." (Acts, 27. 27-36.)

That the phrase "breaking of bread," in the narrative relating to the meeting at Troas, had, in Dr. Paley's opinion, no reference whatever to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is clear; for could he conscientiously have given this sense to it in the passage contained in the text, it would most essentially have served him in the argument which he builds upon that text.

Dr. Heylyn also considered the breaking of bread at Troas to have been a common meal. In remarking upon the text in the Acts 46), " And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart," Dr. Heylyn says, this " plainly must be meant of ordinary and common meats;" and when remarking on the breaking of bread at Troas, he says, that among the ancients St. Chrysostom regarded it as an ordinary supper; and he quotes a passage as from St. Chrysostom in support of that assertion. I must confess, however, that I have looked in vain through the works of that Father for this passage. Nevertheless, I there find satisfactory inferential evidence that St. Chrysostom must have been of the opinion attributed to him. For in his tenth Homily, which is entitled "An Exhortation to those who scruple to go to the Evening Meeting after the Evening Meal" (post cibum sumptum,— literally, after food taken), St. Chrysostom refers to the text in the Acts, which mentions Paul's preaching at Troas, and the use that he makes of his reference in connection with his argument in the Homily, implies that, in his opinion, St. Paul's auditors had, in meeting to break bread, met to take their usual evening meal.

We may, therefore, very safely conclude from the instances here adduced of the phrase "breaking bread" (and they are all taken from St. Luke himself, the narrator of the occurrences at Troas), that, except where the context shows that a different meaning is intended, the Scripture sense of the phrase is invariably that of taking an ordinary meal, and, consequently, the meeting at Troas " to break bread " cannot justly be interpreted to mean, as Mr. Hughes asserts it does, a meeting for the purpose of partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"Breaking of bread "—" that is," says Mr. Hughes, " partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

This bold and positive assertion, that such is the meaning of the phrase, provokes remark upon the previous question, whether, in point of fact, Christ did institute the rite which we now call " the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Few persons are aware (because few inquire into the subject) how little reason there is for believing that he did.

The proof consists of certain words spoken by him at his Last Supper with his disciples. The kind of proof is, no doubt, the best possible; the only question is, Did the words so spoken contain, or imply, a command to Christians in after ages to observe the rite of the Lord's Supper? Let us see what the words were.

But previously let me be allowed to express my sincere conviction that a rite commemorative of the Last Supper of our Lord with his disciples, if the observance of it be free from superstitious practices, and if no superstitious doctrines be attached to it, is eminently calculated to serve and promote the true interests of religion and Christian piety.

With respect, then, to the words spoken by Christ at the Last Supper, and which are supposed to have commanded the observance of this rite, they are, of course, to be looked for in the narratives which the Evangelists have given of that memorable occurrence.

St. Matthew, who was present at the supper, tells us that, on giving the bread to the disciples, Jesus said, " Take, eat: this is my body:" and that, in giving the cup, he said, " Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins: but I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

St. Mark, who was not present, adopts the account given by St. Matthew, and the words which he says Jesus used are the same as those mentioned by St. Matthew, with some variations, too slight to be worthy of notice.

St. Luke, who also was not present, gives a somewhat different account of the distribution of the bread and wine, and of what Jesus said; yet in nothing materially different, except that in stating what Jesus said, St. Luke represents him to have added the words, " This do in remembrance of me."

These words may have been intended as nothing more than a solemn injunction to the disciples to do then what he had commanded, as being an act which was likely to impress upon their minds a lively recollection of their last supper together, when he should have suffered (Luke, 22. 15) and be no longer with them. This, however, is not the sense usually attributed to the words in question. They are much more generally supposed to imply a command from Christ, that the act should be repeated after his death. If the latter be the true sense, it is certainly not a little remarkable, and indeed unaccountable, that words of such high import should have been omitted by St. Matthew, who was an ear-witness of all that passed, which St. Luke was not.

But what says St. John, the beloved disciple, who leaned on the bosom of Jesus during the supper, and must have heard and treasured up every

syllable that fell from his lips? It can (comparatively speaking) little signify what St. Luke says as to the institution of " the Lord's Supper," as he was not present at the Last Supper. What says St. John? Not one word!

What, then, are we to conclude from this unexpected silence of St. John on a subject now considered to be of such vast moment? St. John, who wrote his Gospel to supply the deficiencies of the three other Gospels? Unquestionably we may conclude this, that the three other Evangelists had already told all that could be told as to what Jesus said.

Hence the evidence of a command by Christ to observe the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper rests entirely on the words attributed to him by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. What is the sum of their evidence? Had we only the testimony of Matthew, and of Mark, who copies him, no one would have the hardihood to maintain, that the words spoken by Christ are a command, which was to be obeyed by any except those to whom it was immediately addressed, or that the act commanded to be done was ever to be repeated even by them; and if we take into account St. Luke's addition to that command (" This do in remembrance of me"); and if we assume that this was an injunction to repeat the act after the death of Christ, still this addition to the previous command was also obviously confined to those only to whom it was immediately addressed. Not the slightest indication anywhere appears that the act commanded was to become a practice with other persons and in after ages.

I am aware of what St. John, in the 6th chapter of his Gospel, informs us was said by Christ respecting " the bread of life," the " eating of the flesh," and the " drinking of his blood." All this, however, was said by him, not at the Last Supper, nor in Jerusalem; it was said by him when teaching in a synagogue at Capernaum a year before; and, moreover, in what he there said we find no command, nor any expressions used, which can imply a command to institute and observe a religious rite.

I am also aware of certain passages in the 11th chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, which shew that in the church of Corinth a practice prevailed of breaking bread and drinking wine in commemoration of what Christ had said to his disciples at the Last Supper; and further, that St. Paul testifies himself to the words found in St. Luke's Gospel, " This do in remembrance of me;" and what is rather remarkable, he testifies also (v. 25 and 26) to words of grave importance spoken by Christ on taking the cup, which are not related by St. Luke or any other of the Evangelists.

Whether the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel and the passages above referred to in St. Paul's Epistle can be deemed sufficient to supply the manifest deficiency of three of the Gospel narratives of the Last Supper, and the total silence of St. John as to the institution of the Sacrament, in his Gospel narrative of that supper, is a question which I do not feel it to be necessary to discuss. I have said enough to show (and this was my only object), that those who contend with Mr. Hughes that the disciples at Troas met on the first day of the week for the purpose of religiously observing the day, should be cautious of asserting, as evidence of that fact, that " to break bread " means to take the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; lest, in contending for this far-fetched meaning of a very simple phrase, they should excite inquiry into the origin of the rite itself. This inquiry they would, no doubt, profess to court rather than to avoid. Nevertheless, it might occur to them on reflection, as possible—just possible—that such of their readers as should, for the first time in their lives, enter upon the inquiry (and especially if, in their simplicity, they should trust to their Bible, instead of bewildering themselves with the glosses of Doctors in Divinity), might, upon the question, whether Christ instituted the rite, come to an opinion the very reverse of that which, almost from their cradle, they had been taught and made to believe.

The very respectable Christian sect called Quakers do not observe this rite. Hence Mr. Gurney, a leading member of that community, is obliged, in his "Brief Remarks," to make what he can of the text relating to the meeting at Tress, without contending that it must have been a religious meeting, because, " to break bread," was to partake of the Lord's Supper.

Yet breaking bread is the only expression in the text which affords even a pretense for saying that the meeting at Troas was specially for a religious purpose. No mention is made of prayer or thanksgiving.

Mention is, indeed, made of St. Paul's preaching; but that St. Paul, who was accustomed to preach on every day of the week, when opportunity offered, should take this opportunity of preaching on the first day of the week, can yield no proof that the design of the disciples at Troas, in meeting to take a meal in common on the first day of the week, was also to perform some act of religious worship.

In a certain restricted sense it must have been a religious meeting, although St. Paul had not preached, for such meetings would serve to cement the bonds of religious fellowship between the disciples; and at such meetings they would naturally discourse at times on the subject of their common religion; but this is a perfectly distinct view of their object in meeting from that which would represent them as meeting for the purpose of public worship, or the performance of any other religious rite.

Moreover, the meeting at Troas, to be of any value to the Sabbatarian cause, must be proved to have taken place on the first day of the week,

because it was the first day of the week. If they met for that reason, then, indeed, it might be very fair to argue that, inasmuch as the Christians in after times did meet stately on the first day of the week for the purposes of religion, so did the disciples at Troas on the occasion in question.

This, as I have before intimated, is the use which Dr. Paley endeavors to make of the text relating to the meeting of the disciples at Troas (the Text, No. 4.). He is too candid to assert that the text itself affords any evidence whatever that the disciples met on the first day of the week, because it was then a day stately appropriated to purposes of religion, but he thinks that it affords an inference of its being the custom of the Christians at Troas to meet on that particular day for some purpose or other; and, consequently, that a custom which thus prevailed among Christians in a place so remote as Troas in Mysia, may be inferred to have become at that time established throughout the whole of the then Christian world.

This is all that Dr. Paley attempts to make of Text, No. 4., but the fact which he thinks he establishes by it, he uses as a step to a further advance in his argument, as will be seen when we come to state his remarks upon the Text, No. 5. In the meantime we have only to consider what he says of Text, No. 4., which, although I have before quoted fit (p. 72), I shall, for the sake of convenience, again place before the reader. His words are these, " In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we find the same custom in a Christian Church at a great distance from Jerusalem" (v. 6, 7). " The manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week shows, I think, that the practice by this time was familiar and established."

" The same custom." No custom had been previously proved.

It is obvious that Dr. Paley has no other reason to urge for this opinion than the manner in which the historian has related the occurrence. Now I shall presently shew, that had the historian intended to speak of a custom, his manner in expressing himself would, in all human probability, have been exceedingly different; and if so, Dr. Paley's inference from manner in the present instance would necessarily be erroneous.

Yet beyond this probably erroneous inference from the Text, No. 4., there is no evidence in existence that the disciples at Troas were accustomed to meet stately on the first day of the week for any purpose whatever. It might be their custom to meet daily to break bread, as we are assured was the case with the first converts at Jerusalem; of them it is said in the passage already quoted from the Acts (p. 77), " And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking of bread from house to house," etc. What the actual fact was, in this respect, with the disciples at Troas, we can never know, but if they did meet daily during the stay of St. Paul in Troas, it may well be supposed that he joined in their company occasionally, perhaps every day, and preached to them; and yet it might be that nothing occurred at those previous meetings which it was material for the historian to record. Not so of the meeting on the day in question. There happened at that meeting, in the evening of that day, an accident which gave occasion to the performance of a miracle, that of restoring a dead man to life (Acts, 20. 9, 10).

If my remark that there might be no occurrence at any previous meeting at Troas worth recording, should be retorted upon me, and it should be said, that the like want of incident might account for St. Luke not mentioning any meeting on the first day of the week besides that which he has mentioned as having taken place at Troas, I should reply that the cases are not parallel. St. Luke might well be supposed to omit the notice of more than one preaching of St. Paul during his seven days' abode at Troas, although there had been several; but it is next to impossible to suppose that he should not in the whole course of his history of the Acts of the Apostles, comprising a period of thirty years, mention more than one meeting of Christians on the first day of the week, if they were accustomed to meet stately on that day, and for purposes of religion, whether any remarkable occurrence happened at the meeting or not.

Besides, there can be no doubt but that very many of the events which he does record in his history must have happened on a first day of the week, although he takes no notice of the fact. One instance of the kind it so happens, thanks to the ingenious discovery of the Sabbatarians before referred to, can be pointed out, viz. the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost recorded in Acts, 2. 1.

But why, it may be asked, should the historian, in relating the fact of the disciples assembling to break bread; inform us it was on the first day of the week that they met? The conjecture I might hazard in reply might not be conclusive, but it does not thence follow that the answer of the Sabbatarians would be the true one. Their answer is, that the historian, either incidentally or designedly, mentions a custom at Troas to meet on the first day of the week for religious purposes; but to assert that such was the custom, as it is not attempted to be proved by any other evidence than the text itself, is begging the question. Their answer is, therefore, merely a conjecture.

If then I can oppose the conjecture of the Sabbatarians by one equally or more probable, mine may fairly be considered to neutralize the other, and thereby destroy the proof attempted to be drawn from the text in discussion.

Now it seems to me that the narrative, of which the relation of the transactions at Troas forms a part, does furnish a conjecture on the subject,

which is at least as likely to be well founded as that of the Sabbatarians. St. Luke, who is universally believed to be the author of the book of the Acts, was, we are to recollect, the companion of St. Paul, whose travels are there related. It is not unreasonable to suppose that (to use a modern phrase) St. Luke kept a journal of what occurred in the course of those travels, and that he should note some particulars in that journal not absolutely essential to the narrative afterwards composed from it, but which he has nevertheless transferred to that narrative. For instance, he there tells us that in five days they reached Troas, and stayed there seven. But if he had said, We reached Troas in a few days, and stayed there several days, the mere purposes of history would have been as fully answered as they are now by the mention of the precise number of days which the voyage and the stay at Troas occupied. For what can it signify to the Christian to know whether it took five days or ten to perform the voyage, or whether the abode at Troas was for seven days or seventeen? So when the historian in the very same sentence goes on to state, that, "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them," why should we not attribute the mention here made of the day of the week to that same love of accuracy and particularity of detail which is apparent throughout the whole narrative, instead of presuming to conjecture that St. Luke had a purpose in mentioning the day, of which purpose he himself gives us no intimation? The particulars of dates and times, although, of little importance in themselves, it was natural he should note from day to day, as the events occurred; and it was as natural that, without any special purpose, he should transfer some of these unessential particulars from his notes to the more regular narrative which he afterwards compiled from them. Such minute particulars enliven the narrative, and, what is still more valuable, they serve to authenticate its truth, since they give strong assurance that the narrator was himself an eye and ear witness of what he relates.

Such is my conjecture why the historian notices that it was on the first day of the week that the disciples at Troas met together to break bread, and that Paul preached to them—a conjecture which will appear the more probable upon an attentive perusal of the whole of the passage, of which the text forms a part. It is as follows: "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." Here we have, in crowded succession, an enumeration of times and dates, which seem all of them to be intended to refer to the movements of St. Paul in his travels, and to nothing else; and such, I make no doubt, would be the interpretation which all readers would put upon the above passage, were it not that Sabbatarians come to the perusal of it previously disposed and desirous to discover in it some proof or intimation of the prevalence of a custom at that time for Christians to meet stately on the first day of the week.

But my case does not rest here. I can further weaken the conjecture of my opponents, and thereby proportionably strengthen my own. I shall shew it to be in the highest degree probable, that, if St. Luke had here intended to notice a custom he would have been more explicit, and not have left it to be inferred. This he would have been the more careful to do, since the alleged custom was of such importance in a religious point of view as to be peculiarly deserving of his notice.

St. Luke, we are to keep in mind, was the author of the Gospel which bears his name, as well as of the book of the Acts. In both he is remarkable for noticing compliances with custom. In the 1st chapter of his Gospel he says of Zacharias (v. 9), "According to the custom of the priest's office his lot was to burn incense." In chapter 2. verse 27, "And when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law." In the same chapter, verse 42, "And when he was twelve years old they went up to Jerusalem, after the custom of the feast." In the 4th chapter, verse 16, "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day." In chapter 22. ver. 39, "And he came out and went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives." In chapter 23. verse 56, "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment."

In the book of the Acts, St. Luke says in chapter 16. verse 13, "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made;" and in the 17th chapter of the Acts, verse 1, 2, he says of St. Paul and his companions, "They came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews; and Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them."

From these numerous instances we see, that St. Luke was in the practice of noticing compliances with customs—a practice peculiar to him, no other of the Evangelists having adopted it. [St. John is an exception, in so far as he alludes, which he does twice, to national customs (2. 6; 19. 40).] The mannerism of authors is often found to be an excellent criterion by which to judge of their meaning, when it is not so expressed as to be clearly apparent. Interpreting the text relating to the meeting at Troas by this criterion, scarcely a doubt can remain, but that if a custom existed at Troas to meet stately on the first day of the week, the manner in which the historian would have mentioned the meeting of the disciples recorded in the text would have been to say of it that it was according to their custom, and the text would, probably, in conformity with St. Luke's own mode of expressing himself, have read thus,— "And when the disciples came together to break bread upon the first day of the week, as their custom was, Paul preached unto them."

If, moreover, we again advert to the striking fact that St. Luke, in writing the book of the Acts, which comprises a history of the first thirty

years of the Christian Church, should mention one instance only of a meeting of Christians on the first day of the week, and that he should mention that one meeting without any intimation of its being the result of a custom then prevailing, it seems difficult to imagine how any unprejudiced inquirer into the true interpretation of Scripture narrative can find any proof in the text in question, that when St. Paul and St. Luke visited Troas, the custom among Christians of meeting for religious purposes, on the first day of the week, " was by this time familiar and established."

Yet this Text, No. 4., relating to the meeting at Troas, is the stronghold of the Sabbatarian cause, in the opinion of Dr. Paley and other moderate Sabbatarians; and, indeed, it ought to be considered so by all Sabbatarians, and for this reason—that whatever allusion other texts may be supposed to contain to the alleged custom of Christians in the time of the Apostles to meet on the first day of the week, this is the only text in all Scripture which expressly mentions their having actually met together on that day.

It is unnecessary, and would be improper, that I should except from this remark the texts in St. John's Gospel relating to the meetings of the disciples of Christ in the evening after his resurrection, and again in eight days. For I have shown, when examining those texts, that they afford no sufficient proof of the meetings therein mentioned having taken place on the first day of the week, and no proof whatever of those meetings having been held with the design of manifesting a religious regard to the day of the week on which they were held; the context, moreover, supplying indisputable proof that the first meeting (and by irresistible inference the second also) could not possibly have been held with any such design.

Here I intended to conclude my remarks on the proof which the Sabbatarians attempt to deduce from the meeting of the disciples at Troas, related in the 7th verse of the 20th chapter of the Acts; but it occurred to me, that before proceeding to the examination of the remaining Sabbatarian proofs it might be well to refer to Griesbach's Greek edition of the New Testament, in order to ascertain if it agreed with our received text in the reading of the above verse from the Acts. To my surprise I found an essential difference therein; and so confident is this great German critic of his reading being correct, that he gives it a place in his text, and throws the received reading into his notes.

As I do not know in what light the learned look upon this emendation, I do not regret having, previously to my becoming acquainted with it, completed my remarks on the text as it stands in our ordinary copies; since it is possible the emendation may not be universally assented to. For myself, I think it likely to give the true reading, first, because I trust in the high reputation which Griesbach has attained for diligence, fidelity, and critical skill in his collation of ancient manuscripts; and, secondly, without knowing what may have been Griesbach's reasons for his emendation, I think it most probable, for a reason which I shall presently state, that it was the received reading at the latter end of the fourth century. However this may be, as I have already replied to the Sabbatarian argument as to the meeting at Troas, on the supposition that the commonly received text contains the true reading, I have now only to consider how their argument and my reply to it stand affected by the text as amended by Griesbach.

It cannot, I apprehend, be denied, that my reply not only sustains no detriment, but, on the contrary, receives very effective support from the emendation, especially in the most important point, namely, the mention made of the first day of the week, which now is clearly shown to be, as I conjectured it might be, referable more particularly to the movements of St. Paul. But whilst to my reply the emendation is thus favorable, to the argument of the Sabbatarians it is fatal. The meeting of the disciples on the first day of the week, we are to recollect, was put forward in that argument as a just and valid reason for believing that a custom among Christians to meet on that day was then " familiar and established." It was argued: if the disciples at Troas are found meeting on that particular day, it must have been their custom so to meet; if the custom of Christians dwelling at so remote a distance from Jerusalem as Troas in Mysia, it must have been the custom of all Christians at that time. But we have now no knowledge, or reason for believing, that the disciples at Troas did meet on the first day of the week (as hitherto supposed), neither, therefore, for anything we now know, was it their custom to meet on that day, nor, consequently, the custom of any other Christian community at that time.

No: if the Sabbatarians still contest the Sabbath question on the battle-field presented by the text relating to Troas, they must take up a new position; and this, doubtless, they will do: they will scarcely fail to remark, perhaps even with an air of triumph, that if not the disciples, it is St. Paul himself and his companions, who are recorded to have met together to break bread on the first day of the week; and that if this was the custom of St. Paul, it carries far greater weight than would a like custom discovered among disciples at Troas, or elsewhere. Still I incline to believe, that the Sabbatarians would much prefer their former argument to this. It is, for a reason which I am about to state, so little credible that St. Paul, of all men, should be found to be an observer of days, that the argument of the Sabbatarians upon the text, as it stands in our ordinary copies, must, I should think, appear to them to be the safer of the two: for there is nothing incredible in itself, that the disciples at Troas should be observers of the alleged custom of meeting upon the first day of the week; nor, if that were the case, is there anything improbable in the inference drawn from it, that the custom had by that time become general among Christians. But in the new view of the question, which

Griesbach's emendation presents, the Sabbatarians have to contend that it was St. Paul's custom to assemble with others upon the first day of the week. Now the only evidence we have upon this point, besides the text itself, are St.

Paul's own writings, and most assuredly they prove the very reverse, and this both positively and negatively,— positively, by his express disavowal in those writings of all regard to days and seasons; and negatively, by his never once making mention in them (voluminous as they are) of any meeting of Christians upon the first day of the week; nor, consequently, of his having been present himself at any meeting upon that day. In regard to the evidence of his own practice afforded by the text itself, the emendation makes it more marvelous than ever, that St. Luke should not notice it to be a custom among Christians to meet stately on the first day of the week, if it had been St. Paul's practice to assemble with others upon that particular day. As the companion of his travels, St. Luke must in such case have witnessed St. Paul's observance of the custom " from week to week;" and yet he does not relate a single instance, save that in the text, of St. Paul assembling with others upon the first day of the week; nor does he state that he then assembled with others for any religious purpose. All that he says is, that they met together " to break bread," which, it has been clearly shown, could mean nothing else, in this instance of the use of that phrase, than to take their usual meal. Had the meeting in the text been in observance of a religious custom, it is in the highest degree probable that St. Luke, who tells us (Acts, xvii. 1, 2), that at Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews, Paul, " as his manner was, went in unto them," would have said, when speaking of the meeting at Troas, that Paul assembled with his companions on the first day of the week, " as his manner was."

I have stated (p. 94) that, although ignorant of the reasons given by Griesbach for his emendation of the text relating to Troas, I was myself aware of one which rendered the correctness of the emendation probable. It is this: From the Latin version of the New Testament by Jerome, in A.D. 384 (usually called the Vulgate), it appears that in his time the reading in the Greek copies then extant must have been exactly the same as that in Griesbach's edition, for the Latin version of it is as follows: " Unit autem Sabbati, cum convenissemus ad frangendum panem, Paulus disputabat cum eis, profecturus in crastinum." (Now, on the first day of the week, when we had come together to break bread, Paul disputed with them, being about to depart on the morrow.)

This reading (" we had come together") receives some further confirmation from the passage relating to this text which, as I have mentioned in page 79, Heylyn quotes as from St. Chrysostom, but which I then forbore from copying, because I could not find it in the works of that Father. I shall now, however, copy it; because, whoever was the writer, we may justly infer from it, that in his time the text was in the form which Griesbach gives as the genuine text.

" Disputed with them." So the Vulgate, literally translated; but the original, which is the same both in the common Greek text and in Griesbach's, is generally translated, as in our Bible, " preached unto them." In some translations it is rendered " discoursed with them" (" was discoursing with them:" Wakefield); and as the Latin verb disputare signifies to discourse as well as to dispute, it is on the whole probable, that to discourse is a more correct rendering of the original Greek than to preach. The question, however, seems to be of no essential importance; for, whether St. Paul preached to or discoursed with the disciples, his object would be the same,—to instruct them in the truths of the Gospel, and in their duties as Christians.

It is remarkable, that the text as amended by Griesbach, and as it appears to have stood in the time of Jerome, is defective in point of construction, (" On the first day of the week, we being come together to break bread, Paul preached to them.") The substantive to which " them" refers is nowhere expressed, but the substantive " disciples" is, no doubt, to be understood.

It appears not improbable that this defect in the construction of the sentence gave occasion to the text being altered to the form in which we find it in the ordinary copies. Some copyist, perhaps, perceiving the defect, took upon himself to introduce the word *discipulis* (disciples) in the first part of the text; thereby correcting the grammar and falsifying the fact.

Dr. Heylyn, after noticing the phrase, " to break bread," in this text, adds, " which some conclude to be administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and Paul's discourse which followed on it to be a sermon. But sure I am that St. Chrysostom tells us plainly otherwise, who relates it thus: ' Their meeting at that time (saith he) was not especially to receive instruction from St. Paul, but to eat bread with him; and there, upon occasion given, he discoursed unto them. See' (saith the Father) ' how they all made bold with St. Paul's table, as it had been common to them all.' "

Although Dr. Heylyn is, as I believe, mistaken in quoting this passage as from the works of St. Chrysostom, it is impossible to doubt of his having met with it in a work of some ancient ecclesiastical writer. [I have taken some pains to discover the work from which the quotation is made, but without success.]

We have, therefore, the testimony of that writer to two important facts first, that in the writer's opinion, " to break bread" meant, in the instance

occurring in the text, to take an ordinary meal—an opinion probably universal in his time, since he speaks of it as though no one would think of disputing it. And, secondly, that this text relating to the meeting at Troas, as now corrected, is the very same which this ancient writer must have had before him when he made the above-cited comment upon it; for no such comment could be made upon the text as it now stands in our copies.

In concluding these observations upon Griesbach's emendation of the text now under discussion (the Text, No. 4.), I must request the reader to bear in mind, in the first place, that it is an emendation which destroys in toto Dr. Paley's argument from that text (namely, that the custom of the disciples at Troas is evidence that the like custom was then general among Christians); and in the next place, that if, because the emendation shifts the question as to the practice of observing the first day of the week from the disciples to St. Paul, it be now argued from the corrected text that St. Paul was in the practice of observing that day, my reply is, that this is an argument which can be completely refuted out of the writings of St. Paul himself. Those writings, as I have already stated, and shall hereafter prove, bear witness that St. Paul practiced no such observance.

Thus the fourth in order, and the most formidable in appearance of the whole array of Sabbatarian proofs from the Christian Scriptures, has, by the correction of an error in the ordinary reading of the text, become non-effective, like the three other texts which preceded it. Even if the correction be disputed (which I am not aware it is, or can be), I have conclusively shown that the Sabbatarian argument drawn from the text, as it previously stood, establishes no proof whatever of a custom among Christians to observe the first day of the week, and, consequently, whichever be the true reading of Text, No. 4. it is in either case valueless to the Sabbatarian cause.

THE TEXT, No. 5.

Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.—1 Cor. 16. 1, 2.

Here, say the Sabbatarians, we have the testimony of St. Paul himself to the custom of Christians in his time to assemble on the first day of the week for purposes of religion. Strange that a text, which says nothing of any meeting for any purpose, should be brought to prove a custom to meet for purposes of religion! Yet such is the Sabbatarian inference from this text. "Paul," says Mr. Gurney (p. 77), "commands collections to be made at Corinth upon the first day of the week; . . . it is obvious that this particular day was fixed for these subscriptions, because the regular meetings of the Church would afford the opportunity of their being easily gathered. Accordingly we find from Justin Martyr, that after the congregational worship of the early Christians on the Lord's Day, money was always collected for the benefit of the poor." For this information from Justin Martyr Mr. Gurney refers to Apol. 1. cap. 67.

Now, the date of Justin's First Apology, Mr. Gurney tells us (p. 83), is A.D. 147, which is a century after St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians. The custom in Justin's time, therefore, is little to the purpose to prove a custom in St. Paul's time. Hence, instead of saying, "Congregational worship of the Christians in Justin's time," which would have been the more accurate and honest way of stating the fact, Mr. Gurney very ingeniously employs the less definite phrase of "Congregational worship of the early Christians," and of course those of his readers (and they are the majority) who are little acquainted with historical dates are thus induced to believe that the Christians of each period (Justin's and St. Paul's) were nearly contemporaries. Again, by telling his readers, on the authority of Justin, what was done on "the Lord's Day," Mr. Gurney gives them the impression that Justin, in speaking of the first day of the week, calls it "the Lord's Day;" when the truth is, that Justin never once in all his writings calls it by that name. Instances of these little arts of oratory lie scattered in considerable profusion throughout Mr. Gurney's work. I shall notice others, when the occasion appears to require it. The task would be too onerous to point out every instance. I do not, indeed, profess to be writing an answer to his work. I avail myself of it, as I have said before, chiefly for the purpose of stating, on his authority, the tenets and arguments of the Sabbatarians.

But to return to the consideration of the text. If it be strange to infer from it a custom to meet, although no meeting is mentioned in it, it seems still more strange, still more inconsistent, to infer from it, as Mr. Gurney and other Sabbatarians do, that a direction to lay by alms at home means, that those alms should be given at church. Mr. Hughes, in his reply to the "Horae Sabbaticae," goes a step beyond mere inference. When adverting to the direction to the Corinthians, he represents St. Paul as actually advising them to "bring in" their contributions. He says (p. 27), "That the custom of assembling together on this day (the first of the week) continued thenceforth in the church, we have the testimony of St. Paul; who, in the 16th chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, advises each person to bring in his offering, or alms, on the first day of the week." The phrase "bring in" would certainly accord most harmoniously with the notion of a collection made in the church; but the original phrase is incapable of being thus translated. Mr. Hughes, I am aware, is, strictly speaking, not giving a translation of it; but in giving what he states to be its purport, he misrepresents, and in effect therefore mistranslates it. Not that I impute to him any designed misrepresentation: far from it. The general tone of his reply to Mr. Higgins is so candid, that it would be extremely unjust to suspect that the actual misrepresentation

can be owing to any other cause than inadvertence, and, apparently, a hasty, off-hand habit of writing. Strongly and sincerely prepossessed with the belief that the contributions were offered in the church, he has used an expression well suited to that belief, but also well suited (though such was not his intention) to impose a gross error upon his readers, as to the true meaning of a Scripture phrase.

The translation in our common Bibles is just to the original: " Let every one of you lay by him in store." A still more literal translation of the word in the original, (treasuring up), would render it still more apparent that each contributor was to make the accumulation himself, and not to hand it over from week to week to any other person.

In the Latin Vulgate this interpretation is equally clear: " (Let every one of you set apart at his own house, hoarding whatsoever, etc.)

The Geneva Bible (ed. 1588) thus translates the passage: " C'est que chaque premier jour de la se-main, chacun de vous mette it. part par devers soi, assemblant ce qu'il pourra."

It would be useless to pursue this inquiry. It is impossible for anyone to maintain that the original Greek, can be construed, " bring in." Nevertheless, as in consequence of the is representations, accidental or otherwise, which have been given of the true purport of the original phrase, a very general impression prevails that the Sabbatarians are right in the conclusion which they draw from the text in which it occurs, it may not be unprofitable to consider what St. Paul there says to the Corinthians, in connection with what he afterwards says to them, when he resumes the subject in his second epistle, which he wrote to them in the following year.

"The following year." Some uncertainty prevails as to the dates of St. Paul's epistles, but it does not affect this statement, for it is generally agreed that St. Paul must have written the Second Epistle to the Corinthians about a year, or perhaps a year and a half, after his first.

As, however, the dates of the Epistles of St. Paul will become of importance on some points discussed hereafter, it may be as well to state at once, that I follow the dates assigned by Dr. Lardner, and approved by Bishop Tomline, as being probably more correct than the dates assigned by the Chronological Index which is appended to the quarto edition of the Oxford Bible, and was compiled by Bishop Lloyd, who died in 1717. The following statement shows the dates assigned to such of the Epistles as I now have, or shall hereafter have, occasion to refer to. I take Bishop Tomline's dates from D'Oyly and Mant's edition of the Bible.

Being at Ephesus, and intending to go to Jerusalem, but first to pass through Macedonia and Achaia (Acts, 19. 21), St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians that he designed to come to them, and might possibly pass the following winter with them (1 Cor. 16. 5, 6); but he afterwards changed his plan, and deferred his visit till the ensuing year. In the meantime, being in Macedonia, he wrote to them his second epistle, and, as appears from chapter 9. verse 2., this epistle was written more than a twelvemonth after the first. As he was very desirous to send, or carry with him, to Jerusalem, a sum of money for the relief of the poor brethren in that city, he in his first epistle exhorts the Corinthians, in the words of the text, to contribute to this object. " Upon the first day of the week let every one of you," etc., adding, " And when I come, whomsoever you shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem; and if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me."

[Wakefield, instead of " And if it be meet," etc., renders this passage, " But if it be worthy of my going also, they shall go with me." And he observes in a note, " There is a delicate exhortation to their generosity in the original, which was lost in our translation."]

In his second epistle he renews his exhortation to them; he first endeavors to excite emulation in them by setting forth, in the strongest terms of praise, the spontaneous liberality of the Macedonians. He then mentions his intention of sending Titus to them, that as Titus had begun, so he would finish in them the same grace also (chapter 8. 1-6). He next says, " And herein I give my advice; for this is expedient for you, who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be forward a year ago. Now, therefore, perform the doing of it, that as there was a readiness to will so there may be a performance also " (v. 10, 11). He afterwards repeats his intention of sending Titus, and also others of the brethren, and adds, " Wherefore show ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf." The last topic is thus resumed and enlarged upon in the next chapter: " For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago: and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready: lest haply, if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not you) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready as a matter of bounty and not of covetousness."

Through the remainder of the chapter, St. Paul is most urgent with them to give liberally, " not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver."

Now it seems to be next to impossible for any person to read the foregoing extracts from St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, without coming to the conclusion, that when he wrote that epistle he was, notwithstanding his compliment to their forwardness and zeal, in great uncertainty as to the actual amount of the alms which they had prepared for him, and was also in considerable apprehension that it was far less than he had at one time expected. But if the plan which he had recommended and enjoined to them was to bring in their contributions to the congregation of the church, he could be in no doubt as to the amount of those contributions, for the officers receiving them could, and as a matter of course would, have informed him of it. That they had to some extent the opportunity is beyond all question, because Titus, who had been staying at Corinth when the Corinthians were first exhorted to contribute, had joined St. Paul in Macedonia before he wrote the second epistle (2 Cor. 7. 6). If we were to suppose St. Paul to have known the amount, we should naturally expect to find in that epistle some remark upon it as being either liberal or scanty, instead of which he hints to them his apprehension that it might be not such as he would have reason to boast of in the way he had. This would be quite consistent with the supposition that Titus had made some inquiry among the disciples before he came away, and found that there was but little to expect from them, and that its amount, whatever it might be, could not be ascertained with exactness. That St. Paul's apprehension of its insufficiency, from whatever cause he entertained it, was great, is evident from his not venturing to trust entirely to a second written exhortation to them, earnest and eloquent as it was; but on the contrary sending with his epistle some approved brethren to stir up their benevolence by personal application, lest all his previous boasting of them to the Macedonians should prove vain, and put him, as well as them, to shame.

What grounds St. Paul had for thus boasting of them it does not appear, but he might well presume that the exhortation in his first epistle would not be disregarded; indeed, it is most probable it was not. On the contrary, we may justly imagine that the disciples, in consequence, began immediately and with much willingness to lay by something in store every week, and that St. Paul may have received information to that effect; and if these weekly "somethings" had been paid over to persons hearing office in the church, the collection would have been so far both certain in amount and safe in custody. But if, as was the fact, the weekly savings were to be hoarded up in private, not only is it probable that after a time they were in most families discontinued, but it might also happen that, when the Corinthians found that St. Paul was not coming to them so soon as he had promised, the poor-box would, in some families, be occasionally resorted to, and its contents partly, and in some instances wholly, withdrawn, and applied to their other and more pressing emergencies.

Thus, in any view of the case, it undeniably appears that St. Paul, in his first epistle, directed and intended that the Corinthians should lay by and not bring in their weekly offerings; and it is only by a perversion of the true meaning of the text on this point, that the text can be adduced in proof of the Christians of that period having been accustomed to meet on the first day of the week. It may, indeed, be said, that both Mr. Hughes and Mr. Gurney consider this to be a fact already proved by texts previously adduced; they do so, but they also (Mr. Gurney impliedly, and Mr. Hughes expressly) quote this text as in itself an independent proof of the custom to meet: Mr. Gurney, by arguing that it was the practice to make collections at the regular meetings of the Church; and Mr. Hughes, by emphatically declaring that, for the custom of the Church to assemble on the first day of the week, we have in this text the testimony of St. Paul himself.

Dr. Paley steers clear of all attempts to overstate and pervert the meaning of the text. Far from asserting, or insinuating, that the direction to "lay by" contributions on the first day of the week proves a custom to assemble on that day, and for the purpose of religiously observing it, he is content to say of this text that it affords a probable proof that the day was distinguished by some religious application or other. He does not contend, as Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Gurney, and other Sabbatarians do, that the text from Corinthians is an independent proof of a custom to observe the first day of the week by assembling upon it for the purpose of public worship. He, no doubt, however, does intend to infer from this Text, No. 5., in conjunction with the Text, No. 4., probable evidence of a custom to meet stately on the first day of the week, and for purposes of religion. The drift of his argument is this: "I think the text relating to Troas shows a custom to meet on that day, and the other text renders it probable that such meetings were for some religious purpose." His own words regarding the former text I have before quoted (at p. 72). What he says of the direction to the Corinthians in the latter text is this: "Which direction affords a probable proof that the first day of the week was already amongst the Christians, both of Corinth and Galatia, distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other," (vol. 2. 88.)

How striking is the contrast between the cautious language of Dr. Paley in drawing his inferences and the language employed by Mr. Hughes and Mr. Gurney in drawing their inferences from the same texts!

Although, however, all attempts to convert St. Paul's direction to the Corinthians into an independent proof of a custom to assemble on the first day of the week for some purpose of religion, have been shown to fail, the Sabbatarians may still ask, What other reason could St. Paul have for naming the first day of the week? A probable conjecture is all the answer that can be given to such a question. Intending to recommend periodical savings, St. Paul, we may readily believe, would feel certain they would never be regularly made unless he named some particular day. What day could be more conveniently chosen than the first of each week? Yet had that day then attained a sacred pre-eminence over all the

other days of the week, how extraordinary would it be if St. Paul, in recommending it for a purpose of charity, had not at the same time made some allusion to the estimation and reverence in which it was held!

Let us but reflect a little, and we shall not fail to perceive the fine topic it would have afforded to the fervid eloquence of St. Paul, if, in naming the first day of the week, he could have appealed to it as a day then religiously observed and held sacred among Christians. Anxious, deeply anxious, as he was to excite the benevolence of the Corinthians, who that is acquainted with his writings can believe that he would not, if the naming of that day gave him the opportunity, have represented to them in that glowing and impassioned style of oratory in which no one ever surpassed him, how truly they would commemorate and sanctify the day of their Redeemer's resurrection by the performance of an act of Christian charity to the poor brethren in Jerusalem upon every weekly recurrence of that holy day? That St. Paul should neglect this opportunity, if it really offered itself, of appealing to the religious feelings of the Corinthians in aid of his appeal to their benevolent feelings is an improbability, which ought of itself to produce conviction in the mind of every unprejudiced person, that when St. Paul named the first day of the week for laying by charitable contributions from the Christians of Corinth to the Christians of Jerusalem, he knew it not as a day that was more holy than any other.

One more remark, and it is this: In looking to the speeches of St. Paul recorded in the book of the Acts, and to his own voluminous writings, we find this text from the Epistle to the Corinthians to be the only instance of his making mention of the first day of the week; and in this one instance we cannot but be sensible with what cold indifference he names a day which it is now pretended was, in the estimation of the Corinthians, and in his own, a day of the week set apart from the rest for the performance of solemn offices of religion in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ!

What, then, are the fair inferences to be drawn from a strict examination of the text from the Corinthians? Most assuredly these:— First,—That the text yields no proof of a custom among Christians to meet on the first day of the week, but, on the contrary, affords strong presumptive proof that no such custom existed.

Secondly,—That if the custom to meet were otherwise proved, which it is not, the text yields no proof that this day was (as Dr. Paley argues) distinguished by the Corinthians and Galatians from the rest " by some religious application or other;" but, on the contrary, affords strong presumptive proof that it had no religious character belonging to it which was peculiar to the day.

On the first point, it is incontestable that the text affords no direct proof of a custom to meet on the first day of the week, for it does not say one word about any meeting upon that day; and as to inferential proof, the direction to the Corinthians to treasure up their contributions at home furnishes, besides the other reasons here given, a most powerful argument against the alleged custom. What says Mr. Gurney when he attempts to argue from this direction in favor of the existence of the custom? He remarks (as we have seen) that " it is obvious that this particular day (the first of the week) was fixed for these subscriptions, because the regular meetings of the Church would afford the opportunity of their being easily gathered." But as it is an indisputable fact that St. Paul directed the subscriptions to be laid by at home, Mr. Gurney's remark upon the text leads to a conclusion the very reverse of that which he draws from it. For as the subscriptions would have been, as he truly says, more easily gathered at the regular meetings of the Church, and as St. Paul does not avail himself of that advantageous mode of collecting the subscriptions, the inference seems irresistible that no weekly meetings of the Church were at that time held.

On the second point, that, supposing the custom of meeting on the first day of the week to have been proved, the text " affords a probable proof " that that day was " distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other;" it is certain that the text contains no actual proof that such was the fact; and in regard to probable proof, it points directly the other way: for " the manner " in which St. Paul mentions the first day of the week in his direction to the Corinthians, as also the very circumstance of his selecting that particular day for the object he had in view, are, for the reasons here given, most assuredly probable proof, if not positive proof, that the first day of the week had not then attained to any religious distinction above the rest.

But, in truth, the question, whether the first day of the week was or was not applied to some religious purpose, cannot properly be raised upon the text from Corinthians, unless the custom of Christians to meet on that day be previously proved; which it is not from that text, and cannot be from any other: for the Sabbatarians, we know, have but Six Texts to produce relating to the Sabbath controversy; and all of these, except the sixth, have now been examined, and shown to have failed in proving the alleged custom to meet: and in regard to the sixth text, whatever it may prove in relation to the period to which it refers (A.D. 95 and 96 or 97), it can prove nothing as to the custom of Christians at the time when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians forty years before.

So firm, indeed, is my conviction, that the text from the Corinthians is entirely anti-Sabbatarian in its character, that I tender this very text (the

Text, No. 5.) in evidence, as affording, for the various reasons here assigned, decisive inferential proof that, in the time of the Apostle Paul, the first day of the week was not observed by the Christian Church either as a Sabbath day or as a Prayer day.

THE TEXT, No. 6.

I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day.—Rev. 1. 10.

This passage, in a book ascribed to St. John the Apostle, contains, it is said, a satisfactory proof that, at the time when St. John wrote it (A.D. 95 and 96 or 97), the first day of the week had obtained the name of the Lord's Day; "which name, and St. John's use of it (says Dr. Paley), sufficiently denote the appropriation of this day to the service of religion, and that this appropriation was perfectly known to the churches of Asia."

Even Heylyn, the able opponent of the Sabbatarian "Novelty," two hundred years ago, admits the text from the Revelation as proof that this appropriation of the day had become general in the Christian Church. In speaking of the first century of the Christian era, he says, the first day of the week "began to grow into some credit towards the ending of this age. It came in time to be entitled the Lord's Day, which attribute is first found in the Revelation writ by St. John about the year 94 of our Savior's birth."

But Heylyn is on this point no authority. He could not avoid putting this interpretation on the text in the Revelation, for in his time implicit credit was given to an ancient writing attributed to one of the Fathers, who was contemporary with St. John, in which the phrase of the "Lord's Day" is fully recognized in its modern sense: but this ancient document is now universally acknowledged to be spurious.

[It is one of the interpolated epistles of Ignatius. It will be more particularly noticed hereafter.]

If, however, the Sabbatarians would admit that the observance of Sunday for the purposes of religion towards the close of the first century is all that is proved by this text, I should have no desire to object to their proof; for I am sincerely convinced of the utility of such a practice in keeping up among us a due and an awakening sense of our religious, moral, and social duties. But to admit that the text proves no earlier origin of the practice would not satisfy the Sabbatarians. It would be to admit, so far as the question depends upon this text, that Sunday observance, however useful and expedient, was not instituted by Divine authority. They contend, therefore, that the text not only proves the observance of the Christian Sabbath towards the close of the first century, but that it also proves retrospectively, by corroborating the proofs from the five preceding texts, that the Christian Sabbath had been observed from the very day when Christianity first dawned upon the world, the day on which Christ rose from the dead,—the Lord's Day.

Let us then examine, first, what may be the intrinsic value of the text in reference to the Sabbath question; and in the next place, whether, whatever may be its intrinsic value, it can be looked upon as any corroboration of the proof said to be deduced from the five preceding texts.

It is certain that, from the time when the Book of the Revelation first appeared, there were conflicting opinions in the Church, whether or not it was written by St. John. Dr. Lardner has collected these opinions in his "Credibility," and examined them with his usual candor. It would seem from that examination, that the weight of authority is in favor of the opinion that it is a genuine work of St. John the Apostle. Dr. Lardner is, upon the whole, of that opinion himself; yet it is surprising what a numerous list he gives of ancient Christian communities and ecclesiastical writers who were of an opposite opinion. It is too long to copy; but I cannot omit noticing, on the authority of this list, that the Book of the Revelation was not received by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 247; nor by Chrysostom, one of the most eminent Fathers of the Church (bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 398); nor, probably, by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (about A.D. 423); and that it was wanting in the Canon of the Council of Laodicea, held in the fourth century (A.D. 363). (Lardner, vol. 3. 104; 6. 13; 5. 195; 4. 309.) And further, that Eusebius, the most celebrated of ecclesiastical historians, doubted if it was properly ascribed to St. John. "In the time of Eusebius," says Dr. Lardner, which was "in the former part of the fourth century, it was not received by all; and, therefore, it is reckoned by him among contradicted books. Nevertheless, it was generally received. Eusebius himself seems to have hesitated about it, for he says, It is likely that the Revelation was seen by John the Elder, if not by John the Apostle." (Lardner, vol. 6. 629.) "It may be reckoned probable (Dr. Lardner adds) that the critical argument of Dionysius of Alexandria was of great weight with him, and others of that time." Dr. Lardner states that argument from Eusebius; it is of great length, too long to be copied here, and I shall therefore advert to two only of the objections raised by Dionysius against the genuineness of the Revelation as a work by St. John, much regretting, however, to be obliged to take such brief notice of the argument of Dionysius, as I am sensible I am doing injustice to my own argument by not giving that of Dionysius entire.

[* It occurs in the 25th chapter of the 7th book of Eusebius's History. A translation of that history by Dr. Cruse, an American episcopal divine, has been recently republished in England (by Bagsters, London, 1847).]

One of the two objections is, that " throughout the Gospel and Epistle (of St. John) it is easy to observe one and the same character; but the Revelation is quite different and foreign from those, without any affinity or resemblance, not having so much as a syllable in common with them." (Lardner, 3. 107.) The other objection relates to the style. " It is easy (says Dionysius) to observe the difference of the style of the Gospel and the Epistle from that of the Revelation; for they (the Gospel and Epistle) are not only written correctly, according to the propriety of the Greek tongue, but are most elegant in diction in the arguments, and the whole structure of the style." (Lardner, 3. 107; and Cruse, 311.) Dionysius, after adverting to the gifts of knowledge and eloquence which the Lord had bestowed upon St. John, adds, " As to the other (the writer of the Revelation), I do not perceive in him an accurate skill in the Greek tongue: on the contrary, I observe in him barbarisms and some solecisms, which it is not necessary I should now show particularly; for I do not write by way of ridicule; let no one think so: I only intended to represent, after a critical manner, the difference of these pieces." (Lardner, 3. 108.)

" Dionysius was a man illustrious for his learning, . . . and of undissembled humility and modesty, and of great simplicity. . . . He has the title of Great given him by Eusebius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and other ancient writers."—LARDNER, 3. 99.

The learned among the moderns not being agreed in their criticisms respecting the style of the Revelation, Dr. Lardner declines offering any opinion of his own upon that point; but on the other point, the different character of the Revelation from that of the Gospel and Epistle of St. John, he in the exercise of his habitual candor says, " I must acknowledge that the Revelation, when compared with the Apostle's unquestioned writings, has an unlikeness not easy to be accounted for." (Lardner, 30.)

Such grave doubts having been entertained by learned and orthodox Christians in the early ages of the Church upon the question, whether St. John was the writer of the Book of the Revelation, it will be no sufficient answer to those doubts to say, that the book is now included in our own canon of the New Testament Scriptures; for since in those times it was not certain by whom the book was written, no synod or council of the Church holden at any subsequent period could have authority to settle definitively what would be the true solution of that question. It is a question of fact, and is still as much as ever open to discussion.

In any other respect than that of authorship, the genuineness of the Book of the Revelation cannot be disputed. Its high antiquity, and the esteem in which it was held by many among the early Christians, give it a fair claim to credence upon any matter of fact, which is probable in itself, and clearly stated; as, for instance, that at the date of the book there were Christian Churches in seven of the principal cities of Asia; but the alleged fact of the religious observance of the first day of the week at that date, whether probable or not in itself, is not clearly stated: it is not stated at all. The first day of the week is not mentioned, either in the text quoted (1. 10) or in any other part of the book; nor is there anywhere in it any clear allusion made to a custom among Christians of observing any one day in the week more than another. Yet all Sabbatarians assume, even the logical Paley assumes, that the phrase of " the Lord's Day" is intended by the writer to refer to the first day of the week, and to the religious observance of it. None of the Fathers of the Church, as I believe, and certainly none of the most ancient of them, attribute that intention to the writer; and the prevalent disposition in our times to assume that he had that intention, seems to arise solely from the fact, that habit has familiarized us to the use of the phrase as a name for the first day of the week; and, in consequence, most persons come to the perusal of the Book of the Revelation so strongly impressed with the modern meaning of the phrase, as to be thereby completely prevented from reflecting and exercising their judgment upon the question, what might be that of the writer, who it is in the highest degree probable had some other and very different meaning,— a meaning which, like the Book itself, is and ever has been a mystery.

It is true that the phrase of " the Lord's Day" is very appropriate to the first day of the week, that being the day of the week on which the great event of the Resurrection occurred: but may not that very circumstance, the peculiar fitness of the phrase, have led to the adoption of it from the Book of the Revelation in after times, when the custom of religiously observing the first day of the week had become fully established? The conjecture receives no inconsiderable support from the fact that the phrase is not to be met with in any writing, scriptural or non-scriptural, of a date prior to that of the Revelation, nor in any writing for more than seventy years after that date.

We know that the first day of the week is never called the Lord's Day in any book of Scripture, except it be in that of the Revelation; and as to non-scriptural writings of a date prior to that book, there are but two now extant relating to the Christian Church. They are an epistle of Clement, bishop of Rome, and an epistle ascribed to Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul.

The epistle of Clement is to the Corinthians. Dr. Lardner is of opinion it was written about A.D. 96. Others think it was written much earlier. It is very long, yet it makes no mention of the Lord's Day, nor any allusion to the religious observance of the first day of the week; and this is the more remarkable, as, in one part of the epistle, Clement treats of religious rites and services.

The epistle of Barnabas is supposed by Dr. Lardner to have been written in the year 71 or 72. It is referred to by Sabbatarians as evidence, that the first day of the week was religiously observed at the time when it was written. It will on that account claim attention hereafter. All that I need to remark upon it at present is this, that even if the writer does allude to the first day of the week, and the religious observance of it, he does not call it the Lord's Day.

As to the extant works of Christian authors, who wrote within seventy years after the date of the Book of the Revelation, they are, as appears from Lardner's "Credibility,"-

1. "The Shepherd" of Hermas, a long and very interesting allegory, written about A.D. 100.
2. The Epistles of Ignatius, written about A.D. 107.
3. An epistle of Polycarp, about A.D. 108.
4. A fragment of the works of Papias, about A.D. 116.
5. The works of Justin Martyr, and in particular his first "Apology," written about A.D. 140.

In these ancient writings the phrase of "the Lord's Day" never once occurs. There is, however, a passage in an epistle of Ignatius which the Sabbatarians translate "living according to the Lord's Day." That they are not justified in so translating it, I shall be able to show most satisfactorily hereafter, when I shall have a more convenient opportunity of discussing the question. I shall content myself in the meantime with asserting, that the phrase of "the Lord's Day" does not occur in any genuine epistle of Ignatius.

That it should not be found in Hermas, Polycarp, or Papias, is not surprising, since they make no mention of, or allusion to the day, to which the phrase in the Revelation is supposed to refer; nor, of course, to any religious observance of that day. The same remark, however, cannot be applied to Justin Martyr, who not only speaks of the day, but gives a very particular account of the manner in which it was religiously observed by Christians; yet he does not call it "the Lord's Day." His account is contained in his celebrated apology for Christianity above referred to, and which was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. Instead of there calling it "the Lord's-day," he calls it "the day of the sun" (Sun-day). Mr. Hughes is of opinion (p. 40) that he adopted the name common to Pagans, when writing to a Roman emperor, in order that he might be clearly understood; yet there seems to be no reason why he should refrain from calling it also by the new name which Christians had given to it, if that new name had grown into general use in his time. On the contrary, it would be but reasonable to suppose in such case, that, in relating in what manner the day was observed, he would have spoken of it to the emperor as "the day called the day of the sun, but which we Christians, from veneration of the day on which our Lord rose from the dead, more usually call the Lord's Day." He was not the more likely to displease the emperor on that account; for if the emperor were not offended by being told (as he was in effect) that he was a worshipper of false gods, neither would he be so by being told that the Christians had, on occasions connected with their religion, ceased to call the day of the sun by that heathen name.

Again: Mr. Hughes remarks that Justin, in arguing with Trypho the Jew, conforms in like manner to the Jewish phrase for the day, calling it unam Sabbati (the first day of the week). Still it appears to me, that in any argument with a Jew nothing can well be imagined more appropriate or more natural than for Justin to have said, "the day which you Jews still call unam & Mali, but which we Christians, in honor of our Divine Master, now call the Lord's Day." As, however, he omits all mention of the latter appellation in his dialogue with Trypho, it seems but a fair inference that it was either altogether unknown to Justin Martyr, or that it had not in his time become generally adopted. Certain it is that, from whatever cause, the name of "the Lord's Day" is not to be found in the writings of Justin, although he is particular in describing the manner in which that day was then observed by the Christian Church.

In whatever way the Sabbatarians may attempt to account for the fact, that the appellation of "the Lord's Day" is nowhere noticed by Justin Martyr, it is enough for me now to say that such is the fact; my present purpose being only to produce evidence that the phrase is not to be found in any writing of a date within seventy years after that of the Book of the Revelation.

Nor is it to be met with till we come to the time when Dionysius was bishop of Corinth, about A.D. 170, which is seventy-four years after the supposed date of the Book of Revelation. In An epistle of his (of uncertain date, but after he was bishop) written to the Christians at Rome, and addressed to Soter, their then bishop, Dionysius says, "To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your (Soter's) epistle."—(Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History, book 4. c. 23.)

This is not exactly the phrase used in the Revelation, Dionysius having added the epithet holy; but his letter is, nevertheless, satisfactory evidence that the phrase of "the Lord's Day," first met with in the Revelation, had by this time become generally adopted, since it is certain it must have been then in use both at Rome and at Corinth.

Mr. Gurney, indeed, states that there is an instance of the use of the phrase in Tremens, A.D. 167, three years earlier than the time (A.D. 170) when Dionysius became bishop of Corinth. But although so slight a difference in the dates would not affect my argument, I felt such distrust of Mr. Gurney's statement, from the way in which he quotes his authority for it, that I determined to sift its accuracy, which I have accordingly done.

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.

It appears from the obituary in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for March 1847, that Mr. Gurney studied at Oxford, and that, although a Quaker, he had a thoroughly modern-orthodox Church-of-England education, which may in some degree account for his anti-"Barclay Apology" opinions on the question of the Sabbath. "When his education ceased to be conducted at home, it was entrusted to the Rev. J. H. Browne, a clergyman in Hingham . . . and it was subsequently matured at Oxford, where he had an excellent private tutor in the Rev. John Rogers." He acquired "an extensive acquaintance with the Hebrew and Syriac languages, as well as with classics, mathematics, and general science. Attached, even in early life, to biblical studies, he had critically read the Old and New Testaments, in the original languages, in the Syriac, and in the Latin Vulgate, before he was twenty-two years of age; and he was well acquainted with Rabbinical and Patristic writings" (meaning, it is to be presumed, by the latter epithet, the writings of the Church Fathers).

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; and often, for days and weeks together, the pain which he endured in that part of the head immediately behind the eyes amounted to anguish.

. . . 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).

The account given of his studies, and of his public and private character, in the interesting Memoir of his Life, proves, beyond all question, that Dr. Dwight was a man held in the highest esteem for his integrity, learning, and talent: nevertheless, the above extracts as clearly prove that he was precisely the sort of writer who, having to trust entirely to his memory, could not be relied upon for accuracy of quotation.

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 (p. 87).

The quotation from Irenaeus occurs in one of these sermons. The original passage in Irenaeus is not given by Dr. Dwight in the edition which I have seen.

In vol. 4. p. 28 of the edition I consulted, a reprint from an American edition, which was published by Baynes (London) in 1819.

By the original passage, I mean only that of the old Latin version. The original writings of Tremens were in the Greek language, but they are now extant only in an ancient Latin version, excepting some fragments preserved by Eusebius and other Greek writers. (Lardner, vol. 2. p. 157.)

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; and, indeed, a particular reference could hardly be expected, considering the author's melancholy affliction, almost amounting to total loss of sight, and considering, also, his not having lived to superintend the publication of his "Theology."

Dr. Dwight, consequently, was a writer whom it was peculiarly unsafe to rely upon as an authority in quotation. Mr. Gurney ought, therefore,

to have tested his accuracy in the present instance by consulting the original. He implies that he did so, for, not content with Dr. Dwight's introduction to the quotation, which is simply, "Irenaeus says," he emphatically declares that "Irenaeus expressly asserts."

Dr. Dwight's words are,—"Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John himself, who lived in the second century, says,—'On the Lord's Day, every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating in the law (or Scriptures), and rejoicing in the works of God.'"

Did Mr. Gurney then actually consult the works of Irenaeus for the passage quoted? I should hope not; for if he did, it must have become known to him that no such passage is there to be found.

But, although not to be 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. I shall here place them side by side, giving those of Ignatius, or rather his interpolator, in the Latin version of that Father by Cotelerius.

On the Lord's Day Every one of us Christians Keeps the Sabbath, Meditating in the law and rejoicing in the works of God.

Dr. Paley, also (vol. 2. p. 93), quotes, as from Irenaeus, a similar passage, which is evidently derived from the same source, the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius, and being in Latin the resemblance is the more striking.

The reader may, perhaps, wish to see the whole passage from Ignatius.

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.

It may fairly be presumed that Mr. Gurney must have been well acquainted with Paley's "Moral Philosophy," or at least with that portion of it which treats of the Sabbath. If, however, he was ignorant of the passage in question having been there quoted, as well as in Dwight's "Theology," I cannot but remark how singularly fortunate it was for his argument, since he was thereby enabled to avail himself conscientiously of Dwight's quotation, which was so much better suited to his purpose than Paley's: first, because it mentions the Lord's Day, which Paley's does not; and, secondly, because it omits the word *spiritually* (*Spiritualize*), which Paley's quotation gives. The significance of this word as excluding all pretense for asserting that the Christians of the time, when the Epistle of Ignatius was interpolated, observed an actual Sabbath (by rest from bodily labor, *corporis remissione*), is too obvious to require elucidation.

It is evident, then, that we are not aided by any testimony from Irenaeus in fixing a date to the earliest instance on record of the use of the phrase "the Lord's Day," subsequent to the use of it in the Revelation, and must rest satisfied with the letter of Dionysius about A.D. 170.

Having thus made good my assertion that this name for the first day of the week is not to be met with in any ancient writing until more than seventy years after the date of the book of Revelation, I can now with increased confidence ask, whether it be not more probable that the phrase of "the Lord's Day" was adopted from the book of Revelation in after times, because it was judged to be a fitting name for a day which had then become a stated day of Christian worship, than that it should have been used in that sense by the writer of the Revelation? The former opinion is also the more probable of the two from another consideration, I allude to the singular nature of the book in which the phrase is found—a book totally different in its characteristic features from every other Christian Scripture. It is a prophetic effusion, which, from the beginning to the end of it, has puzzled divines and critics in all ages, and which, from its style, so appropriately in unison with the mystic character of the book itself, seems eminently susceptible of erroneous interpretation.

St. Jerome, in commenting upon the 38th chapter of Ezekiel, declares that the book of Revelation is so mystical throughout, as to require another revelation to explain it. He says, in reference to the opinion of some persons on Rev. 20. 8, Psalm 118. (in our version, Psalm 119.) "They not perceiving that the entire book, which is known by the title of the Revelation, is mystical, and that we are in want of a revelation, that we might say with the prophet, Open thou mine eyes', and I shall behold wondrous things out of thy law.'"—Ed. of Jerome's Works by Erasmus, vol. 5. p. 617.

Consequently, whenever the author uses a phrase peculiar to himself, and to the interpretation of which he affords no clue in any part of his work, it cannot but be highly presumptuous in any one to be confident of its exact meaning.

It is, indeed, not a little surprising, that, if St. John were the author of the Revelation, no clue to his meaning in the use of the phrase in question should be found in any of his epistles, yet in none of them is there any mention made of " the Lord's Day," or any allusion whatever to a custom of religiously observing the first day of the week, now called the Lord's Day.

It is, however, still more surprising that no such clue is to be found in the Revelation itself, if the phrase had any reference to the religious observance of that day of the week; for in such case, what can be more probable than that the author of the Revelation, whoever he might be, when writing to the seven churches, commending some and reproving others, would have seen occasion to commend or reprove their observance or neglect of the Lord's Day? yet on this point he is silent. Again: if Christ had ordained a Sunday-sabbath, it may fairly be conjectured (and what is the Sabbatarian inference from the text of " the Lord's Day" but conjecture?) that the writer of the Revelation, when he tells us of the glories of the New Jerusalem, would also have extolled the surpassing dignity of the new Sabbath. Yet, though much is said of a new Jerusalem, not a word is said of a new Sabbath.

As the Lord's Day and the day of the Lord, grammatically considered, are nothing more than two different modes of expressing the genitive case of the same noun, and as the phrase, " the day of the Lord," in the four instances where it occurs in the New Testament (1 Cor. 5. 5; 2 Cor. 1. 14; 1 Thes. 5. 2; 2 Pet. 3. 10) means the day of judgment, it may seem, and is I believe by some persons understood, to be in this sense, that the phrase of " the Lord's Day" is used in the Revelation; but, besides the objection which might be made, that the latter phrase in the original Greek is peculiar to the book of Revelation, and different, therefore, from that in the former instances above referred to, there is this further objection, that the day spoken of in the Revelation was already past; for the writer says, he received on that day the command to write to the seven churches. I, therefore, cannot avail myself of the supposition that the phrase in the Revelation may have been used in reference to the day of judgment.

Neither shall I attempt to make use of Mr. Higgins's statement, in his "Horae Sabbaticae," that the phrase "Dies Dominica" was in use among the heathens before the birth of Christ, as I am satisfied that the authorities quoted by him for this statement do not sustain it. He says, that the first day of the week " was known by this name before Jesus was born, in honor of the sun, who was always called 'Dominus Sol,' and the day 'Dies Dominica.' " For this he refers to Dupuis "Sur thus les Cultes," vol. 3. p. 41, ed. 4to. (" Horae Sabbaticae." paragraph 54.)

But Dupuis, whose work (in an 8vo. edition) I had an opportunity of consulting, gives no instance that I could find of the use of the phrase " Dies Dominica," before the birth of Christ; and for his appellation of " Lord " to the sun, Dupuis appears to rely upon a passage in Porphyry. (Porphyre " De Abstinent," 1. 4. p. 379.)

This, then, is Mr. Higgins's authority for saying, in his paragraphs 54 and 55, that the sun was always called "Dominus Sol." He states, in the words of Dupuis (translated), " Porphyry, in a prayer which he addresses to the sun, calls him 'Dominus Sol.' " But, on consulting the passage in Porphyry thus referred to by Dupuis and Mr. Higgins, I find that it is not Porphyry who addresses the prayer to the sun, but that Porphyry, speaking of the Egyptians and of their customs at the funerals of their nobles, says, that the coffin in which the corpse is deposited is brought out before the sun, and a prayer is made, which may be thus interpreted; and Porphyry then gives, as the Greek translation of the beginning of the prayer. And this is not related by Porphyry of Egyptians who lived before Christ, but of those of his own time, which was more than 250 years afterwards. True it is, that word may very properly be translated " Domine" (as it is in the Latin version of Porphyry, p. 329, Reiske's ed., Utrecht, 1767, " O Domine Sol "); but this gives no value to the authority of Porphyry.

To make good his point, Mr. Higgins should have produced instances of the Latin phrases, " Dominus Sol" and " Dies Dominica," or of the Greek phrases, having been in use before the birth of Christ. This he has not done. . .

Of the precise sense, therefore, in which the writer of the Revelation makes use of the phrase " the Lord's Day," we should be content to be ignorant, since we can never be certain. Thus it appears that the utmost intrinsic value of the text from the book of the Revelation (the Text, No. 6.) is this:—It contains a phrase which maybe supposed, but can never be proved, to allude to a custom among Christians at the time when the book was written, to observe religiously in some way or other the first day of the week.

As to this text being a corroboration of the Sabbatarian proofs drawn from the five preceding texts, it fails as of course, if its intrinsic value be no greater than it is here stated to be: but, even on the supposition that it actually proves a custom of observing the first day of the week, the proof cannot retrospectively corroborate the alleged proofs from the preceding texts; for the great interval of time between its date and that of the two last of those texts completely disconnects it from them all. The date assigned to the Texts, Nos. 4. and V. by the chronological index of

the Oxford 4to. edition of the Bible, is A.D. 60. Dr. Lardner gives to them both an earlier date, but taking A.D. 60 to be the true date, a space of at least thirty-five years occurs between the date of Texts, Nos. 4. and V. and that of Text, No. 6. During this long period there was ample time for a custom to have sprung up and become very generally established; and, consequently, even if the text in the Revelation proved, which it does not, that the custom of observing the first day of the week was in use at the date of that book, the fact would be no proof whatever, not even a corroborative proof, that it was in use thirty-five years before.

Chapter 4.

Result of Examination of the Six Text.

THE examination of the Six Texts being now concluded, what is the result? It is briefly this,—that there is no Scripture authority for believing that in the time of the Apostles the first day of the week (our Sunday) was observed either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day.

" No Scripture authority." There can of course be no authority found in the Jewish Scriptures for the fact of the observance or the non-observance of the first day of the week by Christians; and the Six Texts contain all the evidence that can be adduced from the Christian Scriptures that that day was religiously observed by them. Mr. Gurney himself, after commenting upon the Six Texts, acknowledges that his evidence from the Christian Scriptures is exhausted; for when proceeding to bring forwards his non-scriptural evidence he says: " Having stated the whole of the evidence afforded by the New Testament respecting the rise and establishment of the Christian Sabbath, I must now proceed to the consideration of uninspired records."—Brief Remarks, p. 81.

That there is no instance recorded in the Six Texts of the Sunday having been observed as a Sabbath is as indisputable as the fact that there is no command in the Christian Scriptures so to observe it. Equally indisputable is it that the Six Texts contain no evidence of a custom to observe the Sabbathian writers, indeed, seem to advocate the belief, that in the time of the Apostles the Sunday was observed as a Sabbath; but they never, on any occasion that I am aware of, venture to assert in plain words that such was the fact. They are content, by the use of equivocal language, when arguing that the Sunday was observed as a prayer day, to insinuate that it was also observed as a Sabbath. They speak of it as though it was of course so observed; but they never, so far as I am acquainted with their works, make this assumed fact the subject of specific proof or direct argument. On this point in the controversy they know they have no case.

With respect to the Sunday having been observed as a prayer day (a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction), I consider the examination of the Six Texts to have decidedly shown. [* Paley's " Philos." 2. 91.]

First, that there is not a single instance recorded in the Christian Scriptures of the Sunday having in the time of the Apostles been observed as a prayer day.

And, secondly, that those Scriptures contain no evidence from which we can even infer a custom among the Christians of that period so to observe it.

As, however, all classes of Sabbathians unite in maintaining that one of the texts (the Text, No. 4., relating to Troas) records an instance of the observance of the Sunday as a stated day of assembling for some religious purpose or other, and that the Six Texts collectively taken prove a custom to observe the Sunday as a prayer day, I shall proceed to offer some further remarks, which will, I trust, completely confirm my previous statement, that the Sabbathians are in error on both these points.

I use this very indefinite phrase that I may give the utmost latitude to the Sabbathian argument from this text, instead of confining it by using the phrase " assembling for public worship;" for of this the text certainly affords no proof; and I adopt the indefinite phrase here used as being the same, or nearly so, as that employed by Dr. Paley, when commenting on the text from Corinthians (the Text, No. 5.), relating to St. Paul's direction to lay by alms on the first day of the week. From that direction Dr. Paley argues that the first day of the week was then distinguished " by some religious application or other" (vol. 2. 88).

In the first place, let me recall attention to some of the principal facts in the case as they appear upon the examination of the Six Texts.

1. The meeting recorded in the first text (being that which was held by the disciples in the evening after the Resurrection) could not possibly have been held for the purpose of celebrating the first day of the week by Christian worship.

2. Consequently, the inference which the Sabbatarians draw from the first text, that the meeting recorded in the second text (the meeting " after eight days") was to celebrate the first day of the week by Christian worship, cannot be sustained; yet this inference is the only evidence the Sabbatarians have to offer that such was the object of that second meeting.

3. As to the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost mentioned in the third text, nothing occurred at it, nor is anything said of it, which gives any indication that their meeting on that particular day was for the purpose of Christian worship. On the contrary, the general tenor of the narrative, and especially the fact of its noticing that the meeting was held on the day of Pentecost, and of its omitting to notice the circumstance (which was accidental) that it was also the first day of the week, implies that the Apostles, as Jews, and adherents as yet to the Mosaic law, met on the day of Pentecost because it was a Jewish festival, and therefore not with the design of celebrating any Christian rite.

1. The meeting at Troas mentioned in the fourth text is expressly said to be for the purpose of breaking "bread; and if that were not a religious purpose, as (for the reasons given) it most assuredly was not, there remains nothing in the text to show that it was held for any purpose of Christian worship. The text is, in effect, more decisively against the Sabbatarian interpretation of it than if it had said nothing about the purpose of the meeting. If it had stood thus: " And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together, Paul preached unto them," it would have had some appearance of the disciples having been accustomed to meet statedly on that day, and that St. Paul took the opportunity of preaching to them then, as in like manner he occasionally preached to the Jews on the Sabbath day. But when we are told that the disciples at Troas met " to break bread" (that is, as I have shown the fact to be, to take their ordinary meal), we are almost expressly told that they met for no other purpose; since, if they had had in view any higher, especially any religious, purpose, it would be absurd to suppose that the historian would not have stated it in preference to that which in his present narrative he has attributed to them,—that of meeting to break bread.

These remarks apply to the text as it stood before Griesbach's emendation of it; but that emendation, showing that it was not the disciples, but St. Paul and his companions, who had thus assembled upon the first day of the week, still more effectively proves (for the reasons given on this point in the examination of the text) that the meeting at Troas to break bread was not a meeting to celebrate religiously the first day of the week; and that emendation, moreover, completely demolishes the foundation of the argument built upon this text by Dr. Paley and others,—namely, that the custom of the Christian church at Troas to meet on the first day of the week shows that that custom had become familiar and established all over the then Christian world.

5. The fifth text (from St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians) containing his direction to put by contributions for the poor brethren on every first day of the week, makes no mention of any meeting on that day of the week, and that it alludes to a custom of the Corinthians to meet on that day is mere conjecture unsupported by the context, and strongly rebutted by many just inferences to be drawn from the second, as well as from the first epistle which St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians.

6. The Sabbatarian inference from the sixth and last text, taken from the book of the Revelation, " I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day," is also mere conjecture. It is not certain who is the author of the book, and it is quite uncertain what he may have meant by the phrase of " the Lord's Day." Even if it were clear that it alludes to a custom at the time when the book was written, to meet on the first day of the week for the purpose of religiously observing it, this would be no proof that the custom was in use at the time when St. Paul preached at Troas, and wrote to the Corinthians more than five-and-thirty years before.

Nor would the fact, if it were the fact, that St. John himself at the close of the first century statedly observed the first day of the week as a day especially devoted to religion, be any proof that it was a practice sanctioned by Divine authority. It cannot be rationally believed, without evidence in support of the belief (and there is no such evidence), that St. John had received a Divine command to observe a religious rite unknown to Christians in the time of the Apostles Peter and Paul.

Conjecture on any subject, however trivial, can be no satisfactory substitute for proof, and is wholly inadmissible as such on subjects of real importance, particularly if the conjecture be offered as proof of a custom. Evidence of custom should consist of the positive testimony of some competent and credible witness, that the existence of the custom had come within his own knowledge, or instances should be given of frequent occasions on which the custom had been observed. In neither of these modes can the custom of observing the first day of the week be proved to have been in use in the time of the Apostles. Neither St. Luke in his history of the first thirty-two years of the Christian church (A.D. 33 to 65), nor St. Paul in the text from the Corinthians, nor St. John in the text from the Revelation, makes mention of a custom to observe the first day of the week: and as to instances of the actual observance of such a custom during the ministry of the Apostles, not one is recorded in the New Testament. Even if, for the sake of the argument, the meeting at Troas be considered as an instance of assembling upon the first day of the week for a religious purpose, it would not prove a custom to meet statedly on that day for that purpose. On no sound principle of evidence can it be maintained, under any circumstances, that a single instance proved of an act done, is proof of a custom to do that act; and most certainly the

slightest counter-evidence would be admitted to put down such an imperfect attempt at proof. Thus, when it is urged that the circumstance of St. Luke telling us (as we will suppose he does), that the disciples at Troas met on the first day of the week to break bread, when Paul preached to them, is proof of a custom then prevalent among Christians to meet stately on that day of the week for sonic religious purpose or other, such proof, resting as it does on a single instance of the alleged observance of the custom, would be effectually met and overthrown by the mere conjecture (it being a probable conjecture), that St. Luke, according to a practice usual with him, would have noticed that the meeting was held in pursuance of a custom, if the custom then existed.

I consider, therefore, that I have, by the examination of the Six Texts, fully established the following propositions:—

First—That the Christian Scriptures record no instance of the observance of the Sunday in the time of the Apostles, either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day.

Secondly—That they afford no evidence of a custom in the time of the Apostles so to observe it.

And that, consequently, they contain no evidence that, by some precept from Christ or his Apostles (not now extant), Christians were enjoined to observe the Sunday as a Sabbath day, or, if not as a Sabbath day, as a prayer day.

Sincerely believing, as I do, that there is no proof what. ever in the Christian Scriptures of the Sunday having been in any way distinguished from other days of the week by the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles, and confident, as I also am, that this belief is fully borne out by a close and impartial examination of the Six Texts, I always (as it is natural I should under such circumstances) feel a momentary surprise whenever I happen to meet with instances of the complacency with which theological writers appeal to these six texts, as affording complete and indisputable proofs of the religious observance of Sunday by the first Christians. I am led to make this remark from having lately, in a work of great theological repute, met with a passage of this kind, wherein it is worthy of all admiration how smoothly the learned author seems to glide along the current of the Six Texts, as though not a breath of adverse wind were stirring in any quarter to impede his onward course. The work alluded to is a treatise entitled " Primitive Christianity," and is written by Dr. Cave, a very eminent divine in the early part of the seventeenth century. After first noticing from the text in the Revelation, that " the Lord's Day, as it is called by St. John himself," was the proper name for the first day of the week, Dr. Cave thus quietly enumerates those proofs of Sunday observance by the first Christians, which he says are intimated in the other five of the six texts:—" We may observe all along in the sacred story, that after Christ's resurrection the Apostles and primitive Christians did especially assemble upon the first day of the week. And whatever they might do at other times, yet there are many passages that intimate that the first day of the week was their more solemn time of meeting. On this day it was that they were met together when our Savior first appeared to them; and so again the next week after. On this day they were assembled, when the Holy Ghost so visibly came down upon them, when Peter preached that excellent sermon, converted and baptized three thousand souls. Thus when St. Paul was taking his leave at Troas, upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, i.e. as almost all agree, to celebrate the Holy Sacrament, he preached to them, sufficiently intimating that upon that day it was their usual custom to meet in that manner. And elsewhere giving directions to the Church of Corinth (as he had done in the like case to other churches), concerning their contributions to the poor suffering brethren, he bids them lay it aside upon the first day of the week, which seems plainly to respect their religious assemblies upon that day; for then it was that every one, according to his ability, deposited something to the relief of the poor, and the uses of the Church." — Primitive Christianity, p. 105.

As I quote from the seventh edition, this work must have had many thousands of readers, the far greater part of whom, knowing but little on the subject from other sources, have looked upon the doctrine of " the Christian Sabbath" as triumphantly proved by such an accumulation of evidence as here seems to be presented to them. Probably not one reader in a hundred would stop for one moment to consider whether the texts appealed to really authorize the conclusions drawn from them. Thus it is that error is propagated and rooted among the ignorant and unreflecting, by the loose, but specious, reasoning of able and learned writers.

The reader who may have accompanied me thus far, and who may now have inquired for the first time into the evidence for his belief in a Christian Sabbath, will doubtless be surprised to find how slight and scanty that evidence is.

Were such evidence tendered in a court of justice to prove any grave fact relating to the ordinary affairs of life, it would not stand the least scrutiny. Let me suppose that I am permitted to personify the Six Texts, and to call them as witnesses on a trial of the truth of the Sabbatarian tenet before some judicial tribunal, which should be governed in its proceedings by those long-established rules and forms which our courts observe, and which are so admirably adapted to the investigation of facts, and the discovery -of truth: it might, in such case, be confidently expected, that the course of an inquiry, so conducted, would be that which I am about to submit to the attention of the reader. But I must premise a few explanatory remarks.

Were the trial confined to the question, Whether the first Christians observed the Sunday as a Sabbath? the examination of the proposed witnesses might be restricted to interrogatories which could be answered exclusively out of the texts personified. The only question, indeed, which could be asked, would be,—Did the Christians observe the Sunday as a Sabbath in the time of the Apostles? and the answer of all the six witnesses to this question must be, " Not to my knowledge;" for no Sabbatarian can contend that any one of the Six Texts contains evidence of the observance of a Sabbath. There would, therefore, be no case to go to a jury, and the Sabbatarians (the plaintiffs in the cause, as they might be called) would, in technical language, be nonsuited, and the trial would be at an end.

But this course of strictly confining the examination of the witnesses to questions which can be answered out of the texts which they represent, cannot be pursued on the trial of the other Sabbatarian proposition, namely, Whether the first day of the week was appropriated in the time of the Apostles to the purpose of public prayer and religious instruction? Thus, for instance, with respect to the Text, No. 1., it is essential to inquire, and ascertain, if possible, whether the meeting of the disciples in the evening following the resurrection, and the appearance of Christ to them at that meeting, took place on the first day of the week; and this depends upon the question, When did the day of the resurrection begin, and when did it end? The text itself (which it should be recollected is not literally translated in our Bibles) does not settle this question. So also with respect to the Text, No. 4., as to the assembling at Troas on the first day of the week " to break bread," the Sabbatarians can have no right to assume as unquestionable a disputed fact, namely, that in the instance recorded in that text, the breaking of bread was the " partaking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Proof that such was the meaning of the writer of the text must be sought for aliunde, for it is not to be found in the text itself.

The course, therefore, which I intend to adopt, and which is indispensable to an effective trial of the second Sabbatarian proposition, is, not to ask such questions only as can be answered out of the texts personified, but to suppose the writers of the text, and any of the Evangelists as occasion may require, to be questioned as witnesses, for the purpose of obtaining information on points left doubtful in the texts themselves. In no case, however, shall I suppose questions to be asked of any witness, to whose testimony on the subject I have not previously appealed in my examination of the Six Texts.

If these preliminary stipulations be allowed (and they are absolutely requisite to the due conduct of the proposed imaginary trial, and are equally fair to all parties concerned in it), the proceedings upon the trial, if my exposition of the Six Texts is correct, would be to the following purport.

The Sabbatarians, holding the affirmative of the propositions included in the question to be tried, would be the party to commence the proceedings. They would have to state their case, and to produce their evidence in support of it.

One of their advocates would then address the jury, and inform them that the proposition which he had to establish, and upon which, after hearing the evidence, it would be for them to determine whether he had succeeded in establishing it or not, was this. In the time of the Apostles the first day of the week (which corresponds with our Sunday or Lord's Day) was observed by the Christian Church as a Sabbath, and as a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction.

Hereupon another of their advocates would rise, and beg permission to inform the court that there was a very considerable difference of opinion amongst Sabbatarians with respect to the proposition just stated; that he represented a large class of them, who were decidedly of opinion that the first day of the week was not observed by the early Christians as a Sabbath: but his clients were, nevertheless, as decidedly of opinion that it was observed by them as a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction; that, therefore, if the decision should be against the proposition in its present form, it was the intention of that class of Sabbatarians whom he represented to have the question afterwards tried upon that part only of the proposition which related to the observance of the day by public worship and religious instruction. But he would submit that, as the witnesses to prove the latter branch of the proposition would be called to prove the whole proposition, it would be very convenient, and would not prejudice the case of the other class of Sabbatarians, if the court would allow the question for the jury to be put in this form, namely, Whether in the time of the Apostles the first day of the week was observed by the Christian Church as a Sabbath, and as a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction; and whether, if not observed as a Sabbath, it was observed as a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction?

This proposal being agreed to by the court, and the counsel for all the parties concerned, the advocate who had first spoken would then resume his address to the jury.

Many fine things would he say of the Lord's Day and the blessed Sabbath. The court and jury would be most impressively told of the comfort it was to the working-classes to be indulged in one day of rest after six of labor, and of the advantage to all classes ensuing from the appropriation

of one day in seven to public devotion and public instruction in religion and morals, and of the consequent benefit to the whole community; and the jury would be most touchingly reminded of the well-known fact (for such he would represent it to be), that the greatest criminals are always discovered to have commenced their career of wickedness by a desecration of the Sabbath.* He would, however, be found to refrain most carefully from pledging himself to prove, and even from decidedly asserting, that the Sunday was, in the time of the Apostles, observed as a Sabbath. All his remarks would insinuate that such was the fact; but all

* This notion, so sedulously propagated by Sabbatarians, is not founded on fact. Sabbath-breaking is not the origin of crime. A man who works on a Sunday breaks the Sabbath (if Sunday be a Sabbath), but his working on that day does not lead him to crime. It is not by him, and such as he, that our jails are filled. This proposition may be easily tested. It is from our jail-chaplains that we receive the statistics as to Sabbath-breaking convicts. It is not difficult to imagine the course taken by the chaplain, when he confesses some great criminal. "I fear," he says, "that you have been a Sabbath-breaker from your youth upwards." The poor wretch, who is no theologian, answers, "Yes, that I have;" and he is forthwith put down in the list of those who have confessed to Sabbath-breaking having been the origin of their vicious career. But if the reverend confessor had put to his penitent (who no doubt had never done any work on any day, when he could avoid it), this one more leading question,— "And you have, I dare say, been guilty of working on a Sunday?" "No," would be the reply, "I never (did such a wicked thing in all my life."

If the Sabbatarian should shift his ground and tell me, that what he meant by Sabbath-breaking is the not going to church on a Sunday, and the spending of the day, instead, in idle pastimes or vicious indulgences, here, again, I should say, the proposition will not hold. Every Sabbatarian must admit that the man who, on some Sunday goes to church three times in the course of the day, and in one of the intervals mends a hole in his coat, or roots up a weed in his garden, is a decided Sabbath-breaker; as much so as he who on the same (lay works hard at his trade, and never goes to church at all: for there are no degrees of comparison in Sabbath-breaking, otherwise a man would not have been stoned to death in the olden time for gathering sticks upon the Sabbath day (Numb. 15. 32, 36).

If, therefore, accuracy in the use of language is to be regarded, it is impossible for Sabbatarians to maintain that Sabbath-breaking is the origin of crime; not even when they explain their meaning to be, that its origin is the abstaining from Church and indulging in vice or idleness on the Sunday. I again deny that proposition. The commencement of the career which ends in crime is of earlier date, and is owing to a very different cause. Its date goes back almost to the period of infancy, and the true cause is the total want of education in religion and morals. That wretched class of our population, which exhibits the extreme of human ignorance and destitution, is the class which supplies our jails with the greatest portion and the worst of criminals, and this from the cause above assigned—the want of education. Much is doing by the truly benevolent at this time to remedy this scandal in our social system by the institution of "Ragged Schools." But I forbear from pursuing the subject further in a note. It is a subject which more properly belongs to a sequel to this work. I have, however, said enough, I hope, to convince any reasonable disputant, that to attribute the origin of crime to Sabbath-breaking is a vulgar error.

His positive statements would be confined to the tenet, that the Sunday was observed at that time as a day of public prayer and edification. He would assure the jury that the two first witnesses he should produce would distinctly prove the important fact, that, on the two first Christian Sabbath days, Christ himself appeared to his disciples when assembled together, and thus sanctioned by his presence the religious observance of those days; and that another witness would prove that by selecting a Sunday for the miracle of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, the Lord of the Sabbath completed the manifestation of his personal sanction to the establishment of the Christian Sabbath.

He would next promise the jury that the proof of the assent and approbation of the Apostles to the subsequent observance of the new Sabbath by the Christian Church would be made so clear by the testimony of his other witnesses, that no reasonable doubt of the fact would remain upon their minds, notwithstanding he had to admit that he should not be able to tender, in proof of the divine institution of the new Sabbath, any express command from Christ, or any positive injunction from the Apostles.

His peroration would probably consist of a strenuous effort, by arguments studiously bewildering and language affectingly pious, to persuade the jury, that in all matters pertaining to religion, and more especially in the solemn case before them, human reason was a treacherous guide, and that it would be safer for them, on the present occasion, to act under the influence and dictation of their religious feelings, than to resort to their usual mode of sifting evidence relating to the petty affairs of this world: and this, it is also probable, would be the last observation addressed to them; for it would be that portion of his harangue which he would wish to sink most deeply into the minds, and by consequence pervert the judgment of those who were sworn to decide upon the case "according to the evidence."

The advocate who appeared for the other class of Sabbatarians would then address the jury. He would make no appeal to their feelings and no attempt to mislead their judgment. He would admit that the question, whether or not the first Christians observed the Sunday as a stated day of

assembling for religious worship, was a question of historical fact, and, like all other questions of fact, to be tried by evidence. He would further admit, that he should not be able to produce direct and positive proof, that such was the practice of the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles; but he expected the witnesses would give such evidence of the observance of the practice at that time by a Christian community far distant from Jerusalem, as would fully justify the inference that " the practice was: (then) familiar and established " wherever the Christian religion had been planted, and that it had become so in consequence of its having had the sanction and approbation of the Apostles, which would fairly justify the further inference that the practice had " originated from some precept of Christ or of his Apostles, though none such be now extant." [Paley's " Philosophy," 2. 87.] To this he would add, in conclusion, that there were other indications of the first day of the week (our Sunday) having been observed as a stated day of religious worship in the time of the Apostles, which he would leave the witnesses to relate, and which he had no doubt would confirm the jury in the opinion that, in fact, the Sunday had been so observed.

The Six Witnesses, representing the Six Texts, would then be called in succession, and the chief points in their evidence would be to the following effect:— John, 20. 19 (ante, p. 26).

The First Witness would depose to the fact of the resurrection, and that it occurred on the first day of the week.

On being asked, If the disciples met together in the evening of that day? he would reply, that they met in the evening following the morning of that day, but whether in the evening which belonged to that day is uncertain (1). If they met before sunset, they met in the evening of that day; for the Jews reckoned two evenings to each day: the one commenced from sunset, and was the beginning of a day; the other commenced from the decline of the sun, and continued till sunset, which was the close of that day.

If, then, the disciples assembled at any time after midday, and before sunset, on the day of the resurrection, they assembled in the evening of the day of the resurrection?

Certainly.

Is it not, therefore, in your opinion most probable, and indeed certain, that the disciples did, in fact, assemble while it was yet the first day of the week, for the purpose of doing honor to the day of the resurrection?

From such a motive (the witness would say) it is impossible that they should have assembled while it was yet the first day of the week, the day of the resurrection.

Why?

Because, at the time they assembled, they did not believe in the resurrection (2).

But Christ appeared to them when they were assembled?

Certainly, and they from that time became Christians, that is to say, believers in the resurrection, which they were not till then.

If Christ appeared to them while it was yet the first day of the week, their meeting, although at first not so intended by the disciples, might still have been a meeting by which the day of the resurrection was sanctified, and that great event religiously celebrated?

It might be so, no doubt.

Was it not probable that Christ would, therefore, appear to the disciples whilst it was yet the first day of the week?

Most certainly, if his intention was that that day should be celebrated by them: but such could not have been his intention.

Why not?

Because, whether the disciples met whilst it was yet the first day of the week, or not, Christ did not appear to them till some hours after that day had closed (3).

But if it was not for this reason that Christ appeared to them, he must have had some other great purpose in view, which would suffice to account for his appearing: can any such purpose be assigned with any probability?

It can be assigned with certainty. He appeared to them in order to assure them of the reality of his resurrection, of which, till then, they had doubted, and at the same time to give them some instructions respecting their future mission as his Apostles (4).

If such is your testimony, it may be useless to ask you whether the disciples observed the day of the resurrection as a Sabbath?

I do not know that any of them did so observe it (5). I know that two of them did not (6).

Or, whether the disciples observed or practiced any religious rite or ceremony on that day, in honor of the great event which had occurred upon it?

Impossible they should do any such thing: they did not become Christians till after the day of the resurrection was past.

John, 20. 26 (ante, p. 50).

The Second Witness would be remarkable for having nothing to say, except that another meeting (but whether it was the second or not he could not tell) was held by the disciples about a week after their first meeting.

Was not the meeting which you are speaking of held on precisely the same day of the week as the first?

I am inclined to believe, but cannot positively say, that it was so.

Whether did the disciples observe the day on which they held this further meeting as a Sabbath? The witness would reply, Not to my knowledge. Whether did they observe or perform any religious rite at that meeting?

Again the witness would reply, Not to my knowledge.

Have you any further evidence to give on the matter in question?

None whatever.

Acts, 2. 1 (ante, p. 62).

The Third Witness on the list would represent the text relating to the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; but, before calling him, the advocate of the moderate Sabbatarians would suggest in a whisper to his learned colleague, that it would be the more prudent course not to call this witness, as his testimony could be but of little (if of any) value; and would perhaps be considered as showing that some distrust was felt as to the sufficiency of the evidence given by the other witnesses. The advocate of the ultra-Sabbatarians would, on the contrary, insist that his evidence was essential, and proceed to call him.

Upon being examined, the witness would state as a fact within his own knowledge, that the Apostles assembled " with one accord in one place " on the day of Pentecost, which occurred soon after the day of Christ's ascension; but he would state no information as to where and what was the place in which the Apostles assembled (7).

He would be then asked, Whether the day on which they thus assembled was the first day of the week? and to this he would reply, that he could not say from recollection whether it was or not; but he would add that on calculation he found that it was so.

He would, in consequence of this discovery, be further questioned thus: — It now appearing that it was on the first day of the week that the Apostles assembled with one accord in one place, did they not so assemble for the purpose of performing some Christian duty appropriate to that day of the week?

The witness would reply, that he could depose to nothing on the subject.

Upon being then asked, Whether the Apostles observed the day on which they thus met as a Christian Sabbath?

He would say, Not to his knowledge.

Acts, 20. 7 (ante, p. 71).

The Fourth Witness would prove that once St. Paul preached to his converts on the first day of the week; and that this happened at Troas, in Mysia, a country far distant from Jerusalem: and at first the witness would state that it was upon the occasion of the disciples at Troas having met together on the first day of the week "to break bread."

Upon being questioned, Whether meeting to break bread did not necessarily signify a meeting for the performance of a religious rite? he would answer, It did not. And, upon being further questioned on the subject, he would say, that the breaking of bread was a customary ceremony with the Jews at their meals, and that, in consequence, the phrase of " assembling to break bread," unless accompanied by other expressions which would give it a different meaning, was an appropriate phrase to signify the assembling to take an ordinary meal (8).

Then, in speaking of the meeting at Troas, your use of the phrase, unaccompanied as it was by any explanatory expressions, implies that you intended to speak of the breaking of bread on that occasion as nothing more than partaking of a common and ordinary meal. Is that your meaning?

Most certainly it is. I am in the habit of using the phrase; and as on all other occasions, so on this, I use it in that sense, and in no other (9).

? Upon being asked to recollect himself as to the fact, whether or not it was the disciples who thus met at Troas to break bread, or St. Paul and his travelling companions, he would desire leave to correct his evidence in that respect, for that, upon recollection, it was St. Paul and his companions who thus met (10).

M Upon being asked, if he knew of any custom, either of the disciples at Troas, or of St. Paul and his companions, to meet together on the first day of the week, as a stated day for performing any Christian rite, he would reply, that he knew of no such custom, either of the disciples at Troas, or of St. Paul and his companions: and he would probably go on to say, that if he had known of such a custom having been practiced in those times by the Apostles, or their disciples, he should have said so proprio mold, without waiting to be asked the question; for that it was usual with him to notice on all fit occasions customs of a religious nature (11).

If then asked, Whether St. Paul observed the first day of the week as a Sabbath? he would answer, Not to my knowledge.

Whether did the Christian Church so observe it in St. Paul's lifetime? - To this also he would answer, Not to my knowledge. And would probably add: Had I known that St. Paul, or any Christian Church in his time, or at any time, observed a first-day-of-the-week Sabbath, I should have made it a point of giving it in evidence, although not questioned upon the subject (12), it being my manner to notice religious customs.

1 Cor. 16. 1 (ante, p. 101).

The Fifth Witness would depose to St. Paul having given order to the churches in Corinth and Galatia concerning a collection for the poor brethren in Jerusalem, and particularly of his having given an express direction to the Corinthians, that every one of them should once a-week, on the first day of the week, lay by him in store whatever he could spare for that purpose.

The witness would thereupon be asked, whether he meant to say that the contributors were to lay by their contributions at home; or whether, on the contrary, he did not mean, by what he had said, that St. Paul's direction was to " bring in " and pay over to the officers of the Church on every first day of the week whatever contributions were intended to be made?

He would reply, that he meant what he had said: each contributor was himself to lay by and treasure up his contributions at his own house (13).

Upon being asked, Whether it was the custom of the Church at Corinth, in the time of St. Paul, to meet on the first day of the week as a day " distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other?" he would reply, He could not say that such was the custom of the Church at Corinth, or of any Christian Church at that time.

Why, then, did St. Paul recommend the first day of the week as the day of the week which was most appropriate for laying by the contributions?

To this question the witness would reply, I cannot tell (14).

Being asked the question, Did the Christians in St. Paul's time observe the first day of the week as a Sabbath? his answer would be, I do not know that they did (15).

Rev. 1. 10 (ante, p. 116).

The Sixth and last Witness would then be called to depose that St. John was on the Spirit in the Lord's Day.

On the appearance of this witness, some doubt would be expressed, and some altercation ensue upon the question, whether he was in reality the person called (16). The judge would decide that his testimony would not ultimately be received, if there was any reasonable doubt as to his identity; but that as he would hear evidence on that question, and as the jury might consider and determine upon that evidence when they came to consider their verdict on the main question, he should allow the witness to be examined, unless it should prove clear that he was not the person called.

The testimony as to identity would then be heard. Some of the witnesses on this point would declare that the person appearing as the witness in the cause was the person whom the plaintiffs had called; some would declare that he was not, and some would say the point was doubtful.

The inquiry into the identity of the proposed witness being concluded, he would then be examined, and would depose, that the writer of the Book of Revelation was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day.

Being then questioned, Whether at the time when that book was written (which the witness would state was not till about the close of the first century) it had become the custom of Christians to meet together on the first day of the week as a stated day of public worship and religious instruction?

He would reply, He could not tell, but was inclined to think it had (17).

Being then asked, If at that time the first day of the week had come to be known by the name of the Lord's Day? he would say, He could not tell, but was inclined to think it had not (18).

The witness would then be asked, Did he know of its having been the practice of Christians at the period of which he was speaking to observe the first day of the week as a Sabbath? and to this he would reply, That he had no knowledge of such being the practice among Christians at that period.

The evidence on the part of the Sabbatarians being here closed, the anti-Sabbatarian advocate would then address the jury; and begin by freely admitting that there was great truth in what had been said, not only as to the comfort to individuals in a periodical day of rest from labor, but also as to the benefit to society in attending upon public worship and receiving instruction in religion and morals upon that day; but he would at the same time desire the jury to bear in mind, that the question of the utility of appropriating a stated day for the weekly performance of religious duties, and for the enjoyment of some rest from the labor of worldly pursuits, was a question which they were not called upon to try; neither were they called upon expressly to decide whether (as had been intimated) the practice which has existed in the Christian Church from very early times so to appropriate the first day of the week, had its origin in a divine command. Nor had any evidence been offered that such a command was ever actually given. Neither of the advocates who had preceded him had ventured to put a single question upon that point to any one of the witnesses. The course which they took was to avoid all direct discussion of that point, and to content themselves with asserting, and tendering evidence to prove, that it had been the practice of Christians, in the time of the Apostles, to observe religiously the first day of the week. They were not agreed, however, as to the mode in which it had been observed; for the jury would recollect that one of the advocates contended that the day had been observed as a Sabbath and as a prayer day, whilst the other was satisfied to prove (if he could) that it was observed as a prayer day only. Both, however, agreed in insisting that the day had, in the time of the Apostles, been "distinguished (from every other day of the week) by some religious application or other;" and the advocate who had last addressed them had maintained that the just inference from that fact, if established, would be this: that the practice had "originated from some precept of Christ, or of his Apostles, though none such be now extant;" which is, in effect, saying it was originally enjoined by a divine command. But before such an inference, whether just or not, could be allowed, clear and satisfactory evidence ought to have been produced in proof of the alleged fact on which it was founded,

namely, that the religious observance of the Sunday (as distinguished from the other days of the week) was actually the practice of the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles. Had there been, he would ask, any such clear and satisfactory evidence produced? He was persuaded the jury would be of opinion there had not. Yet this alleged fact of Sunday observance in the time of the Apostles was, strictly speaking, the real question in the cause; for the jury were not to concern themselves with any inference which might be drawn from that fact if it should be established by their verdict.

In trying this question of fact, the jury would recollect, that on account of the difference of opinion among his opponents as to the mode in which the Sunday had, as they contended, been religiously observed, the question for the jury had by agreement, for the sake of convenience, been divided into two separate questions,—first, was the Sunday observed as a Sabbath, and also as a prayer day? And, secondly, if not as a Sabbath, was it observed as a prayer day?

He would next proceed to recapitulate to the jury the principal points in the evidence, drawing their especial attention to the answers which had been given to questions which he had put to all the witnesses on their cross-examination. He would remark to the jury, that upon the first point which they had to decide, namely, whether it had been customary to observe the first day of the week as a Sabbath, not one of the witnesses could state that it had, nor did any one of them state a single instance of its actual observance as a Sabbath. Then upon the other point, whether it had been customary to observe the Sunday as a stated day of public prayer, or other religious duties, not one of the witnesses had deposed that it had been customary to observe it in that manner; it was only the last witness whose testimony, even touched upon that point, and all that that witness could say amounted to no more than a probability, that towards the close of the first century a custom prevailed of so observing it. This the jury would see afforded no proof, nor even a reasonable presumption, that the day was stately appropriated to religious duties by the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles Peter and Paul, for the time at which the custom would be thus proved (if indeed it were proved) to have prevailed was not till at least thirty years after the deaths of those Apostles, during which long interval it was quite possible for such a custom to have sprung up and become partially, and even generally, established. But unless the evidence proved, which it did not, that it was a custom in use in the time of Peter and Paul, it proved nothing; for a custom known only at the close of the first century could not be properly considered to have belonged to the Apostolic age, or to have received the sanction of Apostolic authority. In this part of the case, also, as in the other, relating to the observance of the Sunday as a Sabbath, the jury would remark, that not a single instance had been proved of the actual observance of the day in the manner alleged. The only evidence produced as to its being observed as a stated day of performing some religious duty or other was the meeting on the first day of the week at Troas; but, in his opinion, and, as he trusted, in the opinion also of the jury, the testimony of the witness had negatived the inference that the meeting had been held on that day with any religious object; and even if it had, this would be no evidence that that particular day of the week was stately so observed. One instance would not prove a custom.

He would then entreat the jury not to suffer themselves to be led away by any appeal to their religious feelings, made, as he must suppose it to be, in the hope of biasing their judgment upon the question. Nor ought they to be influenced by the consideration of the benefit and comfort derived from the observance of a weekly day of devotion and of rest. He had already assented to what had been said on the other side as to the utility of such an institution; and he would, moreover, declare, that he would not have consented to hold a brief in the cause had his instructions been to argue against its utility. What he contended for was, that Sunday observance was of human institution, and not the result of a divine command; and if he might be permitted to state his further opinion on the subject, he would say that he felt confident the Sunday would be more religiously and more generally observed, if its observance were advocated on the sure plan of utility, instead of the disputable pretense of a divine origin. But the question of the origin of Sunday observance, he would again remind the jury, was not specifically before them. The question they had to decide was, whether the Sunday was religiously observed in the time of the Apostles, either as a Sabbath or a prayer day. This was a question of fact, and nothing else; and the more dispassionately they viewed it, and the more closely they sifted it by the ordinary modes of, investigating facts, the more likely were they to arrive at the truth, and to give a just verdict in consequence.

Then, addressing himself to the judge, he would conclude by stating, that he could bring forward witnesses of the greatest respectability, who would depose to facts which, in his opinion, would render it absolutely impossible for any sensible and impartial man to believe that the first Christians observed the Sunday as a Sabbath; and to the last degree improbable that they observed it as a stated day of public worship; but, although he had these witnesses in attendance, he would not call any one of them: he would produce no counter-evidence, but would leave the case in the hands of the jury, upon the sole testimony of the witnesses produced by the advocates on the other side.

The judge would then deliver his charge to the jury, and would begin by directing them to dismiss from their minds all consideration of a question which had been much adverted to in the course of the trial, —the question, whether or not the practice of Sunday observance had originated in a divine command. There was but one issue on the record, but one question to be tried. By consent of all parties, however, that question had been separated into two distinct questions, which were now, therefore, two distinct issues in the cause, namely, whether in the time of the Apostles the first day of the week (Sunday, as we call it) was observed by the Christian Church as a Sabbath, and as a stated day of public worship and religious instruction. And whether, if not observed as a Sabbath, it was observed as a stated day of public worship and

religious instruction. These were both questions of fact, and must be decided upon the evidence which had been given by the witnesses. Upon the first question, however (the observance of the day as a Sabbath), not a particle of evidence had been given to prove that such observance had been practiced in the time of the Apostles; and, therefore, upon this issue in the cause they must return a verdict of NONSUIT. With respect to the other question, the observance of the Sunday as a stated day of public worship and religious instruction, there was some evidence produced which was properly entitled to their attention. They would consider whether it amounted to proof, that the Sunday had been so observed. It would, however, be allowable for them, in a case so peculiar as this, to be satisfied with something short of direct and positive proof. Circumstantial and inferential proof, if very strong, ought to meet with the greatest attention: such proof might be irresistible; but in the case before them, even on the second question in issue (the observance of Sunday by the performance of religious duties), he must say it appeared to him the evidence was not of this character; it was slight and unsatisfactory, not amounting in any part of it to reasonable probability, and, in general, consisting of nothing more than conjecture; the jury were, however, not so to decide, because such was his opinion; they were to form their own opinion upon the evidence before them: but if, upon a careful consideration of that evidence, they should agree in the opinion which he had expressed, they would return a verdict of Nonsuit upon both the issues in the cause.

Thereupon the jury, if actuated by a due regard to their oaths, to give " a true verdict according to the evidence," would return a verdict of NONSUIT upon both issues accordingly.

If any one, whose opinion I ought to value; should tell me that, by arguing the Sabbath question in the form of a trial at law, I am treating a religious subject with levity, I should reply that I am not myself conscious of having so treated it. My object is truth on a question of fact. The Sabbatarian tenet is the assertion of an historical fact, and the evidence which history is said to give of that fact, may, therefore, very properly be submitted to every test, which would be unobjectionable in the case of any serious fact not of a religious nature. There cannot, then, be any reasonable objection to subjecting the Sabbath question to an imaginary trial before some ordinary and competent tribunal; and I am completely protected in taking this course by an example, the authority of which will not be disputed; I allude to Bishop Sherlock's " Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus," which will be found in the fourth volume of the Bishop's " Discourses and Dissertations," Oxford edition, 1812.

In my representation of the probable speeches of counsel, and the probable charge of the judge and verdict of the jury, in the supposed trial of the Sabbath question, it cannot have been reasonably expected of me, that I should represent these matters otherwise than according to my own views of that question, and which I conscientiously believe to be just views of it; but in stating the evidence, which would be given on

This very able and ingenious defense of the Christian religion, in the form of the trial of a question of fact, presents us with the whole array of a judicial court,—judge, jury, counsel, and auditory. I shall quote the conclusion of the trial, which, I apprehend, will be deemed all that is requisite to my justification in having resorted to the same test with respect to another historical fact, also pertaining to a religious subject.

The bishop represents the trial as concluding thus:— Gentlemen of the jury,' (said the judge, after having summed up the evidence), I have laid before you the substance of what has been said on both sides. You are now to consider of it, and to give your verdict.'

The jury consulted together, and the foreman rose up. "Foreman. My Lord, we are ready to give our verdict. "Judge. Are you all agreed?

Jury. Yes.

Judge. Who shall speak for you?

Jury. Our foreman.

Judge. What say you? Are the Apostles guilty of giving false evidence in the case of the Resurrection of Jesus, or not guilty?

Foreman. No GUILTY.

the supposed trial, I am quite aware it was incumbent upon me not to take that opportunity of endeavoring to strengthen my case by overstepping, in any instance, the statement which I had previously made of the purport of the evidence deducible from I trust I have executed that part of my duty with scrupulous exactness. In fact, the supposed trial ought to be, and I hope is, nothing more than my previous argument in another form,—a form, however, which appears to me well adapted to impress the truth of the remark I have so frequently had occasion to make, that if the evidence which the Sabbatarians produce from the Christian Scriptures in support of their tenet, were examined with the same rigid regard to accuracy as it is customary to employ in the investigation of all ordinary matters of fact of any real importance, it would incontestably appear, that in the Christian Scriptures no warrant is to be found for the belief that we are enjoined by divine authority to observe the Sunday, either as a Sabbath day, or as a stated day of " assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction." [Paley's " Philos." vol. 2. p. 91.]

Chapter 5.

Counter-Evidence.

THE supposed judicial trial of the Sabbath question contained in the preceding chapter represents the anti-Sabbatarian advocate as assuming that the witnesses for the Sabbatarians had made out no case by their evidence, and that it was, therefore, unnecessary for him to call any, although he had witnesses of the greatest respectability in attendance, who could depose to facts which, in his opinion, would render it impossible for any sensible and impartial man to believe that the first Christians observed the Sunday as a Sabbath, and to the last degree improbable, that they observed it as a stated day of public worship.

That course, however, which it might be safe for an anti-Sabbatarian advocate to adopt in a trial of the question, according to the rules and forms of a court of justice, it would not be safe for me to pursue in advocating the anti-Sabbatarian cause by the ordinary mode of conducting theological controversy; for, although I may have shown, and, as I believe, have shown by the examination of the only evidence produced by the Sabbatarians from Christian Scripture, that no case is made out by that evidence, I cannot know—there is no public voice to tell me—in this stage of the discussion, what impression that examination may have communicated to the minds of others. I must, therefore, proceed to strengthen still further my argument against the Scripture evidence of the Sabbatarians by producing counter-evidence from the same source, as additional proof of the fact, which I contend for, that the first Christians did not observe the Sunday either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day.

And first, as to the alleged observance of it as a Sabbath.

It is well known from Scripture history that many of the Jewish converts, long after their conversion, continued in the observance of the Mosaic Law, and that some of them, not content with their own adherence to it, insisted that it was obligatory upon the converts made from the Gentiles. "And certain men which came down from Judaea (to Antioch) taught the brethren and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." (Acts, 15.) This occurred in A.D. 52, about twenty years after the death of Christ. Paul and Barnabas who were then at Antioch, after some disputation with these Judaizing Christians, went to Jerusalem to bring the question under the consideration of the Apostles. When they had arrived at Jerusalem, "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them (the Gentile converts), and to command them to keep the law of Moses." But the Apostles determined otherwise. St. Peter, in giving his opinion, said, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" The discussion being concluded, "It pleased the Apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas." They also wrote letters to the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, in which they say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burthen than these necessary things, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication," (Acts, 15.)

From what was thus said in the discussion at Jerusalem, both by the Pharisaical converts and by the Apostle Peter, and also from the 21st verse of the 21st chapter of the Acts, (where it is stated to have been said to St. Paul, "Thou teaches all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after their customs,") it is evident, that though the Jews who came down to Antioch spoke only (so far as we are informed) of the rite of circumcision, their proceeding was considered, —and justly so— to involve in the question which it raised the whole law of ritual observances under the Mosaic dispensation; and the decree contained in the letters of the Apostles to the brethren of the Gentiles, appears to have been framed accordingly. Hence it has always been argued by anti-Sabbatarian writers, and with good reason, that the Gentiles were thereby freed from all obligation to observe the law, except in the particulars mentioned in the decree; and that as the Mosaic Sabbath was not one of the excepted particulars, the Gentiles were thereby and for ever thenceforth exempted from the observance of it. This inference from the Apostolic decree is so clearly just, that it can be evaded only, and then not successfully, by giving a different form to the argument. There are some Sabbatarians who would, perhaps, reply,—The decree did not absolve the Gentile converts from the obligation to observe the Sabbath; nevertheless, we agree that it did absolve them from observing it on the seventh day of the week, which was appointed for its observance by the Mosaic law; but we say that it had been ordained by Christ, or by his authority (although the command is not now extant), that a Sabbath should be observed on the first day of the week instead of the seventh. To such a reply it would be obvious to object, that it assumes as a fact that which has no warrant in Scripture, for not only is no such command by Christ, or by his authority there recorded, but there is, moreover, no allusion made to it, nor is any fact or circumstance mentioned which can be alleged as proof of a compliance with it. There is also another objection to the supposed reply of the Sabbatarians, and it is this, that to observe the Sabbath on any other than the seventh day of the week, would have been so manifest a departure from "the customs," that, if Christ had ordained it, or his Apostles by his authority, it is very surprising that a fact of such vast importance should not have been adverted to in a debate upon a question as to the obligation of those customs, or that, if it be supposed it had been adverted to, the historian should have omitted all notice of what passed respecting it. Some Sabbatarians, indeed, assert, but without any evidence to support the assertion, that the Jewish converts observed the Sabbath both on the new and on the old Sabbath day; and it may be admitted to be the general opinion, that many of the

Jewish converts did continue in the observance of the seventh-day-of-the-week Sabbath till the final abolition of the ritual law of Moses by the destruction of the temple. But if they did so this very fact carries with it a strong presumption that no other Sabbath day was then observed by Jew or Gentile; for it is most improbable, and without positive evidence is not to be believed, that Jews, bound by their conversion to Christianity to observe the alleged ordinance of Christ to keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week, and of course thereby absolved from all religious obligation to observe it on any other day, should voluntarily, and merely from attachment to the customs of their ancestors, observe also the old Sabbath day; thus, in this instance, doubling the pressure of that yoke, which St. Peter said in the discussion at Jerusalem, "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear."

But there is still another circumstance to be noticed, which is of itself, independent of all other evidence, conclusive as a proof that no other than the old Jewish Sabbath day was known in the time of the Apostles. It is, that the Christian Scriptures make no mention of any new Sabbath or new Sabbath day; but, on the contrary, mention the old Sabbath and the old Sabbath day in a manner which precludes the possibility of any other Sabbath having been then in existence, or of any other Sabbath day having been at that time observed. For it is only the Sabbath or the Sabbath day that is there spoken of; and the definite article could never have been used on such occasions by any Christian writer, if any other than the old Jewish Sabbath and Sabbath day had been known to him.

Let us look to some instances of the use of the definite article upon the occasions referred to. I select the four following from the book of the Acts.

1. In the 13th chapter, verse 14, it is said, "They (Paul and his company) came to Antioch, in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day."

2. In verse 42 of the same chapter, it is said, "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath."

3. With the expectation that the request would be complied with, the Gentiles came again on the next Sabbath day, as we find from verse 44, "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God."

In the two first of the above instances the use of the definite article is unquestionably inaccurate, if there was at the time spoken of more than one Sabbath in existence; and with regard to the third instance, "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city," it is obvious to remark, that this should mean the very next day after the request, to hear the words again, was made, if there was then a first-day-of-the-week Sabbath, as well as a seventh; yet no one believes that by "the next Sabbath day" any other day was here intended than the next old Sabbath day.

Heylyn remarks upon the text, "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city," that "it seems the Lord's Day was not grown as yet into any credit, especially not into the repute of the Jewish Sabbath; for if it had, St. Paul might easily have told these Gentiles 'that the next day would be a more convenient time,' and indeed *opus diei in die suo*, the doctrine of the resurrection on the day thereof."

4. But the remaining instance, though not more decisive, is more striking perhaps than any. In chapter 16. 13, we read, "And on the Sabbath 1-we (St. Luke, the writer of the Acts, and St. Paul, and their companions), went out of the city (Philippi) by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made." No one doubts but that in this instance the old Sabbath day is intended, and therefore the use of the definite article in speaking of it indisputably shows that it was the only Sabbath day then known: for that the writer should know that there was another, that other being one which as a Christian he himself observed, and which as a Christian he must believe was ordained to supersede the old Sabbath day, and yet that he should call the latter "the Sabbath day" is incredible. We have here, therefore, indirectly, but undoubtedly, the testimony of St. Luke to the fact, that there was no such institution in existence as a Christian Sabbath at the time when the book of the Acts was written, which was more than thirty years after the death of Christ and the promulgation of his Gospel.

To these proofs from the Acts that Sunday was no Sabbath in the days of the Apostles, some well-known passages might here be added from the epistles of St. Paul, clearly proving the same fact; but as I shall have occasion to quote those passages when producing counter-evidence on the question whether the Sunday was observed as a prayer day, I shall close for the present the counter-evidence on the question, whether it was observed as a Sabbath.

With respect, then, to the question of the Sunday having in the time of the Apostles been observed as a prayer day (a stated day of assembling for public worship and religious instruction), I have, in the first place, in opposition to the Sabbatarian proof on this point, to repeat the remark I have before made, that although the history of the Acts of the Apostles comprises a period of thirty-two years, it nowhere mentions, or alludes to, a custom of meeting on the first day of the week for any purpose; nor does it record a single instance of a meeting having been held on that

day of the week for the purpose of public prayer and religious instruction, the meeting at Troas, usually quoted as an instance, not having been held on that day for that purpose, as I have already sufficiently proved.

COUNTER-EVIDENCE. 183 In the next place, I may remark that the epistles of the New Testament, written by St. Paul and four other of the Apostles, though not in an historical form, give valuable information as to various practices which prevailed in the Church in their time: yet in none of their epistles do they make mention of any meeting having been held on the first day of the week, or of any custom among Christians to meet on that day. There is but one passage in these epistles which is supposed even to allude to such a custom—the text from Corinthians—and this supposition is a conjecture and nothing more, and which, as I have shown, can be effectually met by conjectures more probable to the contrary.

The epistles are twenty-one in number, and in point of date range over a period of thirty years or more (A.D. 52, to between A.D. 80 and 90). Adverting very circumstantially, as they sometimes do, to the practices and usages of the Church (I allude particularly to the epistles of St. Paul), it is passing strange that they should never be found to commend the observance of the weekly day of public prayer, or to reprove the neglect of it, or even to make casual mention of it, if the fact really was, that when the Apostles wrote those epistles the observance of the first day of the week as a stated day of public prayer had come into use by the Christian Church as one of its religious duties: especially if the custom owed its origin to an injunction of the Apostles, and still more if to a command of Christ.

The earliest epistles in point of date, according to Dr. Lardner, are those of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, A.D. 52; the latest, those of St. John, the first of which he places in about A.D. 80, and the second and third between A.D. 80 and 90.—Credibility, vol. 6.

"In the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians," says Mr. Gurney, p. 77, "Brief Remarks," "we have a lively description, first, of their meetings for worship; and secondly, of their love-feasts." Of the meetings for worship the description is indeed abundantly lively: for it appears that the Corinthian converts were so prone to speak in unknown tongues (and without interpreting, or procuring others to interpret, what they said), that St. Paul was obliged to reprove them for it, which he did on the common-sense principle, that words not understood could never edify the hearers. (Ch. 14. 2, 9, 13, 27, 28.) They were also so very eager to exercise their newly-acquired gift of prophesying, that St. Paul, to prevent confusion (14. 33), told them to "prophesy one by one" (31).

It seems not a little extraordinary that Mr. Gurney should venture to appeal, as he does, to this and the 11th chapter of the epistle for the purpose of proving that the Christians of Corinth assembled for worship particularly on the first day of the week. He says of the meetings for worship mentioned in these chapters, "Now that these meetings took place on the first day of the week, we are furnished with incidental evidence in the same epistle." Mr. Gurney must of course be here taken to mean positive evidence; for otherwise his remark has no meaning in it. The epithet "incidental" has nothing to do with the quality of the evidence. He might, and ought rather to have said, "We are furnished with evidence incidentally in the same epistle." He would then have stood clearly pledged to produce evidence of a positive character. But what is it that he does produce? Is it any passage from the same portion of the epistle in which St. Paul is speaking of the meetings held by the Corinthians? Not so. Is it any evidence plainly and indisputably referable to those meetings? No such thing. It is this; and it occurs in a subsequent

portion of the epistle, which relates to a now subject, "That these meetings," says Mr. Gurney, "took place on the first day of the week, we are furnished with incidental evidence in the same epistle. Paul commands collections to be made at Corinth upon the first day of the week' for the poor saints of Jerusalem; and he expressly states that he had given the same directions to the Churches of Galatia." Is this, I ask, positive evidence, or anything approaching to it? Does St. Paul himself tell us that he appointed the first day of the week, because on that particular day the Christians at Corinth and in Galatia assembled for worship? That would indeed have been evidence, but "we are furnished" with nothing of the kind. The evidence produced by Mr. Gurney is merely conjectural, which is of all species of evidence the most illusory and unsatisfactory. This conjecture (founded upon the direction to the Corinthians, in chapter 16. 1, 2) is, I am aware, not peculiar to Mr. Gurney. All Sabbatarians affect to call it evidence of this alleged fact. But Mr. Gurney dresses it up in a form peculiarly his own, and thus gives an air of plausibility to it which it would not otherwise possess. He subjoins this comment: "It is obvious that this particular day was fixed for these subscriptions, because the regular meetings of the Church would afford the opportunity of their being easily gathered. Accordingly (adds Mr. Gurney, and let us well note the expression "accordingly,") we find from Justin Martyr, that after the congregational worship of the early Christians on the Lord's Day, money was always collected for the benefit of the poor." Thus does Mr. Gurney endeavor, by the use of the connecting phrase "accordingly," to persuade his readers into the belief that the practice of Christians, nearly an hundred years after the time when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, was of course the practice of Christians in St. Paul's time: which, if his readers were induced to believe, would in their minds convert the conjectural into positive proof, that the Christians at Corinth, and in Galatia, and everywhere else at the date of St. Paul's epistle, held their stated meetings for worship on the first day of the week.

But to return from this digression, in the course of which I fear I may have needlessly repeated some of the remarks before made (p. 101), when examining the Text No. 5. I again express my surprise that Mr. Gurney should appeal to the 11th and 14th chapters of this epistle, as leading him to a proof that the first day of the week was the particular day on which the Corinthians of that period held their religious meetings. The notice which St. Paul takes of the lively extravagancies perpetrated at those meetings seems to me to point to a conclusion exactly the reverse, it appearing from their strange proceedings far more probable that the Christians at Corinth met every day than that they should meet only one day in the week. It is scarcely conceivable that such a people should be able to restrain the ebullitions of their enthusiasm for a whole week together. As Greeks they were lively by nature, and as new and zealous converts to a new religion, they would naturally be, and from St. Paul's reproofs to them evidently were, impatient of inaction, and were therefore far more likely to assemble in their Church (11. 18) every day in the week, than on one day only; in so doing following the example set them by the first converts to Christianity, who, " continuing daily with one accord. in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people," (Acts, 2. 46, 47.)

But all Protestants, when they reason upon the question, whether the first Christians stately observed the first day of the week, and upon the purport of the text in Corinthians (xvi. 1, 2) in reference to that question, are, I suspect, very apt to be biased towards the opinion that such was the practice of the first Christians by the habit which they themselves have (a habit peculiar to Protestants), of frequenting church but one day out of seven, and on all other days keeping the church itself shut up, and impenetrable to the devout or the curious, except on payment of a fee to the keeper of its keys; whilst in Catholic countries (as was the case in our own in Catholic times), the churches are open every day, and all day long, for the purposes of congregational and individual devotion.

Surely the total silence maintained upon this topic by all the five Apostles who wrote those twenty-one epistles, is an irresistible inferential proof that in the time of the Apostles there was no custom in the Church of assembling for public worship specially on the first day of the week. Where, I would ask, do we find any inferential proof so strong as this in support of the Sabbatarian assertion that such a custom did exist? It is nowhere to be found.

Yet strong as is the proof last stated of the nonobservance of the first day of the week in the time of the Apostles, it is slight in comparison with that which still remains to be produced: I allude to certain passages in — which, so far as I am aware, are never quoted by Sabbatarian writers; and why? Because the evidence which they disclose on the Sabbath question is strikingly opposed to the Sabbatarian tenet. They are, indeed, sometimes commented upon by Sabbatarians, when translating or annotating St. Paul's Epistles; but this is not quoting them in controversy. These well-known and remarkable passages occur in the Epistles to the Galatians, the Romans, and the Colossians; and they are applicable both to the question, whether the Sunday was observed as a Sabbath day, and to the question, whether, if not so observed, it was observed as a prayer day.



EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

To the Galatians St. Paul writes (A.D. 52 or 53), " Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," (4. 10, 11.) No one can deny that whatever the practice may have been which St. Paul here refers to, his remark upon it betokens disapprobation of it, and we may feel perfectly sure, that what he disapproved of in other Christians he did not practice himself. Whatever, therefore, were the days which he alludes to as being observed by the Galatians, it is certain that he himself observed them not.

As to the dates of St. Paul's Epistles, I have followed Dr. Lardner, as being those which I believe are most approved by modern divines. They differ a little from those given in the old chronological index of the Oxford 4to. edition of the Bible. Nothing, however, in the present argument turns upon this difference in dates. See ante, p. 105, note.

Some translators give this passage interrogatively, " Do ye observe days and months," etc.? But this, if correct, would make no difference in the argument, or, if any, would still more clearly show that the practice, at least by the Galatians, was new, since it was till then not known by St. Paul, and then not known with certainty, for he inquires if it be the fact.

Was, then, the first day of the week (our Sunday) one of the days which were at that time observed by the Galatians, or was it not? If it was not observed by them, there is at once an end of the Sabbatarian case, for it is impossible to suppose that there could ever have existed any precept of Christ, or of his Apostles by his authority, to observe the first day of the week, and that the practice of observing it should not, from the very first issuing of the precept, have become universal in the Christian Church.

That, however, the Galatians did not become observers of the Sunday upon their becoming converts to Christianity, is apparent from the text itself. St. Paul writes to them, " Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." This he says after he had been staying with them; and he unquestionably speaks of the circumstance, which he mentions as though he had been apprised of it since he left them. Consequently, when he was with them, they did not observe any days, or months, or times, or years, therefore not the Sunday.

If, on the other hand, it be assumed that the Sunday was one of the days which the Galatians had begun to observe, it follows that that day was one of those which St. Paul disapproved of their observing, since he does not except it; and any practice disapproved of by him could not have been one that had originated in a precept of Christ or of his Apostles. Whichever branch of the dilemma the Sabbatarians adopt, their choice is an acceptance of the testimony of an Apostle to the fact, that, in the time of the Apostles, the Sunday was not esteemed more holy than any other day of the week.

It may, indeed, be argued in reply, that, supposing the practice of distinguishing the Sunday, by the religious observance of it, had been enjoined, and had become in consequence universally established, there was no need for St. Paul to except it. This I deny.

Ye observe days I am afraid of you, is language much too strong not to require an exception to be made, if any day whatever was intended to be excepted. St. Paul would, moreover, in the case supposed, have gloried in excepting a day which by divine authority and appointment had then become sacred in the estimation of the Church of Christ.

Before closing my remarks upon the text in Galatians, it may be proper I should admit that, in what St. Paul there says to the Galatians, he does not, as some have supposed, positively condemn the observance of days. This would have been inconsistent with the tolerant language used by him upon that subject in his Epistles to the Romans and the Colossians, which I am about to refer to. He does, however, in his Epistle to the Galatians, express an anxious apprehension, that evil results may follow from such observances. What those results might be, he has no further intimated than by saying, they might be such as to render vain all the labor he had bestowed upon them. Possibly he might fear a relapse into Judaism or heathenism, or he might think that the observance of any day, even of Sunday (if we suppose the Galatians to have begun to observe it), would, though perfectly innocent, and in some respects praiseworthy in itself, degenerate into an extravagant and superstitious regard for the day, which he well knew was the case with the Jewish Pharisees in his time as to the old Sabbath.

He might also, and with good reason, be apprehensive that many unreflecting persons would thus be led into the belief that the religious observance of one particular day in a week, or other stated period, would to some extent atone for irreligious and immoral conduct upon all other days.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Let us now turn to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It was written A.D. 68, about six years after that to the Galatians. It appears from the 14th chapter of this Epistle, that there were contentions at that time among the Christians at Rome as to the obligation of observing days; one man esteeming one day above another, and another man esteeming all days alike. From the same chapter of the Epistle, it appears that there were contentions also as to eating, or refraining from eating, particular meats. Annotators upon this chapter have remarked that " the reverence which the Jewish converts still retained for the Mosaic law made them scrupulous in several matters, of themselves indifferent, such as the use of particular meats, and the observation of certain days; while the Gentile Christians openly indulged themselves in perfect liberty from such restrictions, not without some contempt of the Jewish scruples. The Apostle here exhorts both parties to mutual forbear- ante," (Pyle and Burkitt, in D'Oyly and Mant's Notes.)

The question as to meats forms no part of the subject in discussion; but I cannot correctly state St. Paul's censure of those who judged one another respecting the observance of days without quoting passages which relate to the question of meats, as St. Paul blends the two subjects together. In the second and some subsequent verses of the chapter St. Paul says, " One believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eats herbs. Let not him that eats despise him that eats not; and let not him which eats not, judge him that eats . . . Who art thou that judges another man's servant? To his own master he stands or falls . . . One man esteemed one day above another, another esteemed every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regarded the day regarded it unto the Lord, and he that regarded not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eats eats to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eats not, to the Lord he eats not, and giveth God thanks . . . Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. . . . Let us not therefore judge one another anymore.

Here, then, we have again to remark, that whatever were the days about the observance of which disputes had arisen, St. Paul's language on the occasion proves beyond question that he was indifferent to them all. No one can deny that St. Paul means to tell the Roman converts, that whether they refrained, or did not refrain, from eating particular meats, it was a matter of indifference in a religious point of view; nor can any one deny that he places the observance or non-observance of days upon precisely the same footing; and it would be scarcely too much to affirm that St. Paul names Christ himself as his authority for the indifference which he professes to the observance of days. For in a passage subsequent to those above quoted he does name this high authority for his indifference on the question of meats. "I know," he says, "and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that esteemed anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean," (v. 14.) We are here strikingly reminded of the similar phraseology in which (in verse 5) he had spoken of the observance of days: "One man esteemed one day above another; another esteemed every day alike." It is natural therefore to infer, and it would be somewhat hyper-, critical to deny, that St. Paul meant his declaration of the source of his persuasion respecting meats to extend to that which he held respecting days. He gives not the slightest hint to the contrary, although his two subjects are so intimately linked together in his argument and admonitions, that if what he had said respecting days had not had the sanction of Christ, he would scarcely have failed to notice in an especial manner a distinction of such importance between the two subjects upon which he was treating at the same time.

Intimately linked together. Particularly so in verse 6, where exactly the same, form of expressing his sentiment is applied to each subject: "He that regarded the day, regarded it unto the Lord: and he that regarded not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eats, eats to the Lord; and he that eats not, to the Lord he eats not."

Whatever opinion may be formed upon this latter point, no doubt can possibly be entertained but that St. Paul's reproof of intolerance applies equally to both subjects. Consequently he must be considered as censuring in the strongest terms those who took upon themselves to judge such of their fellow-Christians as did not "esteem one day above another." He also as expressly reproves those who censured the observance of days by such as conscientiously believed it was proper to observe them. In either case, St. Paul in substance declares that the dictates of conscience were to be followed, and that the conduct of all who were thus guided by what they deemed to be their duty in regard to the observance or non-observance of days was to be approved and respected instead of being questioned and condemned.

But it is impossible that St. Paul could thus leave it to the private judgment of every man to determine whether he ought or ought not to observe the Sunday, if that day had, either by Christ or by his Apostles, been enjoined to be observed; and if the observance of it had been thus enjoined, why did St. Paul not except it when expressing his own indifference to the observance of days? To this question I could myself imagine no answer, except that which I supposed might be given to the like question upon the text from Galatians, namely, that what all knew he must intend to except, there was no need to except. But that St. Paul should a second time forbear from making an exception so natural and proper to be made is most improbable; and as in the present text it is clear beyond dispute that the language he uses amounts to a permission to every man to esteem every day alike, it is more than improbable, it seems incredible, that in giving a license to treat all days alike, St. Paul should not have qualified that license by excepting a day regarded by him as sacred, if any such there were.

Another answer, however, is attempted to be given by Sabbatarians to the question why St. Paul did not make the exception. The late Mr. Belsham, in his translation of and comments upon St. Paul's Epistles, says, with reference to the text from the Epistle to the Romans, that the reason why St. Paul did not except the Sunday was this:— St. Paul was not then treating of Christian worship.

That I may not weaken this plea by a short statement of it, I shall state it at length in the author's own words, which are as follow:— One man esteemed one day above another; but another man esteemed every day alike. Let every one freely enjoy his own opinion.'

The converted Jew Observes his Sabbaths, his new moons, his fasts, and his festivals. The Gentile believer, unaccustomed to Sabbatical distinctions of every kind, regards all his time as equally appropriated to God, and does not esteem any one day as more holy than another. 'He who regarded the day, regarded it to the Lord; and he who disregarded the day, disregarded it to the Lord.'

There is no meaning in language if the Apostle does not here pronounce that all Sabbatical distinctions are abolished under the Christian law. The Apostle uses the utmost latitude of expression: whatever is fit and lawful upon one day is fit and lawful upon another, without any distinction between the first or the seventh and any other day of the week. But mark, the Apostle is not treating upon the subject of Christian worship; this is undoubtedly a duty of universal obligation, which, for the sake of order and decency, must necessarily be carried on at some convenient and appropriate season. Nor is he to be understood as saying anything to contravene that ancient and useful practice which the Christian Church in all ages has derived from the Apostles, of observing the first day of the week as a Christian festival for the religious and joyful commemoration of the death of Christ, and of his resurrection on the third day. The opposition made by the Apostle is to Sabbatical

impositions, not to religious institutions."—The Epistles of Paul the Apostle, translated by the Rev. Thomas Belsham, minister of Essex Street Chapel. London, 1822. Vol. 1. 169. Quarto edition.

I entirely concur in the opinion that Christian worship is a duty, and that to render the performance of this duty really efficacious in its true object, that of promoting religion and good morals among the worshippers, it must necessarily be carried on at some convenient and appropriate season, and should include in its services Christian instruction in all things pertaining to "our duty towards God, and our duty towards our neighbours." ["Church Catechism."] But Mr. Belsham, as we see, goes a step beyond this, and asserts that the ancient practice of observing the first day of the week for Christian worship is derived from the Apostles. This, for reasons already given, I deny. Mr. Belsham states no ground for the opinion on which the assertion is founded, but there can be little doubt it was formed from the superficial, matter-of-course examination usually made of the Six Texts, in which everything wished to be found in them is taken for granted beforehand, and nothing adverse to that wish therefore is required to be proved. With Mr. Belsham's opinion, however, upon this point, I have no concern, I quote his statement of it solely from a desire to set forth fully, and in his own words, the plea set up by him to account for St. Paul's not excepting the Sunday, when giving to every man the license of regarding, or not regarding, days.

St. Paul, he says, is not here treating upon the subject of Christian worship. How so? He is telling the Christians at Rome, that, whether they regarded the day to the Lord or disregarded the day to the Lord, it mattered not. He is, therefore, treating upon the subject of the religious observance of days by Christians. What else, I would ask, is this but "treating upon the subject of Christian worship?" I confess my inability to perceive the thin distinction, if any there be, between these two subjects. I am, on this occasion, as on many others, not a little surprised that such shallow reasoning should satisfy the minds of learned and able theologians, even when biased by their hope and anxiety to find in "troublesome words" (voces inopportune*) nothing upon examination that is adverse to their preconceived and long-cherished opinions.

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Four years after St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, he wrote one to the Colossians, A.D. 62, and in this he repeats still more pointedly his injunction, that no man should vex and censure another for not being an observer of days. His words are these: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come," (16, 17.)

Sabbath days! "Let no man judge you in respect of the Sabbath days!" When St. Paul uses language so strong and explicit as this, and without any exception or qualification, it is inconsistent with common sense to believe that a Christian Sabbath, in the strict and proper sense of the word Sabbath, was then observed. The same remark will, upon due consideration, be found applicable also to the question, whether there then existed a Christian Sabbath in the other sense of the word—that of a prayer day? If the first day of the week had become, by divine appointment, appropriated to the services of religion, it had become "an holy day" to Christians; yet St. Paul directs that no man shall judge another in respect of "an holy day." There could, therefore, at that time be no day in the week, neither the first nor the seventh, nor any other, which a Christian was by his religious duty bound specially to observe. This to me appears so clear and indisputable, that in giving reasons for my opinion, I seem to be engaged in the useless task of proving a truism, which no one will dispute; yet it is not admitted, for to admit it would be to give up the whole case at once on the part of the Sabbatarians. They, however, do not venture to approach the texts here quoted from St. Paul's Epistles when discussing the Sabbath question in treatises professedly written upon that subject. It is only, as I believe, when commenting generally on the Epistles, that they introduce, and then, as it were casually, upon those texts, remarks to explain away their anti-Sabbatarian tendency. Mr. Belsham, though he has a long note upon the words "Sabbath days" in the text from the Colossians, [Volume 2, page 260] carefully avoids any direct comment upon the words "an holy day." In his note upon "Sabbath-days," however, he very adroitly takes occasion to tell his readers, that although the text proves that "the old Sabbath is expressly repealed," and that "no new one is enjoined in its stead," they must always keep "in mind the very obvious and important distinction between the Lord's Day as a weekly religious festival and as a day of Sabbatical rest." What! when in the very same text "an holy day" (and such was the Lord's Day if of divine appointment) is expressly mentioned, as well as "Sabbath days?" What amazing inconsistency! If the text be an authority for believing that no man thenceforth should be called to account for not observing Sabbaths, it is equally an for the belief that no man is under an obligation to observe "an holy day." True it is that Mr. Belsham, literally speaking, could not comment upon the words "an holy day," which we find in this text, as translated in our Bibles, for he translates the original of "an holy day" by the word "festival." "Let no man, therefore, call you to account about meat or drink, or with respect to a festival, or a new moon, or Sabbaths," is his version of the text; nor can any objection be made to "festival," as a substitute for "an holy day," as the Greek word in the text may very properly be translated "a festival," meaning, however, a religious festival, for in no other sense can it be here translated. Where, then, is the difference between "a festival" and "an holy day?" Mr. Belsham would himself have to confess there is none; for, speaking of the Lord's Day in the very sentence which has just been quoted from his note, he calls it "a weekly religious festival;" and in his comment upon the text from the Romans (see ante, p. 197), he advocates the observance of "the first day of the week as a Christian festival." Yet upon the prohibition in the text from Colossians to call any man "to account with respect to a festival" (Mr.

Belsham's own translation), Mr. Belsham has not a single comment to offer for the purpose of explaining why this prohibition does not extend to his "Christian festival" on the first day of the week. This part of the text was too strong against him for a "Lord's Day" comment.

How glaring is the improbability that St. Paul, when treating in three of his Epistles upon the subject of the religious observance of days, should, on no one of those occasions, say a single word respecting the great "Christian festival," if such a festival there were! How exceedingly probable is it, on the other hand, that St. Paul would, if such were the fact, have seized the opportunities afforded him to extol above all festivals the day which, among the followers of the Gospel of Christ, was set apart for religious worship, in commemoration of the day of his resurrection! Antithesis was a figure of speech in which St. Paul delighted and excelled; and, therefore, if the first day of the week was thus observed, it is difficult to imagine it possible, he should not, in some one or other of the Epistles here quoted, have, with his wonted eloquence, set up in contrast to the ceremonial rites and unmeaning sacrifices of the Jewish and Pagan festivals the spiritual and purer worship of Christians on the Lord's Day.

And now, looking back to the texts extracted from those Epistles, how marvelous, how incredible, it appears, that St. Paul should, on three different occasions, and to three different Christian communities, widely separated from each other, make known, in unmistakable language, that for himself he esteemed all days alike, and should, moreover, in his Epistle to the Colossians, declare that no man should be called to account for the non-observance of a Sabbath or an holy day; and yet should not in some one — I ought rather to say in all — of these Epistles, have excepted the Sunday, if at that time the Sunday was, by divine appointment, distinguished by the religious observance of it from all other days of the week!

For these various reasons, I do with the utmost confidence affirm and maintain, that the Epistles of St. Paul, himself an Apostle, present us with proof, not in this instance the less decisive, because it is inferential (so strong are the inferences), that, in the time of the Apostles, the observance of Sunday, either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day, had not become the practice of the Christian Church.

With such cogent and superabundant evidence as I have here collected and stated from Christian Scripture, in refutation of the Sabbatarian tenet, whilst there is not any evidence deducible from that Scripture in support of the tenet, but such as, when touched by "the rude hand of inquiry," shrinks into utter insignificance; may we not with justice exclaim, What a wonderful phenomenon, with reference to our reasoning faculties, is the prevalence of Sabbatarian belief! Such dazzling, unsubstantial phenomena are, however, by no means rare in the misty regions of theology. Observe yon Protestant divine, a sincere and rigid Sabbatarian: he is gazing with unfeigned astonishment on the splendid errors of Catholicism; the awful doctrine of transubstantiation has just developed itself to his view. Preposterous delusion! alike opposed to reason and to Scripture! Impious invention of presumptuous man! Such are his reflections; yet is that doctrine as implicitly believed by the multitude, and as strenuously, ably, and honestly defended by the talented, the learned, and the pious, as is the unscriptural doctrine of a CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

Chapter 6.

On the Practice and Example of the Apostles with reference to the Religions Observance of the Sunday.

As from what has been said in the preceding chapters, it is clear that the Sunday was not in any manner observed as a religious festival by the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles, and that, consequently, the observance of it as such could not have been recommended or sanctioned by their practice and example, the present chapter may be considered superfluous. But such vast stress is laid upon the alleged example of the Apostles in regard to Sunday observance in all Sabbatarian tracts, treatises, and sermons, so ostentatiously is that example referred to by Sabbatarians on all occasions as an historical fact, which no one thinks of denying or disputing, that, after some hesitation, I have come to the opinion, that an express notice and separate discussion of this important topic is at least expedient, if not absolutely required.

The Apostles (say the Sabbatarians) have by their own practice set us an example of the religious observance of the Sunday. That is the proposition. But if the proposition be true, there ought to be some well-authenticated instances on record of the Sunday having been so observed by the Apostles, or by some of them; where are we to look for these instances? We naturally turn for such information to that portion of Scripture which is entitled "The Acts of the Apostles." There, if anywhere, should it be found. Yet what do we learn of the Apostles from that source in respect of Sunday observance? Of the Apostles collectively, nothing. We are nowhere told in it, that they observed a Sabbath on the first day of the week, or that they observed that day of the week in particular as a day of prayer. It is not even anywhere stated in the Acts that they on any one occasion met together on the first day of the week. [Acts, 2. 1, is no exception to this remark; what is there stated is, that the Apostles met on the day of Pentecost.] From the book of the Acts, therefore, we derive no information whatever of the practice of the Apostles collectively in regard to Sunday observance. What, then, does the book tell us of them individually on this, or, indeed, on any subject? Much of

Paul and Peter, but only on other subjects than that of Sunday observance. As to all the other Apostles, it tells but little of any of them, and of most of them it tells nothing. The greater number of the Apostles are never even named after the enumeration given of the eleven upon the election of Matthias (Acts, 1. 26), at the very outset of their Apostolical career (A.D. 33).

The name of Peter is of frequent occurrence in the former part of the Book of the Acts, and that of Paul occurs continually in the latter part; but the name of John, the greatest of all the Apostles next to Peter and Paul, occurs but five times, [In the narrative of the cure of the lame man by Peter and John (Acts, the name of John is, of course, several times repeated. I do not reckon these repetitions. This is but one occasion of the mention of his name.) and those only in the first and second years of the Apostolic mission; after which nothing more is said of him in the Acts, except, indeed, that his name is incidentally mentioned a sixth time, but then only for the purpose of distinguishing which of the two Apostles of the name of James it was whom Herod put to death (" James, the brother of John," Acts, xu. 2). The name of James the Less occurs but three times; that of James (the brother of John) but once; and the names of the other eight Apostles, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simeon, Jude, and Matthias, are never mentioned at all. So little do we know of the Apostles individually from the book of the Acts.

The only genuine source of information, besides the book of the Acts, as to the practice of the Apostles, whether collectively or individually, in regard to Sunday observance, would be the epistles written by five of them (Paul, Peter, John, James the Less, and Jude), and included in our Scripture canon: but from none of these epistles do we learn that the Apostles ever once met together on the first day of the week, or that any one of them ever observed that day of the week either as a Sabbath day or as a prayer day.

There are, it is true, in the works of ecclesiastical historians and the ancient fathers, legends in plenty of the lives and actions not only of the more eminent Apostles, but also of those who are so slightly, or not at all, mentioned in the book of the Acts. But even these legends, we may take for granted, contain nothing about the observance of the Sunday, at least not anything favorable to the Sabbatarian cause; for if they did, it would most assuredly have been long ago hunted out and paraded with much triumph by Sabbatarian writers, however small its value, or doubtful its authenticity.

There is, however, one fact relating to the Apostle John, which seems well authenticated by ecclesiastical history, and that is the great age to which he attained, his life being prolonged, it is said, to the year 100 of the Christian era. But this is all that ecclesiastical history tells us, which is important and worthy of credit, respecting him, so that of the last sixty-six years of his life we really know nothing that he did in the exercise of his Apostolic duties, except greeting Paul and Barnabas on their arriving at Jerusalem, A.D. 52 (Gal. 2. 9), and writing in extreme old age his three epistles, and also writing, as is generally believed, but on no sure authority, the book of the Revelation.

Here, therefore, I think it opportune to notice, that because St. John lived to the close of the first century, we are accustomed to speak of the times of the Apostles as though they were commensurate with the whole of that century, than which nothing can be more incorrect. The times of the Apostles, properly considered, comprise that portion only of the first century during which we have an authentic account of what they did in the personal discharge of their duty as Apostles, a period which closes with the book of the Acts in A.D. 65. All the epistles in our canon, except those of St. John, were written previously to that year, [The short epistle of St. Jude was, according to Dr. Lardner, written in 64 or 65.] so that the times of the Apostles may still be reckoned as to all intents and purposes ending with the year 65. Certain it is that if we except the very little we know of St. John after that year, we know nothing of a later date that is authentic relating to the Acts of the Apostles. This is therefore the limit of that period which ought to be designated as the age, or the times of the Apostles. But to return to the subject previously in discussion. I have shown what a complete dearth of information exists respecting all the Apostles, from the time of their entering upon their public ministry, excepting Peter and Paul; and as to them the information we possess is only on subjects having no relation to Sunday observance. The Sabbatarians, notwithstanding, preach and write as boldly about the example of Sunday observance set us by the Apostles as though they were familiarly acquainted with the lives and actions of all the Apostles, and consequently could have no difficulty whatever in producing instances in abundance of their observance of the Sunday, whilst in truth and in fact not one single instance of such observance by the Apostles, or by any one of them, is anywhere to be found.

I have taken the date of the year when St. Paul arrived a prisoner at Rome to be 63, as given in the chronology of the quarto Bible. if this be correct, the history of the Acts of the Apostles closes, as I have stated, with the year 65, this including the two years during which we learn from the Acts St. Paul remained a prisoner in his own house at Rome. But the above-mentioned chronology extends the history to a later date by supposing that when St. Paul, at the end of the two years, was set at liberty, he went into Crete, and that he wrote his epistle to Titus relating to the Cretans in the year 66. But these suppositions are at variance with the opinion of the most eminent chronologers.—(LARDNER, 6. 291, 320.) All is uncertainty as to St. Paul's movements after he was set at liberty; but it is generally agreed as probable that he returned to Rome and suffered martyrdom there at the same time as Peter. Some critics, however (Pagi and Basnage), think these martyrdoms happened in 65. Lardner says, "Nor do I think the Apostles survived that year. But I cannot say whether their martyrdoms happened in the year 64 or 65."—(P. 299 and 301.)

Something of course the Sabbatarians attempt to say in defense of their assertion as to the example set us by the Apostles, and that something is this:— First, that it appears from the Acts, although it is not expressly so stated, that the Apostles actually did once assemble together on the first day of the week; for they assembled on the day of Pentecost, which it is now discovered by calculation must have happened on the first day of the week. But what of this, when the historian neither speaks of the day as being the first day of the week, nor assigns any reason for the meeting of the Apostles on that day, other than that it was the day of Pentecost?

See this more fully discussed in the examination of Text No. 3. The conjecture of the Sabbatarians, that the Apostles met on the day of Pentecost, because it was also (as it happened) the first day of the week, is there shown to be one of the most futile of all their attempts to support by evidence their assertion, that the Apostles have set us the example of Sunday observance.

In the next place, referring to St. John's Gospel, the Sabbatarians say, that previous to the day of Pentecost above-mentioned, the Apostles did meet together twice on the first day of the week, namely, on the day of the resurrection, and again " after eight days;" but in reply I ask, Did they meet on the first of those occasions, and consequently on the second, for the purpose of observing the first day of the week as a day of Christian worship? I have in the examination of the Texts Nos. 1. and 2. shown this to be impossible. Yet these two meetings, and that on the day of Pentecost, constitute all the evidence which the Sabbatarians produce in attempting to prove instances of Sunday observance by the Apostles collectively.

What, then, is it that they have to allege in regard to Sunday observance by any one or more of the Apostles individually? They say not a word of any of them, excepting St. Paul; and of him they say this, that his preaching to the disciples at Troas on the first day of the week is an instance of Sunday observance by that Apostle.

As to this solitary instance of alleged Sunday observance by one out of the thirteen Apostles, I might content myself by repeating, or referring to the reasons I have already given, when examining the Text No. 4., for in that examination I have shown that there is nothing in the narrative of the occurrences at Troas which can justify the opinion that St. Paul intended, by what he there did on the first day of the week, to observe that particular day of the week either as a Sabbath day or as a stated day of Christian worship. But independent of those reasons, I have now the right to assert, upon St. Paul's own testimony, that he could not have had that intention, for I have proved by passages since quoted from his epistles, that he esteemed all days alike. St. Paul, therefore, unless he were inconsistent with himself; which cannot be imagined possible, observed no Sabbath or stated day of prayer at Troas.

Thus, after all that the Sabbatarians have written and preached on the obligation to observe the Sunday, in consequence of the example set us by the Apostles in the observance of it, we discover, that when the real facts of Scripture history are fully and correctly investigated and scrutinized, there is no such example to be found,—not a single instance being recorded of the observance of the first day of the week by the Apostles collectively, or by any one of them individually! I do not forget that the Sabbatarians find in the text from the Revelation, " I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day," a proof which satisfies them, that even if the Apostle Paul did not, there was another Apostle who did observe the first day of the week. To this it is sufficient to reply, that when it is proved, beyond all reasonable doubt, that St. John the Apostle was the writer of the Revelation, and when it can be also proved that by the phrase of the "Lord's Day" the writer meant the first day of the week, then may the text be allowed to afford a fair inference that it had become the practice of St. John, in his old age, to observe the Sunday as a stated day of Christian worship. But until these essential preliminary points are proved, the text in the Revelation will remain wholly inapplicable as an evidence of an Apostolical observance of the Sunday. Besides, were the preliminary proofs made good, and the inference admitted, that St. John, when he wrote the Book of the Revelation, if he did write it, was an observer of the Sunday, the fact would do no more than prove that there was one Apostle who, at the close of the first century, practiced Sunday observance. But what any one Apostle did is not of necessity an example to be followed. St. Paul practiced celibacy, and recommended his practice to his Christian disciples (1 Cor. 7. 7, 8), yet in this no one regards either his precept or his example. The example of St. John, therefore, in practicing Sunday observance in his old age, were it admitted that he did so, would not be an example which it would be the religious duty of Christians to imitate. It cannot be pretended that it could be called an example of Sunday observance set us by the Apostles. It would be but the example of one Apostle, and it is opposed by that of another Apostle, whilst of the practice of Sunday observance by any of the rest of the Apostles we know nothing. Such an example, therefore, can possess no claim to Apostolical authority.

Thus much on the subject of the shallow argument for Sunday observance derived from the alleged example of the Apostles,—an argument in such high favor with the Sabbatarians, that it is constantly put forward by them with as much confidence as if there actually existed Scripture proof of the asserted fact on which their argument is founded: A notable instance this of intrepid assertion on the part of the Sabbatarians in opposition to Scripture facts; but with instances of this kind the writings of Sabbatarians, both lay and clerical, abound.

There is but little to add to what has been already said upon this question; for it having been shown on Scripture authority that the Apostles have left us no example of Sunday observance, it is adding but little if I remark that the subsequent history of the Church for more than two centuries is in accordance with that fact. No writer during that period asserts that the practice of Sunday observance originated with the Apostles; and this circumstance, I may remark, is a very sufficient answer to those who, with Mr. Belsham, are bold in asserting, that " the Christian Church in all ages has derived from the Apostles the practice of observing the first day of the week as a Christian festival." But, except as affording a direct answer to that assertion, I place little value on the accordant testimony of subsequent history on the subject; for it can add nothing to the strength of Scripture proof (and this we possess), that neither by precept nor example did the Apostles enjoin or recommend the religious observance of the Sunday.

Having concluded my remarks upon the evidence and counter-evidence deducible from the Christian Scriptures in reference to the Sabbath question, I shall -now briefly repeat my original statement of the Sabbatarian argument from those Scriptures.

The Christian Scriptures not containing any command to observe the Sunday, the Sabbatarians are obliged to contend that they do contain, as the substitute for an express command, abundant evidence that the observance of the Sunday as a Sabbath, or, if not as a Sabbath, as a stated day of Christian worship, is an institution of divine appointment, and they adduce as such evidence the universality of the practice of Sunday observance in the time of the Apostles. From the universality of the practice at that period, which they assume to be proved, they argue that it must have had the sanction of the Apostles, and consequently must have emanated from some precept of Christ, or of his Apostles, " though none such be now extant," (Paley, 2. 87.)

I have replied to this argument of the Sabbatarians and met their evidence by counter-evidence; and it is my sincere conviction that I have thereby made it apparent, beyond all justifiable doubt, that the very reverse of the Sabbatarian tenet as to the observance of Sunday in the time of the Apostles is the historical truth; that, so far from the religious observance of the Sunday as a Christian festival having been universal in the Christian Church at that time, and so far from such alleged observance having had the sanction of the Apostles, there is not a single instance recorded in Scripture of the observance of the Sunday by the Christian Church, nor a single instance of such observance by the Apostles themselves, or by any one of them; and further, that there is no Scripture proof of any custom of the Apostles, or of the Church in their time, to observe that day; that consequently there are no just grounds for presuming that a precept from Christ, or his Apostles, enjoining such observance did once exist, though not now extant; and, finally, that the legitimate and undeniable conclusion from these well-established premises is this,—that the observance of the Sunday, whether as a Sabbath or as a stated day " of assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction," is not an institution of divine appointment.

Chapter 7.

Examination of the Non-Scriptural Evidence adduced in proof of a Christian Sabbath.

IF I have already shown, as I confidently believe I have, that the proof which the Sabbatarians deduce from the Christian Scriptures in support of their tenet entirely fails to establish that tenet, my task of opposing their proof ought to be considered as at an end. It is not so, however, for the Sabbatarians appeal to non-Scriptural writings, as well as to Scripture itself; and some Sabbatarians attribute such great importance to those writings, that I should be suspected of fearing to encounter the force of the evidence said to be contained in them, were I to decline entering into a full examination of them. Therefore although, in my judgment, the proof as to every duty peculiar to Christians, and imposed upon them by Divine authority, ought to be found in the Christian Scriptures, and there only, I shall proceed at once to canvass the evidence which Sabbatarians contend is to be found in favor of a Sunday Sabbath in non-Scriptural, and even in heathen writings.

The first of these writings, with reference to its supposed date, is the Epistle of Barnabas, of which I have already taken some notice (ante, p. 123), when examining the text from the Revelation.

THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS.

The evidence supposed to be contributed by this epistle towards the proof of the so-called Christian Sabbath is thus introduced by Mr. Gurney to the attention of his readers: " Barnabas (he says) speculates on the coming of the millennium after seven thousand years (from the creation) of labor and sorrow." " Wherefore, he adds (says Mr. Gurney), we keep the eighth day as a joyful holy-day, on which day also Jesus rose from the dead."

"The eighth day,"—which Mr. Gurney in a parenthesis explains as meaning the first day of the week; and although to designate the first day as the eighth day is a quaint mode of speaking of it, wholly unknown in Scripture, it would seem from the allusion to the day of the resurrection in the context, that the writer of the Epistle must be taken to mean the first day of the week.

Upon Mr. Gurney's translation of this passage, I shall have occasion to make some remark hereafter. In the meantime I will merely observe that the affecting phrase "of labor and sorrow" is not to be met with from one end of the epistle to the other: but this gratuitous addition to the original, when giving the purport of passages in an author, is in Mr. Gurney's usual style of dressing up his subject in order to captivate his readers.

Yes, to captivate them; for strange to say, there is with very many pious persons a positive charm in dwelling upon the contemplation of terrestrial misery, probably as contrasting with those heavenly joys which they (being of the elect) are sure to attain when the period of labor and sorrow shall be past.

But why "seven thousand years of labor and sorrow?" Why should Mr. Gurney protract the duration of our doom of suffering by one thousand years? Barnabas, as will be seen when I quote him more fully, speaks of six thousand years (corresponding with the six days' works of creation,) that are to be succeeded by a day (one thousand years) of rest, which therefore cannot be a period of labor and sorrow.

This slight and very vague description of Sunday observance is but ill adapted to make up for the failure of Scripture proof as to the religious observance of that day. Non-Scriptural evidence ought at least to be good of its kind, explicit and decisive upon the subject to which it relates. However, such as it is in the present instance, it certainly is admissible evidence to show that in the time of the writer of the Epistle the first day of the week was by some Christians,—somewhere or other, and after some fashion or other,—observed and distinguished from the other days of the week; and in the paucity of Sabbatarian proof even this poor scrap of evidence will tell for something, however little, if it should appear on investigation that it is given by a witness who wrote in the first century, especially if a considerable time before the close of that century. Our first inquiry, therefore, must be into the probable date of the epistle. If written by Barnabas it settles the point at once as to its being written in the first century, for it is very unlikely that Barnabas should have lived to the second. But the question, whether Barnabas was the writer, is one of at least some uncertainty, and I shall presently bring forward strong evidence to prove that he was not.

The ancient fathers, indeed, are mostly of opinion that he was, but "Eusebius (says Dr. Lardner, vol. 2. 12) reckons this epistle among those books that are spurious, meaning, it is likely, contradicted." Dr. Lardner himself thinks it to be most probable that it is genuine, but with his usual candor he tells us that "the judgments of the moderns are various. Pearson, Cave, Dupin, Wake, and many other learned men, suppose it to be a genuine epistle of Barnabas, the companion of Paul. Some are more doubtful, as Cotelerius, who is rather inclined to think it was not written by Barnabas. Others think there are many things in it unworthy of him. The objections against the genuineness of it are strongly urged by Basnage. And the late Mr. Jeremiah Jones has offered in our own language many objections to the same purpose." Thus writes Dr. Lardner, to which I may add, as worthy of remark, that the earliest of the three ancient writers whom Dr. Lardner mentions as noticing this epistle, lived at a period long after the time of Barnabas. They are, Clement of Alexandria after A.D. 192; Origen about A.D. 230; and Jerome about A.D. 392; so that the testimony of their belief (for they all believed), that Barnabas was the author of the epistle, can scarcely be thought to outweigh the rather adverse testimony of Eusebius, and the reasonable doubts of modern writers, arising in great part, I presume, from the nonsense which the epistle contains, and which was not likely to be taken into any very serious consideration by the ancient fathers of the Church, as they were very much addicted to writing nonsense themselves.

[I infer this from Dr. Lardner's statement, that in their opinion there are many things in the epistle unworthy of Barnabas, for I am not myself acquainted with the works of Basnage and Jones.]

This (speaking of the fathers generally) is a fact which cannot be disputed. Of the three in particular who are mentioned by Lardner as citing the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, I need only remark, that as to Clemens Alexandrinus, it has been said of him, that he "holds as many absurd, unsound, and exploded doctrines, and deals as largely in the fabulous and apocryphal books of the primitive Christians as any other father whatsoever." [Middleton's "Free Enquiry," p. 65. London, 1749] As to Origen, with all his immense learning and talents, he is generally admitted to have been too prone to indulge his fancy (like the author of the epistle of Barnabas) in allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures; [Archbishop Wake, speaking of "the (allegorical) way of interpreting Scripture," says of Origen, he "has been noted as excessive in it."—"Discourse appended to translation of the Apostolical Fathers.")] and as to Jerome, it is enough to say, that he lived at the end of the fourth century, and no one—no Protestant at least—will deny the nonsensical credulity of the fathers of that century, Jerome included. [Of the "Patristic" nonsense of the second century, I shall presently produce a notable instance.]

The question as to the authorship of the epistle must, therefore, depend on other considerations than the belief of the ancient fathers respecting it. I shall, however, first proceed to discuss the question, as to the time when the epistle was probably written; I say probably, for no one pretends that there is any certainty on that point.

Dr. Lardner thinks he discovers internal evidence, that it must have been written so early as in A.D. 71 or 72; but the reasons he gives for this opinion are far from conclusive. He infers, and very justly, from a passage of the epistle itself that the temple of Jerusalem was destroyed at the time of writing it. He then adds as follows (p. 13):—" In another place the author writes: Consider yet this also, that (or since) ye have seen so great signs and prodigies in the people of the Jews; and thus God forsakes them.'

From both which passages I conclude that the temple was but just destroyed, and that the signs and prodigies preceding and attending the destruction of Jerusalem had happened in the time of the persons to whom he writes, forasmuch as they had seen them.

The " Epistle was written in Greek, but the four first chapters, or sections, and a part of the fifth, are wanting in the Greek copies. It is, however, entire in an ancient Latin version." (LARDNER, 2. 14.)

It is from this version that Dr. Lardner copies the passage he refers to, it not being extant in the Greek. The following is Archbishop Wake's translation;—" Consider this also; although you have seen so great signs and wonders done among the people of the Jews, yet this notwithstanding the Lord hath forsaken them."

And since God was now only forsaking them, this epistle was written whilst the Jewish people were under great afflictions, between the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the reduction of the remaining cities of Judaea." (Lardner's " Cred." vol. 2. 13.)

The reduction of those cities, Dr. Lardner says, was accomplished in A.D. 73, as may be computed (vol. 7. 104). He does not state upon what data his computation is made; but he seems warranted in it by some passages in Josephus. Assuming, then, the year 73 to be the date of the complete reduction of Judaea, it may still be asked, Why it should, therefore, be supposed that the epistle was written before that year? Dr. Lardner's answer, as we have seen, would be, that until then God had not forsaken the Jews, but was only forsaking them; and in support of this very nice distinction, he observes, that the verb (forsake) is used in the present tense (derelinquit). This criticism seems to be more ingenious than solid, as God had forsaken the Jews before the siege of the city began. For surely it is an agreed point among all Christians, that the Divine favor was withdrawn from the time when the Jews crucified the Savior of mankind. Therefore, the writer of the epistle, although he uses the present tense, ought not to be understood as using it in the strict sense attributed to it by Dr. Lardner; and this appears to have been the opinion of Archbishop Wake, who translates derelinquit " hath forsaken."

It is a curious fact that Dr. Lardner, in his very next chapter, contends that, in settling the date of Clément's Epistle, the use of the present tense ought not to have any weight in the argument.

This remark is also applicable to Dr. Lardner's criticism on the word "derelisquit," which occurs in the same passage as the word " rideritis," and is not extant, therefore, in the Greek (see note, p. 221).

Dr. Lardner also lays considerable stress on the word videritie (you have seen), which occurs in the passage he has quoted, arguing from it, that the Epistle must have been written to persons who had seen " the signs and prodigies preceding and attending the destruction of Jerusalem." But this argument does not prove that the Epistle was written within one or two years after the destruction of the city; for the expression " you have seen " would for very many years after that event continue to be applicable to persons who survived it. I may also observe that the original Greek of the passage in which the word videriti8 occurs, not being now extant, we do not know what was the expression used by the writer with sufficient exactness to be enabled to found any sure argument upon it.t Even supposing, however, that videriti8 is a perfectly literal translation of the original, it does not follow that we must, in this case, construe it in its strictest sense, and I now proceed to show that it cannot consistently be so construed.

In the first place, I would ask, is it clear that it is to the signs and prodigies preceding and attending the destruction of Jerusalem, that the writer of the epistle intends to refer? Far from it. Not that I imagine such a writer would hesitate for a moment to give credit to any idle stories current in his day about the portents said to have been witnessed during the siege of Jerusalem.

Among those portents was a flaming sword seen in the air, and which hung over the city for a whole year; another was a rather unusual accident, which happened to a cow, as it was being led up to the altar in the temple, viz. its bringing forth a lamb instead of a calf. These and other like absurdities are related by Josephus in the chapter upon this subject, in his work entitled " The Wars of the Jews."

My opinion, that he refers to other prodigies than those, is formed from passages in the epistle, that plainly point to the miracles of Christ as being the signs and wonders which the writer has in his mind. The passage immediately preceding that which has just been quoted from the epistle speaks of the kingdom of Christ, and immediately after these two passages the writer proceeds to expatiate on what Christ did and suffered for mankind, and says of him, "and finally teaching the people of Israel, and doing so great wonders and signs among them, he preached to them, and showed the exceeding great love which he bore towards them." Let the reader compare this with the passage quoted by Dr. Lardner (see ante, p. 221) beginning, "Consider yet this also," and he can hardly fail to come to the opinion that the writer alludes throughout to the miracles of Christ, and not to the portents at the siege of Jerusalem.

Archbishop Wake's translation, except that "so great" (*tam magna*) is here substituted for the word "many" in the Archbishop's translation. The Greek of this passage is extant.

I conclude, therefore, that the reasons given by Dr. Lardner are insufficient to prove that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was written so early as in the year 71 or 72. He does not, indeed, appear to feel any certainty as to this being its date; and I will venture to surmise, as more probable than not, that it was a production of some zealous and well-intentioned Christian of the second century. Be this as it may, I maintain that it could not have been written by Barnabas, and of this I shall now complete my proof.

The fact (which I take to be satisfactorily proved) that the writer intends to refer to the miracles of Christ, and not to the portents at the siege of Jerusalem, precludes us from construing literally the word "rideritis" used in speaking of them, because (as I before intimated, p. 223) a literal construction could not be consistently given of it. For even if the epistle were written so early as in 71 or 72 (and it could not be written earlier, since it notices the destruction of the temple), the writer could not with any propriety appeal to the Christians of that period as having actually witnessed the miracles of Christ forty years before: a fortiori not, if the epistle was written at any time after the year 72. He could only mean, therefore, to speak of what they had seen related of those miracles in the authentic memoirs of them, which in his time were in the possession of the Christian Church.

Barnabas, Mr. Gurney says, "speculates on the coming of the millennium." I trust the reader feels some curiosity to be made acquainted with the exact purport of this speculation. I shall now lay it before him. He will thus be enabled to judge for himself, whether it be arrant nonsense, or sound Christian doctrine, such as might be expected from the pen of a chosen teacher of the Gospel on its first promulgation.

Referring to what God hath declared respecting the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, the writer of the epistle says, "Even in the beginning of the creation, he (the Almighty) makes mention of the Sabbath. And God made in six days the works of his hands, and he finished them on the seventh day, and he rested the seventh day and sanctified it. Consider, my children, what that signifies—he finished them in six days. The meaning of it is this, that in six thousand years the Lord God will bring all things to an end, for with him one day is a thousand years, as himself testified, saying, Behold this day shall be as a thousand years. Therefore, children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, shall all things be accomplished. And what is that he saith, And he rested the seventh day? He meant this, that when his Son shall come and abolish the season of the wicked one, and judge the ungodly, and shall change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then he shall gloriously rest in that seventh day . . . Lastly, he saith unto them: Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it. The Sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world; for which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness." (Archbishop Wake's translation.)

Such is the "speculation" of the supposed Barnabas concerning the millennium, which is thus improved upon by the millennium speculation of St. Irenaeus: "The days will come in which there shall grow vineyards, having each ten thousand vine-stocks, and each stock ten thousand branches; each branch ten thousand shoots; each shoot ten thousand bunches; each bunch ten thousand grapes; and each grape squeezed shall yield twenty-five measures of wine; and when any of the saints shall go to pluck a bunch, another bunch will cry out, I am a better, take me and bless the Lord through me."

A tolerably satisfactory specimen this of the nonsense which could be written by a distinguished father of the church in the second century (see ante, p. 221). The original is to be found in lib. 5. cap. 33, sect. 3, of Massuet's edition of his works. Irenaeus gives the account contained in this passage on the authority of a tradition that it is what was taught by Christ himself concerning the millennium, and he appears to think the tradition credible.

The trash of the supposed Barnabas on the subject of the millennium is, it must be confessed, much exceeded by that of the saint, Irenaeus. But on another subject the former has another speculation, which almost turns the balance of nonsense in his favor. "Abraham," says this writer, "who was the first that brought in circumcision, looking forward in the Spirit to Jesus circumcised, having received the mystery of three letters;

for the Scripture says, that Abraham circumcised three hundred and eighteen men of his house. But what, therefore, was the mystery that was made known unto him? Mark, first, the eighteen, and next the three hundred; for the numerical letters of ten and eight are I. H., and these denote Jesus; and because the cross was that by which we were to find grace, therefore he adds three hundred, the note of which is T. (the figure of his cross); wherefore, by two letters, he signified Jesus, and by the third his cross."

Let those, who after reading the foregoing extracts from the epistle, still cling to the belief that Barnabas was the writer of it, read in the epistle itself what almost immediately follows upon the passage just quoted. I cannot copy it, its absurdity is so far exceeded by its grossness.

There is, besides, another and a crowning proof that no Gospel teacher, associated as such with the Apostles, could have written the epistle attributed to Barnabas. It is this:—After giving the reason before stated, why Abraham circumcised exactly three hundred and eighteen persons, a reason so preposterously absurd that no man in his right senses can believe it, the writer thus affirms it to be a truth, and declares at the same time that he is divinely authorized to teach it.

He who has put the engrafted gift of his doctrine within us, knows that I never taught to any one a more certain truth, but I trust that ye are worthy of it.

The supposed Barnabas having told one untruth, we here find him telling another to support it. Having asserted, respecting the circumcision by Abraham, what was too improbable to be believed on mere human authority, he here solemnly assures his readers that Christ himself speaks through him, and knows that it is true.

With such evidence as this, extracted from the epistle itself, is it not most unaccountable that a critic, so cautious and judicious, and so honest as Lardner, should profess a belief that the epistle was written by Barnabas, who, it is evident from the book of the Acts, was little less than an apostle, and was unquestionably an appointed associate with the Apostles in preaching the Gospel to "all nations?" I know but of OBC mode of accounting for such excess of credulity in so candid an inquirer into Gospel truth as Dr. Lardner, and that is, that notwithstanding the absurdities which abound in the first seventeen of the twenty-one chapters into which the epistle has been divided, there are interspersed even in those first chapters occasional specimens of unexceptionable doctrine and of sound moral instruction, and the four remaining chapters are entirely of this description. They stand out in marvelous contrast with the trash which pervades a great portion of the preceding chapters.

Doubts have been entertained whether the four last chapters, sometimes called the second part, formed any portion of the original epistle. Archbishop Wake, when adverting in his discourse to the probable object in writing this epistle, says:—"There are not wanting in the latter part of it many excellent rules to render it still very useful to pious readers. Indeed," he adds, "some have doubted," and he refers in the margin to Bishop Usher, "whether this did originally belong to the epistle, or whether it has not since been added to it." Probably Bishop Usher thought that the following passage at the conclusion of the nineteenth chapter savored of doctrines and practices of a later period than any probable date of the original Epistle. "Thou shalt confess thy sins, and not come to thy prayer with an evil conscience." Dr. Lardner, however, seems to be of opinion, that what is called the second part always belonged to the original epistle; for, in vol. 2. p. 12, he quotes Clement of Alexandria, as referring to "a passage found in the last chapter of this epistle, which," says Dr. Lardner, "assures us that the second part containing the moral instructions was supposed to be his," (the writing of Barnabas), "as well as the former." But this proves nothing more than that the second part had been written at the very end of the second century, or in the beginning of the third, and it might not be then acknowledged by all as genuine, though quoted as such by Clement. Indeed, there is very strong presumptive proof against the genuineness of the second part, in the fact that the old Latin version ends with the first part, and that the conclusion there given of the first part is such as to indicate that the original epistle ended with it. This not only forms an appropriate conclusion to the first part of the epistle, but being omitted in the copy of the epistle which contains the two parts, it is clear that the second part was an after addition, either by the writer of the original epistle or by some other person; but that it could not have been by Barnabas, and, therefore, that Barnabas is not entitled to the credit of that excellent portion of the epistle, is certain; for although the learned do not, that I am aware of, assign any date to the old Latin version, I presume no one supposes any Latin version of this, or of any other of the writings of the Greek fathers, to have been made before some period in the second century, which would be long after the death of Barnabas, the companion of Paul.

I take the opportunity of remarking that if, as Dr. Lardner appears to think, the second part formed a portion of the original epistle, he is not correct in stating (see ante, p. 221), that the epistle is "entire in an ancient Latin version."

It is possible, therefore, that in consideration of the excellence of some part of the epistle, Dr. Lardner has been induced to overlook the reprehensible character of the rest, which nothing can redeem. Nothing can displace the proof which the writer himself has afforded, that he is guilty of a positive and blasphemous falsehood; for such, most indisputably, is his assertion, that he has the authority of Christ for teaching as "a certain truth," that which cannot by any possibility be true.

Cannot by any possibility be true. The reason which the writer of the epistle gives for the precise number circumcised by Abraham is a falsehood, not only because it is too absurd to be true, but because the assertion that " the Scripture says" the number was three hundred and eighteen is itself a falsehood. The Scripture says no such thing. What we there read is: " And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised" them, (Gen. xvii. 23) Whence then did the writer get his number three hundred and eighteen? he found it in chapter 14. 14, " And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen."

That the number circumcised, comprising as it did every male young and old, born in Abraham's house, and bought with his money, should be precisely the same as the number of his men born in his house and trained to arms fifteen years before (the dates according to the chronology of the Oxford quarto are, B.C. 1913 and B.C. 1898), would be a miracle of chance, and is utterly incredible without Scripture authority for it, which there is not; but even if we suppose a fact so improbable as that three hundred and eighteen was the number circumcised, the Scripture does not say so; yet the writer of the epistle asserts that it does.

Could this be Barnabas, whose Gospel labors are recorded among the Acts of the Apostles, and of whom St. Luke testifies (Acts, 11. 24), that he was " a good man and full of the Holy Ghost?" Do those who maintain it was this same Barnabas, ever ask themselves the question how such a fact would tell in a discussion upon the evidences of Christianity? I should imagine they do not.

It is with extreme regret that I have found myself obliged to dwell so long upon such a document as the so-called epistle of Barnabas. My motive for thus thoroughly sifting its pretensions I have already avowed by my admission that, if really written by Barnabas, it would tell for something; it would show, that in no long time after the deaths of Peter and Paul, Sunday observance, in some form or other, had begun to be practiced among Christians. This would " be proving something,' but 'not much; for it would not prove the observance to have been then the practice of the Christian Church, and it would in no respect shake the evidence I have adduced from Scripture itself, that such was not the practice of the Church in the time of St. Paul. 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. Not being the epistle of Barnabas, the document is, as regards the Sabbath question, nothing more than the testimony of some unknown writer to the practice of Sunday observance by some Christians of some unknown community at some uncertain period of the Christian era, with no sufficient ground for believing that period to have been the first century.

As affording proof that Sunday was observed in the second century, the epistle is of no value whatever. Of that fact, we have, as will be presently shown, much more distinct evidence, and on much better authority (I allude to the testimony of Justin Martyr). The epistle is, however, of some value, as giving some, though but a vague and imperfect, notion of the mode in which Sunday was observed in the time of the writer, whenever that might be. The writer, it may be recollected, thus describes it, according to Mr. Gurney's translation; " We keep the eighth day as a joyful holy day."

Undoubtedly the verb may mean " to observe a festival," which in the present instance would imply a religious festival; but Mr. Gurney seems to have adopted this somewhat circuitous translation for the sake of introducing the word holy, which is not in the original. Archbishop Wake, who had no Sabbatarian object in view when translating this passage, is content to translate it more literally, " We observe the eighth day with gladness."

From Mr. Gurney's translation, his readers would be disposed to imagine, as he probably intended they should, that the day was principally devoted to prayer and other holy exercises; whilst there can be little doubt, from the description given in the epistle, slight as it is, that the principal characteristic of the day was festivity, in its ordinary sense, and very possibly, therefore, the only religious ceremony of the day was the giving of thanks at the feast.

That no Sabbatical gloom hung over the celebration of this " joyful holy day," Mr. Gurney's first epithet and Archbishop Wake's more literal translation sufficiently testify, and that, in fact, there was, in the celebration of the day, a total disregard of the old Sabbath, and consequently of all its austerities, may be gathered from the manner in which the writer speaks of Sabbaths in the passages already quoted from the epistle. He there represents the Almighty as declaring of the old Sabbaths, they " are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made, when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world."

Whatever, therefore, was, in the time of the writer of the epistle, the peculiar mode of observing the Sunday, it could not have been Sabbatical;

for he represents the observance of the old Sabbaths to be no longer acceptable to God, and the observance of new Sabbaths, he tells us, was reserved for the world to come.

He is even, if possible, still more explicit on this point in a previous chapter of the epistle. He there quotes the well-known passages from Isaiah 11, etc.): " To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting." And upon those passages the writer of the epistle makes the following comment: " These things therefore bath God abolished, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of any such necessity, might have the spiritual offering of men themselves."

Although no importance whatever can be attached to anything which the writer of this epistle may have been pleased to assert authoritatively, as from himself, in regard to doctrine, the above comment is decisive evidence of the fact, that in his time Sunday was not Sabbatically observed; which fact, although appearing in the depositions of his own witness, Mr. Gurney has found it convenient to suppress.

A writer of " Brief Remarks " is fairly entitled to the privilege of omitting to notice facts adverse to his case; since the notice of them would require comment that would add inconveniently to the length of a treatise intended to be short. But surely he abuses his privilege, when he brings forward as a witness in his case an ancient author wholly unknown and inaccessible to the great majority of his readers, and lays before them the favorable testimony of that author on a minor point, and withholds his adverse testimony of the chief point in the controversy. Mr. Gurney, it is to be recollected, is an ultra-Sabbatarian, whose main object is to persuade his readers that they are bound as Christians to observe the Sunday as a Sabbath in the strictest sense of that word, and who, with that object in view, invariably intimates to them, that proof of the religious observance of that day by the early Christians is proof of their Sabbatical observance of it. He could have no fair right, therefore, to adduce the testimony of Barnabas to prove that the early only Christians observed the Sunday as " a joyful holy day," and conceal that part of his witness's testimony, which proves that they did not observe it as a Sabbath.

Paley, who was no Sabbatarian in the proper sense of that appellation, might, with perfect fairness and consistency, if he had produced Barnabas as a witness to the observance of Sunday " by some religious application or other," have omitted to state the anti-Sabbatarian portion of his testimony. Not so with Mr. Gurney, the strenuous advocate of a Sunday Sabbath.

IGNATIUS, HIS EPISTLE TO THE MAGNESIANS.

The next non-Scriptural document to which the Sabbatarians appeal, is this epistle of Ignatius.

The epistle of Clement, bishop of Rome, an unquestionably genuine writing of about A.D. 96, as some think, but as others think, of much earlier date, is not one of the non-Scriptural documents which Sabbatarians appeal to; for, as before remarked (p. 123), it is entirely silent as to any religious observance of the first day of the week.

Everyone at all conversant with such matters is aware that the works of Ignatius have been more interpolated and corrupted than those of any other of the ancient fathers; and also, that some writings have been attributed to him which are wholly spurious. "Archbishop Usher was the first that began to remedy the confusion in the works of Ignatius, and to restore him to his primitive simplicity in his edition of them at Oxford, A.D. 1644, but this edition consisted of the old Latin translation of them." [Archbishop Wake's Discourse, appended to his translation of the genuine epistles of the Apostolic Fathers. London, 2d edition, 1710.] Some years afterwards Cotelerius (Cotelier), an eminent French divine, in a collection which he published of the works of the Apostolic Fathers, inserted all the works that had ever been attributed to Ignatius with a new Latin translation of them. Some idea may be formed of the extent to which liberties had been taken with the name and writings of this father, when it is found that Cotelerius ranges his subject under these four heads:-

1. Sancti Ignatii Epistolae. (The Epistles of St. Ignatius. These are seven in number and very short.)
2. Sancti Ignatii Epistolae Interpolator. (These are the seven short Epistles, largely interpolated.)
3. Epistolae Supposititiae. (Spurious Epistles.)
4. Aliae Adulterinae Epistolae. (Other spurious Epistles.)

Cotelerius also gives, in his edition, the old Latin translation, which he entitles " Epistolarum verarum et supposititiarum vetus Versio."

The learned labors of Cotelerius were by some, no doubt, considered to have settled for ever what ought to be deemed genuine and what spurious in the writings ascribed to Ignatius; but it would seem we are not yet to feel secure on that point. A recent discovery of two very

ancient manuscripts in the British Museum renders it probable that even the short epistles, which had been deemed genuine by Cotelerius, may have been interpolated, for the newly-discovered MSS. consist of Syriac versions of three of the short epistles, and the omissions in those three, of passages now forming part of the so-called genuine epistles, are said to be considerable. Some able critics of the last century had had their suspicions, which are thus verified, that even those epistles were not entirely genuine. Dr. Lardner thought " they may have been tampered with;" and he says that Beausobre, though he favors the genuineness of those epistles, " suspects that even they have been interpolated," (vol. 2. p. 69, and note.)

It might be doubted, in consequence, whether it be worthwhile to go into any examination of the testimony supposed to be afforded by Ignatius to the custom of observing the Sunday at the time when he wrote the epistle to the Magnesians, which Lardner thinks was in AM. 107; others think it was some years later. But since that epistle is quoted by Mr. Gurney as containing " a clear allusion to the keeping of the Lord's Day," and since it is not one of those epistles that are found in the Syriac MSS., and, therefore, may still be thought genuine throughout, some examination of it becomes indispensable.

Assuming, then, for this purpose, the perfect integrity of the short epistle to the Magnesians, as given by Cotelerius, I shall transcribe from it the passage which Mr. Gurney appeals to. Mr. Gurney quotes the original in a note, but instead of translating this passage, short as it is, he, in his text, gives the following account of it:—" Ignatius, in his epistle to the Magnesians, contrasts the Jewish practice of Sabbatising with living according to the Lord's Day in which our life arose. These expressions (Mr. Gurney adds) are probably descriptive of a life spent in holiness and virtue, after the likeness of the resurrection of Christ. Nevertheless they contain a clear allusion to the keeping of the Lord's Day."

Mr. Gurney, it thus appears, assents to Archbishop Wake's translation of the passage as regards the phrase of " the Lord's Day." The archbishop's translation is as follows:—" No longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's Day, in which also our life is sprung up."

" No longer observing Sabbaths." By giving an account, instead of a translation of the passage, Mr. Gurney very adroitly avoids the necessity of placing these inopportune words in sight. The little word (no longer) seems to have frightened him out of his usual course, which was to translate his Greek quotations for the benefit of the unlearned.

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. The original, , means " living according to," and can mean nothing else. The old Latin version is true to this sense; so, also, is that of Cotelerius. It is impossible to suspect Archbishop Wake of any design to misrepresent his author. The probability seems to be, that sincerely believing the Lord's Day was intended to be referred to, he thought that to speak of living according to a day would be to speak something very like nonsense, as, indeed, it would. He, therefore, made use of the word " keeping" (keeping the Lord's Day), and thus gave a translation conformable to the supposed sense of the original, though not conformable to its language. But why should the archbishop think Ignatius meant to refer to the Lord's Day when he speaks only of the Lord's life? Cotelerius also translates the original as though Ignatius meant to refer to the Lord's Day; but, nevertheless, he is evidently annoyed at finding, as the substantive to, the word (life), where he would rather have found (day), or no substantive at all. It looks as if both these learned persons suffered themselves to be unduly influenced by the old Latin version, in which the original is translated " secundum Dominicam viventes" (living according to the Lord's Day). Cotelerius has, "juxta Dominican virentes."

Cotelerius was also influenced, and strange it seems that he should be so, by a passage in Clemens Alexandrinus, which he adds to his note beginning. Having quoted this, Cotelerius exclaims,— " See what it is to live according to the Lord's Day." (" Vides quod sit secundum Dominicam vivere.") But Clement says not a word in this quotation about living " according to" a (day). The phrase we find in it is, " according to" the Gospel. " He (says Clemens) who fulfils the command according to the Gospel, makes that a Lord's Day in which he casts aside every evil thought," etc. A very good sentiment, but nothing to the purpose of Cotelerius, as it is no authority whatever for the use of the phrase " according to the Lord's Day." It is much more like an authority for a literal translation of the phrase in Ignatius, " living according to the Lord's life " (i.e. according to the Gospel).

It may, indeed, be conjectured, that the author of the old version had a manuscript before him in which did not occur. In such a case it would certainly be allowable, if consistent with the context, to assume that it was the understood substantive to the adjective. But I shall show from the context that it must be the true reading, and may be presumed, therefore, to have been found in all the ancient manuscripts, as well as in those that are extant. It is to be observed, besides, that as the old Latin version comprises translations, not only of the genuine epistles but of those

also which are interpolated, and even of those (the epistolic supposititiae) which are forgeries from beginning to end, it must have been made very many years—some centuries, perhaps—after the time of Ignatius, and when the practice of Sunday observance had become fully established, and the day itself generally designated as the Lord's Day; and, therefore, the author of that version may have been unduly influenced by the interpolated epistle, which refers expressly to the Lord's Day, and may, in consequence, when translating the genuine epistle, have used an unjustifiable latitude of interpretation.

With regard to the interpolator of that epistle, he, it is clear, was determined to make it apparent that Ignatius was an especial patron of the practice of observing the Lord's Day, and he accordingly makes the saint speak in unmistakable terms upon the subject. He, therefore, in the first place repudiates the "troublesome word" (life), for which (as displaying a perception of the elegance of the passage when so corrected) he is, as we have seen, complimented by Cotelerius; he then introduces into the text the following passage, which certainly is making Ignatius speak out plain enough. I give it in the Latin version of Cotelerius

* (Let us, therefore, no longer observe Sabbaths after the manner of the Jews . . . but let every one of you observe Sabbaths in a spiritual manner, rejoicing in the meditation of the law . . . and after the Sabbath day, let every lover of Christ celebrate the Lord's Day, which is consecrated to our Lord's resurrection, and is the queen and chief of all days.)

This interpolation was received as genuine by all in Heylyn's time, and is quoted as such by Bishop White, who was contemporary with Heylyn. It cannot appear surprising, therefore, that Heylyn should look upon the text in the Revelation (1. 10) as unquestionable proof that before the death of St. John (about A.D. 100) the Sunday was religiously observed, and called by the name of "the Lord's Day" (see p. 116); for the date of the epistle to the Magnesians could not have been much subsequent to that of the Book of the Revelation, if written by St. John, as Heylyn believed it was. But had Heylyn known what is now known, that the additions made in the larger epistles were all forgeries, it may well be doubted if he would so readily have admitted that the custom of observing the Sunday, and calling it (as he says) the Lord's Day, was established among Christians at the close of the first century.

But to return to the genuine epistle. Why should it be supposed that Ignatius, in the passage quoted from it, meant to speak of living according to the Lord's Day, and not of living according to the Lord's life? Because, says Cotelerius, of the elegance of the former interpretation, by which to observe Sabbath-days, and to live according to the Lord's Day, are placed in admirable contrast with each other (praeclare opponuntur). But if we look to the context, we shall find a contrast quite as perfect, and much more consistent and intelligible, in reference to the Lord's life. The extract in question forms part of a passage, of which I shall now quote the whole, excepting (in the translation) two sentences which are parenthetical, and have no bearing on the point in discussion. I shall use Archbishop Wake's translation, but shall take the liberty of giving its literal interpretation.

Be not deceived (says Ignatius) with strange doctrines, nor with old fables which are unprofitable. For if we still continue to live according to the Jewish law, we do confess ourselves not to have received grace. For even the most holy prophets lived according to Christ Jesus. . . . Wherefore if they who were brought up in these ancient laws came nevertheless to the newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord's life, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, whom yet some deny; . . . how shall we be able to live different from him, whose disciples the very prophets themselves being, did by the Spirit expect him as their Master? And therefore he, whom they justly waited for, being come, raised them up from the dead. Let us not then be insensible of his goodness; for should he have dealt with us according to our works, we had not now had a being. Wherefore being become his disciples, let us learn to live according to the rules of Christianity.

The first surprise of the reader, on perusing these extracts, will probably be, that of finding that in the passage quoted by Mr. Gurney, and which is translated by Archbishop Wake, "no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's Day," Ignatius is speaking, not of himself and of the Christians in his time, but of "the most holy prophets" of the olden time: and the next surprise, I should think, will be that of finding it to have been possible for the learned to fancy Ignatius meant to represent the prophets as keeping the Lord's Day; for such, if they are consistent, must be the fancy of those who maintain the true translation of the passage under consideration to be, as Archbishop Wake has it, "no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's Day." It is undoubtedly a very allowable figure of speech to represent the prophets as Christians by anticipation, inasmuch as they expected Christ, and lived a life of holiness and virtue, conformably to "the rules of Christianity:" but Ignatius has far exceeded all reasonable license of imagination, if he intended to say of the prophets that they actually observed a day commemorating an event which in their time had not yet come to pass. He therefore must have intended to represent them as "living according to the Lord's life," and not as keeping or living according to the Lord's Day. To speak of living according to a day is, in fact, to use a phrase without a meaning. Not less unmeaning, however, and equally absurd, is the sentiment attributed to Ignatius by Mr. Gurney, who, as we have seen, represents him as describing "a life spent in holiness and virtue, after the likeness of the resurrection."

On the other hand, if our theological theorists would but allow Ignatius to be his own interpreter, and the words which he uses to bear their natural and literal signification, how perfectly would his phrase of "living according to the Lord's life" agree with the whole tenor of the context! For the context shows that Ignatius, instead of intending to contrast the Sabbath day with the Lord's Day, is throughout contrasting a Jewish life with a Christian life; a life spent in observing Sabbaths and ceremonies, with a life spent according to the Lord's life, which was spent in holiness and virtue "according to the rules of Christianity." This last-quoted expression, and other expressions found in the above extracts from the epistle, are in a very striking manner confirmatory of the construction here given to the passage under consideration, and as such can hardly have escaped the notice of the reader. Thus, "living according to the Lord's life, in which also our life is sprung up." Why "also" our life, unless the Lord's life had been previously mentioned? Still more remarkable is the language of a preceding sentence, "for even the most holy prophets lived according to Christ Jesus." What is this but saying in other words living "according to the Lord's life?" that is, according to the pattern He set us, or, as Ignatius expresses it, "according to the rules of Christianity."

Judging, therefore, by the tenor of the epistle itself, the literal translation of the passage in discussion, "no longer observing Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord's life," appears to give its true and proper meaning; and if this be so, Ignatius, whom Mr. Gurney puts forward as a material witness to prove the observance of the Lord's Day in the beginning of the second century, fails to prove any such fact, it appearing on a thorough examination of his testimony that he does not even mention the Lord's Day, nor in any way allude to the religious observance of it, whether by that name or by any other. Far from serving the Sabbatarian cause, Ignatius does it a great disservice; for he speaks of Sabbaths in a manner which clearly indicates that the Christians of his time observed no Sabbath whatever.

From the testimony of Ignatius, thus proved to be unprofitable, and in one point of view injurious to the Sabbatarians, we may now proceed to that of Pliny, which might justly be considered as in some degree favorable to them, if the question, Whether the Sunday was observed by Christians in the beginning of the second century? were one of real importance in the Sabbath controversy, which most certainly it is not.

PLINY, HIS EPISTLE TO TRAJAN.

Our next witness is Pliny the younger, says Mr. Gurney, with that air of triumph which betokens a confidence, real or assumed, that his two previous witnesses, Barnabas and Ignatius, had done wonders for him, although the latter had proved nothing, and the former nothing that was worth proving. For, as we have seen, Ignatius makes no mention of the religious observance of any day whatever; and the supposed Barnabas, in his vague allusion to some such observance of "the eighth day," is most probably speaking of some practice of the second century, or towards the close of the first century; in which case his evidence of it is of no value.

What then is the nature, and what the value, of the evidence given by Mr. Gurney's "next witness, Pliny the younger?" It is contained in a letter written to the Emperor Trajan, in the year 107 of the Christian era, when Pliny was governor of the province of Bithynia, upon information given by persons who had once been Christians, against those who were accused before Pliny of being at that time Christians. Pliny tells the emperor that the Christians "were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as a God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder,

I have used Lardner's translation. Melmoth translates the last sentence thus: "After which it was their custom to separate, and then re-assemble to eat in common a harmless meal."

At what periods this stated day occurred does not appear in Pliny's letter. It has been generally taken for granted that it was once a-week, and on the first day of the week; yet, it may be that it was not so. The Christians of Bithynia were, it is to be presumed, chiefly converts from heathenism, and neither Greeks nor Romans then made use of that division of time—they divided their year into months, and their months into decades. The Christians of Bithynia may, therefore, for anything that appears to the contrary, have met once in every month, or once in every decade. However, as it was afterwards the custom among Christians to make the first day of the week the stated day of assembling for Christian worship, it is on the whole most probable that such was the custom of the Bithynian Christians in Pliny's time. But Mr. Gurney is not content to rest the belief of the fact on probability only, he undertakes to give proof of it. For this purpose he quotes the above passage from Pliny's letter relating to the religious rites performed by Christians on a stated day, and then asks emphatically, "But what was the stated day when these things took place? Clearly," he answers, "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, Hast thou kept the Lord's Day? To which the answer usually returned was in substance as follows: I am a Christian, I cannot omit it."

No one can doubt but that Mr. Gurney means by this statement to be understood as asserting that the question, Hast thou kept the Lord's Day? was addressed to Pliny's martyrs, for, otherwise, his proof would not be applicable to his case.

Now, although with reference to the chief questions in the Sabbath controversy, the fact (if it be the fact) that the Sunday was observed in Pliny's time, is one of no real value to the Sabbatarians, inasmuch as it would be no evidence that the Sunday was observed in the time of the Apostles, I shall, nevertheless, proceed to investigate the truth of Mr. Gurney's assertion (for in effect he does assert), that *Dominicum Servasti?* was a question put to the Christians accused before Pliny. The result will, I expect, show this to be a curious instance of the little regard which theological writers are accustomed to pay to accuracy, when their purpose is to persuade their readers into the belief of a favorite dogma. Those only who have occasion, and who take the trouble to test the statements of such writers when dealing with matters of fact, can have any idea of the extent to which their habitual recklessness of assertion is carried. I therefore think that my proposed inquiry into the truth of Mr. Gurney's bold statement respecting the question put to Pliny's martyrs, although it will be of some length, will be well worth the space which I shall be compelled to allot to it.

Let us see then how Mr. Gurney attempts to make good his statement. All the authority he gives for it is a note in these words, " Acts of Martyrs in Bishop Andrews on the Ten Commandments, p. 264." Mr. Gurney's readers are, therefore, to understand, that if they will refer to the works of Bishop Andrews (which none of them were likely to possess, and but few were likely to have access to), they would there find proofs collected by the bishop from ancient writings called " Acts of Martyrs," that the customary question to the martyrs from the earliest times of persecution, was *Dominicum servasti?*—Hast thou kept the Lord's Day? But should any of Mr. Gurney's readers take the trouble to refer to Bishop Andrews, their expectation would be disappointed, as I shall proceed to show.

The work which Mr. Gurney must intend to refer to, is entitled, " The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine at large; or, a learned and pious Exposition of the Ten Commandments," in page 264 of which there is the following passage relating to the Lord's Day:— This day, this came to have the name of *Dies Dominicus* in the Apostles' times, and is so expressly called then by St. John in the Revelation (1. 10); and that name from that day to this hath holden still, which continuance of it from the Apostles' age may be deduced down from father to father, even to the council of Nice; and lower, I trust, we need not to follow it. No doubt is made of it since then by any that hath read anything. I should hold you too long to cite them in particular. I avow it on my credit, there is not any ecclesiastical writer in whom it is not to be found.

Ignatius (whom I would not name, but that I find his words in Nazianzen), Justin Martyr, Dionysius bishop of Corinth, in Eusebius, lib. 4., Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, everyone.

And that we may put it past all question, Justin Martyr, who lived in the very next age to the Apostles, and Tertullian, who lived in the next age to him, both say directly the solemn assemblies of the Christians were that day ever on Sunday, saith Justin; *Die Solis*, saith Tertullian, and leave the Jews to their Saturn (either, in their apologies offered by them to the emperors; Justin made two, in his second, Tertullian but one, the sixteenth chapter of his); that of the true day there can be no manner of doubt.

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.—I am a Christian, I cannot intermit it, not the Lord's Day, in any wise. These are examples enough.

And this loose, rambling piece of declamation, Mr. Gurney is of opinion, fully authorizes him to assure his readers, that clearly the first day of the week was the stated day when the Christians held their religious meetings in the time of Pliny. Even if the reference made to the Acts of the Martyrs by the bishop were found to bear out his statement as to the question, *Dominicum servasti?* having been put to the martyrs, the statement is not so precise in its language as to imply that the bishop intended to pledge himself by it to the fact that that question was invariably, without any exception, addressed to the martyrs from the earliest times of persecution. Yet, unless Mr. Gurney puts this construction upon the bishop's words, " it was ever," he cannot be entitled to adduce them in proof, that so early as in Pliny's time the question, *Dominicum servasti?* was put to the accused; and even if the bishop meant to pledge himself to the fact that this was an invariable question, it did not become Mr. Gurney, who was so well qualified by his learning and talents to investigate such matters, to take so improbable a fact for granted without further inquiry, especially as he must know that the " Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine," from which the foregoing extract is taken, was a posthumous publication; and, what is more, he must also know, if he read the preface, that the editor inserted in the book as published, many passages which formed no part of the bishop's original work, and that the passage here extracted-from the book is one of them: it is printed in italics as such, " Whereas," says the editor, " some things are omitted or but briefly touched (in the "Pattern,") a supplement is made out of his (the bishop's) other works, or where it could not be had out of them, there is added what was needful to be supplied." It might happen, no doubt, that the addition above noticed, was made out of the bishop's other works, but the editor does not say that it was so. It might, therefore, be a supplement written by himself. Did Mr. Gurney endeavor to ascertain how the fact stood? I suspect he did not. If so, he was not justified in

quoting the bishop as his authority for what he had stated. If he did inquire into the fact, and was successful in his inquiry, he would find that, although true it is the addition was made out of the bishop's other works, it was from a work upon which no reliance whatever could properly be placed. He would find that it was taken, word for word, from a printed speech, said to have been made by the bishop in the court of Star-Chamber in the case of Thraske, who was accused before that arbitrary tribunal of maintaining the heretical opinion that Christians were bound to keep the seventh-day Sabbath (a Saturday and not a Sunday Sabbath), an opinion, by the way, which, from its obvious consistency with the fourth commandment, had some followers, and gave great trouble to such of the Sunday Sabbatarians of those days as maintained that the fourth commandment was obligatory upon Christians.

He must know that it was a posthumous publication, whether he read the preface to it or not. Its title, as well as its date, shows it to be so; for no author would speak of his own performance as "a learned and pious exposition" of his subject. It is possible, indeed, to suppose, though hard to believe, that Mr. Gurney paid no attention to the date, the title, or the preface. But even if such was the case, such negligence would leave him still culpable for quoting the bishop as an authority.

The bishop died in 1626, and his speech against Thraske was not published till 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 intended 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." These the editor of the "Pattern," who must have had full access to the bishop's papers, has evidently acknowledged to be genuine by his insertion of a portion of the speech in the "Pattern." There can be no reasonable doubt, therefore, of the speech having been printed from a paper in the bishop's handwriting. But although a genuine production from the pen of Bishop Andrews, was it in itself a document which had any claim to respect as authority? Far otherwise. It was, indeed, well suited to, and all-sufficient for, its immediate object, that of satisfying the nice consciences of Star-Chamber judges, that they might proceed without scruple to condemn the heresy of Thraske; but such a hurried, off hand sketch of an argument the bishop would never have looked upon as fit for publication, it being in every respect unworthy of him. Its reasoning is as careless as its style: it treats two perfectly distinct subjects as though they were identical, which they were not, namely, the custom of observing the Sunday, and the custom of calling it the Lord's Day. It evinces not less carelessness in the statement of matters of fact; as, for instance, the assertion that *Dominicum servasti?* was ever a usual question put by the heathens when examining persons accused of being Christians, an assertion which is wholly unfounded. As, however, it would not be decorous to say this of any assertion made by so learned and respectable a prelate as Bishop Andrews without at the same time offering some strong proof that he is in error, I shall now state such proof on the subject as will, I doubt not, appear indisputably conclusive.

The bishop refers to Justin Martyr, as one of the fathers through whom the appellation of the Lord's Day given to Sunday might be deduced. Yet Justin makes no mention of the Lord's Day. He testifies to the observance of Sunday, but he calls it by that name (the day of the sun) and by no other.

What was Thraske's fate I have not been able to ascertain, probably a mild one, for Bishop Andrews was no bigot.

The result of another trial in the Star-Chamber some years afterwards for the same heresy was singular enough. Brabourne (the accused) had written a clever book in support of his opinion, but, nevertheless, being persuaded by the court to submit himself to a private conference, he was, somehow or other, convinced of his error, and "became (says Bishop White) a convert to the orthodox doctrine of the Church of England, both concerning the Sabbath day, and likewise concerning the Lord's Day." Preface to Bishop White's Treatise on the Sabbath.

The bishop, as we have seen, refers to the Acts of the Martyrs as justifying his assertion respecting the question, *Dominicum Servasti?* but he does not cite a single instance from them in which that question was put. We are left, therefore, to hunt out the instances for ourselves, wherever, if anywhere, they are to be found.

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 sinsera et selecta.*"

Mosheim. See note in his "Eccles. History," translated by Maclaine, vol. 1. p. 63, 2d edition, 1774. The reference there is to the Amsterdam edition of Ruinart (1713). That which he had access to is the Paris edition in 1689.

I have carefully consulted that work, and I take 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.

The first martyrdom is that of St. James, in A.D. 62. The only question mentioned to have been asked of him is, *Quodnam esset ostium Jesu?* alluding, probably, to St. John's Gospel, 10. 9.

This question, founded, as there can be little doubt it is, on a passage in a Gospel not written till some years after the martyrdom, shows the degree of credit due to the legend.

St. Symeon's is the next, in A.D. 104. No question is recorded. He is said to have suffered because he was a Christian, (*eo quod Christiana esset*).

The third martyrdom is that of St. Ignatius, which happened, it is said, in A.D. 107 (the year in which Pliny wrote his epistle to Trajan). If we may credit the legend, Trajan himself presided at the trial, and examined the accused.

[Trajan was not at Antioch when Ignatius is said to have been tried there, nor does Eusebius, or Jerome after him, say anything of Ignatius having been condemned by Trajan himself. LARDNER, 7.290.]

The examination has all the air of a theological skirmish between Trajan and Ignatius on the subject of daemons. Ignatius having then mentioned the name of Christ, Trajan said, "Are you speaking of him who was crucified under Pontius Pilate?" Ignatius making an answer in figurative language wholly unintelligible to Trajan, the latter taking him to mean literally what he had said, replied, "Then you yourself carry Christ about within you?" Ignatius said, "Yes; for it is written, I will dwell in them and walk in them," (2 Cor. 6. 16). Trajan then closed the controversy by pronouncing this sentence upon his opponent: "We command that Ignatius, who says that he carries about within him a crucified man, be conducted a prisoner, under military guard, to imperial Rome, and there devoured by wild beasts as a show to the people."

Pliny died in A.D. 113; but I will notice the next martyrdom, as it happened so soon afterwards (A.D. 120). The martyrs were Saint Symphorosa and her seven sons. This was in the time of the Emperor Hadrian, who, like Trajan, condescended (if we may believe these legends) to interrogate the accused himself. Not a word, however, does his imperial majesty utter respecting the Lord's Day. The accused were asked some questions about daemons. They were also asked if they would sacrifice to idols, and they suffered death for replying that they would not.

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. 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.

There is one of the intervening martyrdoms which, though, like all the rest, it is silent on the question of *Dominicum servasti?* has a legend in connection with the Lord's Day, which it may be proper to notice. It is that of the Agaunensian martyrs, A.D. 286. They were a legion in the Roman army under Maximianus, and had the name of the Thebtean Legion. Being called into Gaul (Switzerland) by Maximianus, and ordered to put down the Christians there, they refused, and were all of them (6600 in number, it is said) slain by command of Maximianus. The slaughter took place at Acaunus, or Agaunus, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard, where a monastery was founded in honor of these martyrs, in the time of St. Theodore, Bishop of Octodurus, (now. Martinach, or Martigni) a town in the neighborhood of Agaunus. Whilst the building of a church for this monastery was in progress, there happened the following rather remarkable occurrence. One of the workmen, who was a heathen, was one Sunday left alone in the yet unfinished building,—the rest, who were all Christians, having gone to attend divine service elsewhere. Suddenly there appeared amidst a blaze of light a great number of the 6600 martyrs (*turba martyrum*), when the unlucky operative who had remained after the departure of his comrades was seized hold of, and after receiving a proper thrashing, was upbraided either (says the

story) because he alone was absent from public worship on the Lord's Day, or because he, though a Gentile, had dared to engage in the holy work of building a church. It is almost needless to add that the astonished heathen was effectually flogged, or frightened, into the belief of the true faith, and became a Christian on the spot.

St. Theodore being one of the bishops who were present at the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, the miraculous conversion here related may be assumed to have taken place about that period. It is clear from the narrative, that though the Agaunensian saints reproached the workman for not going to church, or for presuming to assist in building one (the writer is not certain on this point), they never thought of censuring him for working on a Sunday. Indeed this would be inconsistent with the rest of the narrative, which states that the other workmen had left their work to go to church. From this legend, therefore, it may fairly be presumed that in the time of St. Theodore (the latter end of the fourth century), the ecclesiastical authorities in Gaul held it not to be a sin to work on a Sunday—at least not in church building.

The narrative is very long, and therefore I shall select from it only those instances of the occurrence of the word *Dominicum* which are most in point to prove that this was the martyrdom which the bishop had in his recollection, and the authority on which he relied for his statement of the question ever put to the Christian martyrs. In translating the passages which I am about to quote, I shall assume, as the bishop does, that the word *Dominicum* signifies the Lord's Day.

Saturninus, when examined, says, ("We have celebrated the Lord's Day.") The proconsul asking "Why?" he answered, ("Because the Lord's Day cannot be intermitted.") Emeritus, one of the martyrs accused with Saturninus, says, ("In my house we celebrated the Lord's Day.") The proconsul asking, "Why he did not prevent meetings in his house?" he replies, ("I could not, for we cannot do without the Lord's Day.")

The younger Felix, another of these martyrs, after declaring, ("that the Lord's Day was the hope and salvation of Christians,") adds, ("With a devout mind have I celebrated the Lord's Day, and held a meeting with my brethren because, I am a Christian.")

The younger Saturninus having also, to a question put to him, answered, ("I am a Christian,") the proconsul said ("What I ask you is not this, but whether you celebrated the Lord's Day?") To which Saturninus answers, ("I celebrated the Lord's Day, because Christ is my Savior.")

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, 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 and he quotes Tertullian and Cyprian in support of this interpretation. In another note upon a passage in which *Dominicum* occurs, he says that, instead of this word, some manuscripts have in that passage *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 Neocaesarea. 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 Hilary.

It is unnecessary to transcribe the several passages quoted by these critics, since it seems to be generally agreed among the learned, that the word has the two meanings here ascribed to it; for I find by a note in the Oxford edition of Cyprian's works, published in 1682, that

4. The editors of that edition (Dr. Fell, bishop of Oxford, and Dr. Pearson, bishop of Chester,) also give both those meanings to the word *Dominicum*.

But I am bound to state that these English critics add another meaning, and that other is "the Lord's Day!" They, however, offer no satisfactory reasons for this additional meaning. Placing it first in rank, they notice it thus.

Upon this it may be remarked, that as to the text in the Revelation, Ruinart, Gesner, and the Benedictine editors of St. Augustine, were, doubtless, as well acquainted with it as our English bishops, yet they all refrain from noticing it, and with good reason, for to constitute the text an authority in the case, there should be found in it the substantive (which would in Greek represent the Latin *Dominicum*), but we there find only the adjective is synonymous with begging the question.

In truth, the additional meaning given by the Oxford editors to the word *Dominicum* seems to be nothing more than an English crotchet about the Lord's Day. They do not, and therefore we may presume they could not, adduce in justification of their additional meaning any one single passage from the works of ancient ecclesiastical writers, in which the noun substantive *Dominicum*, or what would be its corresponding Greek substantive, occurs; and they do not venture to assert that *Dominicum* means "the Lord's Day" in the narrative of the martyrdom of Saturninus. They, therefore, leave me in possession of my proof, that in that narrative the word *Dominicum* could mean only a church or the Lord's supper.

It thus appearing that the reference made by Bishop Andrews to the "Acts of Martyrs" completely fails to establish his dictum respecting the question alleged to have been put to the martyrs, and it also appearing that there existed strong and obvious reasons for not placing implicit reliance upon that dictum, what are we to think of Mr. Gurney's regard for truth, when we find he does not scruple to tell his readers that the stated day mentioned in Pliny's letter, as that on which the Christians held their religious assemblies, was "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, *Dominicum servasti? Hast thou kept the Lord's Day?*" ("Brief Remarks," p. 83.)

For this unqualified assertion, prefaced as it is by the word "clearly," in order to make it the more impressive, Mr. Gurney is without any excuse; and this, not only for the reasons already assigned, but for another, which I am now about to state. Will it be believed—yet such is the fact—and it is hard to imagine that Mr. Gurney should not know it, that Pliny himself, in his letter to the emperor, states what was the very question which he addressed to his martyrs? And, what is very remarkable, he also states that the business of examining persons accused of being Christians was wholly new to him, so that it was not very probable he should be prepared with the question, "Have you kept the Lord's Day?" And, in fact, he only asked them if they were Christians? I give the extract from his letter in Dr. Lardner's translation:—"I have never (says Pliny) been present at any trials of Christians, so that I know not well what is the subject-matter of punishment or of inquiry. In the meantime I have taken this course with all who have been brought before me, and have been accused as Christians. I have put the question to them, whether they were Christians. Upon their confessing to me that they were, I repeated the question a second and a third time, threatening also to punish them with death. Those who still persisted I ordered away to be punished."

Such is Pliny's statement. To the reader's judgment I leave the determination, whether Mr. Gurney be an honest guide. A safe one he certainly is not.

Having, in the outset of these remarks upon Pliny's letter, admitted the probability to be, that the stated day mentioned in it was the first day of the week, I do not retract that admission, although I have demonstrated the disingenuousness of Mr. Gurney's attempt to make a show of actual proof, that such was the fact. Actual proof of it there is none. This, however, is a point which, in my estimation, is of so little importance in the controversy, that I should have abstained from entering into so long a discussion of Mr. Gurney's pretense to proof, had it not, as I before intimated, been my design to expose to censure one of those daring misstatements of fact so frequent in theological writings, and which, from the confident tone so generally assumed by the writers on such occasions, are usually received without examination, and allowed, in consequence, to pass current for truth.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

A space of about forty years intervenes between the date of Pliny's letter and that of the next historical document connected with the question of Sunday observance,—the "Apology of Justin Martyr," addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, in A.D. 147. [The learned are by no means agreed upon this point. The range within which they differ is from A.D. 139 to A.D. 150.—LARDNER, vol. 2. 117.] This document proves beyond all dispute, that in Justin's time the custom of observing the Sunday as a day of public prayer and other religious exercises, had become generally established among Christians. "On the day called Sunday (he says) there is a meeting in one place of all the Christians who live either in the towns or in the country; and the memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read to them as long as it is suitable. When the reader stops the president pronounces an admonition, and exhorts to the imitation of those noble examples: after which we all arise and begin to pray." This translation of the passage in Justin I take from Mr. Gurney's "Brief Remarks." Mr. Gurney adds, that "Justin then describes the Eucharistic meal, and the collections made for the poor, and concludes by explaining why this day of the week was chosen for their public worship," (p. 83.) The reader will probably be somewhat surprised on learning one of the reasons why, according to Justin's account, the Christians of his time observed the Sunday. This will be duly noticed in the next chapter.

Thus are we at length relieved from the dissatisfaction which always accompanies the investigation of facts through the aid of conjectural evidence only; and we arrive at proof—positive unequivocal proof—on the subject in discussion. From it we learn the fact, that in somewhat more than a century after the death of Christ the Sunday had come to be regarded as a stated day of public prayer and religious instruction: but that it was observed also as a Sabbath, there is still no trace to be found. All that Justin states of the religious rites of the day is not only compatible with the belief that it was not Sabbatically observed, but authorizes, by its silence on that point, a clear inference that, except during the time of divine service, the Christians of that period lawfully might, and actually did, follow their worldly pursuits on the Sunday. This inference appears irresistible when we further consider that Justin, in this part of his Apology, is professedly intending to describe the mode in which Christians observed the Sunday. He accordingly states what it was, which, from a sense of religious duty, they did on the Sunday; but if there were anything which from a sense of religious duty they did not do on that day, it was equally within his purpose, and equally incumbent upon him, to notice that also; for it must be quite as essential to the proper observance of the Sunday to omit doing what is unlawful to be done in it, as it is to do that which is required to be done. Yet Justin says not a word of the duty and the practice of abstaining from labor on the Sunday, a conclusive proof that no such duty was then known to Christians, and no such practice in use among them. It would be no sufficient answer to this argument to reply, that it was not likely Justin should enter into such full particulars in a memorial addressed to a heathen emperor. Why should he not? 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 almsgiving; 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? The emperor well knew that such abstinence was the custom of all his Jewish subjects on the Saturday (die Saturn^o, and could readily have understood it to be the custom of his Christian subjects on the Sunday (die Soli⁸, as Justin calls it in his Apology). And, therefore, if such was the custom of Christians in Justin's time, his description of their Sunday duties was essentially defective. It is . not, however, at all probable he would intend to omit noticing so important a characteristic of the day as the Sabbatical observance of it, if it was in fact Sabbatically observed. 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, " choose to write in character."

Now, in that Dialogue the Sabbath is made a prominent topic, and the way in which Justin speaks of it precludes all belief, on any rational grounds, that the Christians then observed any Sabbath whatever. He remarks to Trypho, that the elements are never idle, and keep no Sabbaths, and asserts, that as the Sabbath originated with Moses, so it ceased with Christ. How could he reason thus in disputing with a Jew, if it was in the power of the Jew to reply, " Why, then, do you make a Sabbath of your Sunday?"

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.

Further, we need not carry our inquiry into non-Scriptural evidence: for as regards the observance of Sunday as a prayer day, no one doubts but that it has been uniformly so observed by the Christian Church from the time of Justin to our own times; and as regards its observance as a Sabbath, it matters not when it came to be so observed, if, as is manifest, it was not so observed in the time of Justin. I may remark, however, that in point of fact no historical evidence exists of the Sabbatical observance of Sunday, which is of a date prior to the beginning of the fourth century (A.D. 321), when, as is well known, it pleased the Emperor Constantine, of his own imperial authority, to command thenceforth the observance of a Sunday Sabbath.

The non-Scriptural documents which have just been examined are, if I may judge from Mr. Gurney's statement, all which Sabbatarians are accustomed to appeal to, with the exception of a few, which being of a later date than Justin's Apology, it is for that reason unnecessary to discuss. The mention they make of Sunday observance adds nothing material to the information given respecting it by Justin: and some of them, so far from proving that the Sunday was Sabbatically observed, plainly intimate that in their time no Sabbath was observed by the Christian Church.

What, then, can be the object of Sabbatarians in bringing forwards non-Scriptural evidence? It would seem as if it is intended thereby to prove what Scripture evidence does not prove—that Sunday was observed in the time of the Apostles; or, that it is intended thereby to strengthen the Scripture proof of that fact, if Scripture evidence does prove it. Should the former be the object of the Sabbatarians, my reply would be, that the only one of the non-Scriptural documents adduced by them, which is at all in point in such case, is the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, for it is the only one which by possibility can have been written in, or shortly after, the time of the Apostles Peter and Paul; and even supposing it was written during that period, surely the Sabbatarians could not fail to perceive the ridicule which must attach to the proposition that Sunday observance is proved, not out of Scripture, but by a document of an uncertain date, the work of a writer also uncertain, and whose whole

testimony to Sunday observance consists of these words:—" We observe the eighth day with gladness!" It may, indeed, be said, that he also states why the eighth day was observed. He does so; and it has already been seen (ante, p. 227) what a nonsensical reason he assigns for it.

The Sabbatarians, however, cannot really mean to make any use of non-Scriptural evidence, which should be grounded on an admission that they find no proof in Scripture. They must, therefore, be supposed to use it for the purpose of adding strength to their Scripture proof. But if there be full proof in Scripture, any other proof is superfluous; and if Scripture proof is not complete, if it be so defective as to require external aid, still would it receive none from the non-Scriptural documents adduced, since all of them (unless the epistle ascribed to Barnabas be an exception) must have been written long subsequent to the deaths of Peter and Paul, and therefore can be no evidence, within the knowledge of the writers, of the practice of Sunday observance in the times of the Apostles.

Nevertheless, we find Mr. Gurney making a great parade of his non-Scriptural evidence, and concluding by giving such an imposing summary of it, as cannot but impress the generality of his readers with a feeling that he has thereby presented to them, in conjunction with his previous proof, an overwhelming mass of evidence that the religious observance of the Sunday is obligatory on Christians as a duty enjoined (impliedly at least) by Divine command.

The witnesses (he says) whose testimony we have now adduced were scattered over various countries: Barnabas, Justin, and Origen, lived in Palestine; Clement of Alexandria, in Egypt; Pliny (during his proconsul ship), in Bithynia; Ignatius, in Syria; Dionysius, in Greece; the persons to whom he wrote, in Italy; Irenaeus, in Gaul; Tertullian and Cyprian, in Libya. We may conclude, therefore, that the practice of devoting the first day of the week to religious purposes became, during the first three centuries after (of?) the Christian era, universal in the Church of Christ, (p. 86.)

That I may show more distinctly what is the actual amount of the value to be attached to this magnificent array of non-Scriptural evidence, I shall place it here in column, with a few facts and dates by its side in another column.

But I must first make the confession, that I am quite at a loss to determine what may be Mr. Gurney's meaning in the passage above quoted. He there speaks of Sunday observance becoming universal in the Church of Christ. Is it possible he can mean to say (as the word " became" would seem to imply) that in the course of the first three centuries the Sunday came to be observed by the whole Christian Church, and that there might during that period be some Christian communities amongst whom Sunday observance was not practiced? If so, he in effect gives up the main proposition contended for by Paley, —that the religious observance of the Sunday may have been enjoined by some precept of Christ or of his Apostles, although it be not now extant,—for it is impossible for any one to deny that, had there ever existed such a precept, the practice of observing the Sunday must have been adopted at once by every distinct Christian Church as soon as it was planted; and for this reason, that if it was a rite enjoined by Divine authority it would be essentially part and parcel of the religion to which the members of each of those churches had become converts.

Nor does the doubt I entertain of Mr. Gurney's meaning rest entirely on his expression " became universal in the Church of Christ;" for in the subsequent passage, Mr. Gurney appears to place the obligation to observe the Sunday on the basis of the fourth Commandment, and a sort of voluntary adaptation of its principle by the early Christians to the purpose of establishing a Sabbatical institution, which should be distinct from that of the Jews and peculiar to themselves. This is what Mr. Gurney says (after stating, as above-mentioned, that Sunday observance became universal in the Church of Christ): " So remarkable and extensive an uniformity could not have arisen from accident. It must surely have been founded on some common principle generally understood. Now, I conceive that the principle in question could have been no other than the unalterable obligation of the fourth Commandment, connected with an understanding (derived from the Apostles themselves) that Christians were to keep that day of the week as their Sabbath on which Jesus had risen from the dead."

If, then, what I have last above suggested be Mr. Gurney's meaning—if, in fact, he intends to place the duty of Sunday observance, not upon any implied precept from Christ or from his Apostles, but upon the eternal obligation of the fourth Commandment, I shall show hereafter the fallacy of such a proposition. I defer the discussion of it only because it involves a question which it is not within the scope of the present work to take into consideration. But I shall not fail to notice it in another work now in progress, which will be devoted to the discussion of the alleged present obligation of the Sabbaths of the Old Testament. I shall there prove that the obligation of the fourth Commandment not only began, but ended with the Mosaic Dispensation.

I now proceed, as I proposed, to place Mr. Gurney's summary of non-Scriptural evidence in column, with a statement of some dates and facts connected with it in another column by its side.

Mr. Gurney's Summary. Dates and Facts.

BARNABAS.

Not known that Barnabas wrote the epistle ascribed to him; uncertain, therefore, whether it was written in the first century.

JUSTIN.

At the earliest his " Apology " may have been written A D. 139. Mr. Gurney's date is A.D. 147. Some critics date it in A.D. 150.

ORIGEN.

Mr. Gurney's date for the time of Origen is A.D. 230.

CLEMENT (of Alexandria).

Mr. Gurney's date of the time of Clement is A.D. 192.

PLINY. A.D. 107.

IGNATIUS.

His time, A.D. 107, but he proves nothing whatever respecting Sunday observance. He makes no mention of it, nor any allusion to it.

DIONYSIUS.

Mr. Gurney's date is A.D. 170.

IRENEUS.

Mr. Gurney's date, A.D. 167. The passage respecting Sunday observance, quoted by Mr. Gurney as from the works of Irenaeus, is nowhere to be found in them.

TERTULLIAN.

Mr. Gurney's date is A.D. 192.

CYPRIAN.

Mr. Gurney's date, A.D. 250.

Such is Mr. Gurney's list of his non-Scriptural witnesses, from which, and from his elaborate specification of their respective abodes, he draws the conclusion above quoted. But the reader will have seen, from the dates stated in the opposite column, and from the facts there noticed (which had all been here previously proved), that the list is exposed to the following remarks upon it.

In the first place, three of the witnesses must be at once struck off from the list; Barnabas, because he is not known to be the author of the epistle ascribed to him, and Ignatius and Irenaeus, because they give no testimony upon the matter in dispute. In the next place, although the epistle ascribed to Barnabas must be admitted as containing the testimony of some ancient, but unknown writer, still, by reason of the uncertainty of the authorship, and consequently of its date, it cannot with any propriety be placed in the first century, and must, therefore, be classed with the writings of the rest of the witnesses, all of which are, undoubtedly, productions of the second or third century. With respect to the witnesses last referred to, the only one amongst them whose testimony borders on the first century is Pliny. But though that testimony is of so early a date as A.D. 107, this, it will be borne in mind, is seventy-four years after the death of Christ, and at the least forty years after the deaths of the Apostles Peter and Paul. The testimony of Justin Martyr is, as before remarked, valuable on account of its being the first decisive and indisputable proof we have of Sunday observance, as an established rite of the Christian Church. The testimony of the other witnesses, Origen, Clement, Dionysius, Tertullian, and Cyprian, is not of the slightest value upon the point in discussion; for it is all of a date subsequent to that of the testimony of Justin. And as to this testimony of Justin himself, if we give to it its earliest possible date (A.D. 139), it is of a date more than a century after the death of Christ, and more than seventy years after the deaths of Peter and Paul.

Thus the whole of Mr. Gurney's non-Scriptural evidence, so specious and so mystifying in the description which he gives of it, is, nevertheless, by reason of the distance of its dates, and by the failure of some of the witnesses to give any testimony in the case, entirely unavailing, either as independent, or as corroborative, proof of the practice of Sunday observance in the time of the Apostles.

Evidence such as this, which Mr. Gurney adduces from non-Scriptural writings, neither requires, nor deserves, to be met by any counter-evidence from writings of the same description. I am unwilling, however, that the cause I am advocating should chance to suffer by the

omission of any argument which may possibly influence others in coming to a decision upon the question at issue, although to me it may seem a superfluous addition to the evidence which I have already adduced in justification of the view I take of that question. I, therefore, tender to the consideration of the reader the remarkable evidence (negative, I admit, for it could scarcely be otherwise), which is afforded by the epistle of Clement, bishop of Rome, in the first century of the Christian era,— evidence which strongly, I might almost say indisputably, testifies to the fact, that in his time the observance of Sunday as a stated period for the performance of religious rites, was unknown in the Christian Church. [This epistle has been noticed before, at p. 123.]

The learned are completely at fault, and at variance with each other, as to the date of this epistle. Archbishop Wake and others contending that it was written as early as in some year between 64 and 70; others, amongst whom is Lardner, contending that it was not written till many years after; Lardner thinks not till 96. It is a singular circumstance that there are passages in the epistle which so strongly favor both sides of the question in this controversy as to render it quite impossible to come to any certain conclusion upon it; and I notice this because the passage I am about to quote from it is one which the advocates for an early date appeal to in support of their opinion. It speaks of the Jewish rites and sacrifices as though they were still observed at the time when the epistle was written, which they could not have been if the temple, where alone they could be performed, had been then destroyed, and that event (the destruction of the temple) did not occur till the year 70. Dr. Lardner's arguments in favor of a later date have much force, but he has to combat the powerful argument which his opponents deduce from the passage above alluded to, wherein (as Dr. Lardner admits) Clement " speaks in the present tense concerning the sacrifices of the Mosaic law." In reply to which, Dr. Lardner expresses himself thus:—" I am surprised so many learned men should have insisted on this argument. Josephus, in his 1 Antiquities,' not finished before the year 93, continually speaks in the present tense when he gives an account of the several kinds of sacrifices appointed by the law," (Vol. 2. 24). This surprise of the worthy doctor at the argument of those who in this instance rely on the rigid construction of the present tense, comes rather amusingly from him, when (as may be recollected, see p. 222) he himself, in his preceding chapter, relating to the epistle of Barnabas, had based his main argument, as to the date of that epistle, upon the strict construction of the tense in which the verb " forsake " is there used, the present tense (derelinquit).

This uncertainty as to the date of Clement's epistle, although proper to be noticed, does not, I apprehend, affect in any way the use I intend to make of the passage I quote from it, which is as follows:— Seeing then those things are manifest unto us, it will behoove us to take care that looking into the depths of the divine knowledge, we do all things in order whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do, and particularly that we perform our offerings and service to God at their appointed seasons, for those he has commanded to be done not rashly and disorderly, but at certain determinate times and hours: and therefore he has ordained by his supreme will and authority, both where and by what persons they are to be performed; that so all things being piously done unto all well pleasing, they may be acceptable unto him. They, therefore, who make their offerings at the appointed seasons are happy and accepted: because that, obeying the commandments of the Lord, they are free from sin. And the same care must be had of the persons that minister unto him. For the chief priest has his proper services, and to the priests their proper place is appointed, and to the Levites appertain their proper ministries, and the layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen. Let every one of you, therefore, brethren, bless God in his proper station with a good conscience and with all gravity, not exceeding the rule of his service that is appointed to him. The daily sacrifices are not offered everywhere, nor the peace-offerings, nor the sacrifices appointed for sins and transgressions, but only at Jerusalem, nor in any place there, but only at the altar before the temple, (chapter 40 and 41, Archbishop Wake's Translation.)

Now, whether or not Clement is here speaking of observing and performing the rites and sacrifices appointed by the Mosaic law, as being a practice still in use in his time, I think it must be undeniable that on this occasion he would, as he proceeded in his exhortations to the Christians of Corinth, have impressed upon them the indispensable obligation they were under to observe the new Christian rite of Sunday worship, had this rite then existed. Yet he has done no such thing. " It will (he says) behoove us to take care that we do all things in order whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do, and particularly "—what in particular?—to offer up prayer and thanksgiving to God on every recurrence of that day of the week on which Christ rose from the dead? By no means: he makes no mention whatever of that sacred day, but proceeds to speak, (and in language applicable only to the ceremonies of the Mosaic law,) of performing " offerings and service to God at their appointed seasons."

Again, " The daily sacrifices (he says) are not offered everywhere, but only at Jerusalem." It exceeds all probability that he should not have embraced this opportunity of adverting to the weekly sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving which it was obligatory upon Christians to perform somewhere, and lawful to them to perform anywhere upon the Lord's Day, had that sacrifice been commanded. It would be useless to reply, that when he speaks of offerings and service to God at their appointed seasons, and commanded to be done at certain determinate times and hours, he ought to be understood to allude to the religious observance of the Sunday. So obscure an allusion to the new Christian rite is to the last degree improbable, when he had every conceivable inducement to speak of it openly and clearly, if it had ever been " commanded to be done." It seems, indeed, not a little absurd to imagine he could mean to allude to Sunday observance when speaking of services commanded to be done " at certain determined times and hours;" for no one pretends to say that our Lord appointed not only the CLEMENT. 289 day, but the hour, when Christians should hold their weekly meetings for public worship and religious instruction.

There is, in fact, not a single word in the whole passage which is here quoted, nor in any other part of the epistle, which can be rationally construed into a recognition of the so-called Christian Sabbath.

The epistle of Clement is characterized throughout by the purest spirit of Christian benevolence. It instructs by its moral precepts, and it charms by its frequent and felicitous adaptation of beautiful passages from the Jewish Scriptures to the various topics of advice and exhortation contained in it; and, although very long, it is entirely free from any blemish, such as those which disgrace the epistle ascribed to Barnabas. There is but one weak point in it. Clement, it appears, was a firm believer in the existence of the bird of Arabian fable, the phoenix. He gives an account singularly curious of its supposed natural history, and, never doubting of its truth, he falls into the gross error of affirming that the resuscitation of the phoenix is a type of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection from the dead. He calls it "that wonderful type of the resurrection."

From the testimony of this pre-eminently respectable non-Scriptural witness, therefore, we derive strong negative proof that the practice of Sunday observance had not come into use at the time when the epistle was written; that is to say, proof that the practice of Sunday observance, as a rite of the Christian Church, was unknown in the period immediately succeeding the deaths of Peter and Paul, if Archbishop Wake, and those who think with him, are right in their conjecture as to the date of the epistle: and that the practice remained unknown at nearly the end of the first century, if on the question upon the date of the epistle Dr. Lardner and his coadjutors in the controversy are right in their conjecture.

Such, and so fatal to the Sabbatarian tenet, is the result of inquiry into the purport and real value of non-Scriptural evidence.

Chapter 8.

On the Origin of Sunday Observance as a Sabbath day, and as a stated day of Public Worship, though not as a Sabbath.

1.—AS A SABBATH DAY.

CENTURIES of the Christian era passed away before the Sunday was observed by the Christian Church as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the Sabbatical edict of Constantine in A.D. 321.

In a subsequent work I propose to take some notice of the history of the Christian Sabbath from the time of Constantine, and shall there offer some observations upon his edict, and shall only remark upon it at present, that the emperor makes no appeal therein to Apostolical or Scriptural authority for its justification. It is, in fact, a Sabbath of his own invention, its chief feature being completely anti-Scriptural: for it commands a Sabbath to be observed in towns, but exempts the country, in order, says the edict, that the bounty of Providence (intended for the sustenance of man) might not perish. Yet we read in Exodus, 34. 21, that the Sabbath day was to be kept even "in earing time and harvest," (or, as Dr. Geddes translates the original, "in seed-time and in harvest").

On the other hand, there is inferential proof of the most satisfactory character to be collected from Scripture and from non-Scriptural writings, that from the time of the first promulgation of Christianity to the middle of the second century the Christian Church observed no Sabbath. And whether it did, or did not, observe a Sabbath in the interval between that period and the time of Constantine, can be of no importance whatever in the Sabbath controversy, though it may be safely assumed as a fact that it did not.

As to the evidence on the subject to the middle of the second century, I shall not here recapitulate the Scripture proof, but shall content myself with noticing, once more, two very remarkable instances of that proof: the one is (see ante, p. 179) the use of the definite article in the book of the Acts whenever a Sabbath is referred to, thereby plainly showing that there could not then be two Sabbaths. This is a proof which partakes of the nature and possesses all the force of mathematical demonstration. The other instance I take from St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians (2. 16): "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." It is for various reasons already stated (see ante, p. 199) utterly inconsistent with this injunction of the Apostle; and, I may here add, it is impossible, on any rational construction of it, to believe that Sunday was at the time when this epistle was written regarded as a Sabbath day by the Christian Church.

With respect to non-Scriptural documents, it will be recollected that those which have been already noticed are as follows:-

1. The epistle of Clement, bishop of Rome in the first century, which strongly negatives the Sabbatarian opinion (see ante, p. 284).

2. The epistle ascribed to Barnabas, the writer of which says (and he probably says only what was believed by all Christian churches in his day, whenever that might be), " These things therefore" (Sabbaths, new moons, etc.) " bath God abolished, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of any such necessity, might have the spiritual offering of men themselves" (see ante, p. 236).

3. Ignatius. I mention him because his epistle to the Magnesians has been much discussed in a preceding chapter (see ante, p. 237); but it gives, in fact, no actual information upon the present subject. If, however, any inference is to be drawn from the silence of Ignatius respecting it in this and in all his other genuine epistles, it can only be that he knew of no observance of a Sabbath by the Christian Church in his time.

4. Pliny. We have in his epistle strong grounds for assuming that the Christians in general, or at least that one community of them, in the beginning of the second century observed the Sunday as a stated day for performing religious rites; yet, not as a Sabbath, for the inference, if any, to be drawn from the facts which Pliny relates is exactly the reverse. " They were wont," says Pliny, " to meet together on a stated day before it was light;" and the religious rites which he describes as performed by them when they met are clearly such as might be concluded before the working hours of the day began (ante, p. 252). They thus left themselves free to follow during the day their usual worldly occupations; and in the absence of all testimony to the contrary, it is reasonable, if not imperative upon us, to conclude that they did so, and, consequently that to them the Sunday was no Sabbath.

5. Justin Martyr. That in his Apology addressed to the Roman emperor he should, in describing the religious duties of the Sunday, say nothing of abstinence from labor, is, as already remarked (p. 274), exceedingly strong negative evidence of the fact that such abstinence formed no part of the religious duties of the day. But in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew his language is so emphatic against the observance of any Sabbath whatever that it would be nothing less than sheer folly to imagine that the Christians then made a Sabbath of the Sunday. I shall not repeat here the passage already quoted from this Dialogue in p. 276, but I will quote another, which is of an equally anti-Sabbatical character: " This new law (says Justin to Trypho, and meaning thereby the law of Christ as opposed to the Mosaic law) teaches you to observe a perpetual Sabbath, and you, when you have spent one day in idleness, think you have discharged the duties of religion, not well considering to what end this command was given you; and if you have eaten unleavened bread you say you have fulfilled the will of God; but with such things as those the Lord our God is not well pleased. If anyone amongst you is guilty of perjury or theft, let him forbear to commit such sins; if anyone is guilty of adultery, let him repent, and then he hath kept the true and delightful Sabbath unto God," (sect. 12, Brown's Translation, p. 43).

From the rest of the passage it is clear that by a perpetual Sabbath is meant a whole life spent in righteousness and piety. Man having been doomed to earn his livelihood by the sweat of his brow (Genesis, 3. 19) could not keep a perpetual Sabbath in the strict sense of the words.

Brown's translation of " Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew," (a reprint at Cambridge in 1846).

This, be it remarked (as was also the passage before quoted in page 276), is said in reply to Trypho on his accusing Justin and his fellow-Christians of not observing Sabbaths.* Instead of denying the truth of this accusation, Justin, we see, retorts by reproaching Trypho with continuing to observe them, notwithstanding the command for such observance had been superseded; and this reproach is accompanied by a sneer at Trypho for passing a day in idleness and calling it religion. How absurd the sneer if Christians did the same! Should it be said that Christians on their supposed day of idleness went to church to perform their public devotions, the answer is, so did the Jews to their synagogue, and for the same purpose, on their idle day. That man must be bereft of his reasoning faculties who, in the face of such testimony as Justin's to the contrary, should believe that the Christians in Justin's time observed a Sunday Sabbath, or any Sabbath whatever, but the spiritual or perpetual Sabbath which " the new law" prescribed. The fact that they did not is indisputable.

But that which we most of all wonder at (says Trypho), is that you who pretend to be very religious, and think yourselves better than other men, do not excel them in anything, and that you do not in your lives and conversations differ in anything at all from the Gentiles, as ye neither observe the Feasts nor the Sabbaths," (sect. 10, Brown's Translation, p. 39.)

There are, as I have before noticed, other non-Scriptural writers referred to by Mr. Gurney, but whose testimony being of a date subsequent to that of Justin, I have hitherto considered it useless to comment upon. Having, however, said (p. 277) that some of them plainly intimated that in their time no Sabbath was observed by the Christian Church, I now proceed to make good that assertion.

Irenaeus (A.D. 167) is, we may recollect, one of the writers referred to by Mr. Gurney; and, although I have shown that the quotation he makes as from the works of Irenaeus, is not to be found in them, but is collected from one of the spurious passages in an interpolated epistle of Ignatius, I consider that the interpolator, whoever he might be, and whenever it was that he took upon himself the task of improving the genuine epistles of Ignatius, gives testimony to the fact that the observance of a Sabbath, in the proper sense of the word, was in his time unknown to

Christians. The passage, as quoted by Mr. Gurney, runs thus: " On the Lord's Day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law," etc. But we are to remember that the very significant word, " spiritually," is omitted in Mr. Gurney's quotation; and that in the original it is, " Keeps the Sabbath spiritually, meditating on the law," etc., which is clear proof that it was not kept by a religious abstinence from work, proof made still more clear by words that follow, the whole of this part of the sentence in question being: " Let every one of you sabbatize spiritually, rejoicing .in the meditation of the law, not in bodily rest." See ante, p. 131.

To avoid too great prolixity on a point so clear, I select but one more from Mr. Gurney's list of non-Scriptural witnesses. It is Tertullian (A.D. 192) who says: (Rigault's edition, Paris, 1675, p. 185). " It follows, therefore (says Tertullian), that as the abolition of circumcision and of the old law is shown to have been completed in their appointed periods, so the observance of the Sabbath also is shown to have been temporary." Tertullian, in thus noticing the two Jewish rites, circumcision and the Sabbath, speaks of them both as having finished their destined course. Of the latter he says expressly that he had proved the observance of it to have been temporary. How could he say this of the rite of the Sabbath, if it continued to be observed under the new law, though on a different day from that enjoined for its observance by the old law So conclusive, indeed, is the testimony borne by the writings of Justin and Tertullian to the fact that the Sunday was not sabbatically observed in the middle of the second century, that even if there had been no evidence existing (of which, however, there is abundance) that the Apostles and first converts to Christianity did not observe the Sunday as a Sabbath, it would be imperative upon us to believe that they did not; for if they did, and, especially, if in so doing, they obeyed a divine precept, it is inconceivable that the practice of such observance would have been discontinued and have become obsolete in the time of Justin and Tertullian, with not even a tradition then afloat, which has reached our time, that a Sunday Sabbath had once been observed.

It would be useless to carry on the negative evidence through the interval between the middle of the second century and the edict of Constantine. It suffices to remark, that there is no trace of the observance of a Sunday Sabbath at any time during that interval to be found in historical or any other writings relating to that period. We may, therefore, safely fix upon the date of the edict (A.D. 321), as beyond all doubt the precise time when the Christian Church first made a Sabbath of their Sunday.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE AS A PRAYER DAY.

It remains for consideration what may be the probable date of the origin of Sunday observance as a stated day of public prayer and religious instruction.

Let me then suppose the case of an intelligent Hindoo converted to Christianity by some foreign missionary, but as yet unacquainted with the Christian Scriptures, excepting such passages in them as may have been quoted to him in confirmation of the truths which he had been taught. He finds it to be the custom of his teacher to call all his converts together on the first day of the week for the purpose of devotion and instruction. He is told that the custom of thus stately assembling on that day, and for that purpose, is universal among Christians, and that it is a rite peculiar to their religion, and as ancient as the religion itself. Let me further suppose him to be curious respecting the origin of this rite, and desirous of ascertaining whether it were one of divine appointment or the invention of human wisdom, he is referred for such information to the Christian Scriptures, and also to sundry ancient, yet not Scriptural, documents, which have relation to the early history of Christianity.

Before he enters upon his investigation, he may be expected to reason thus with himself. If the rite originated in a divine command, I shall assuredly find that command registered in the sacred records of my new religion. He finds it not. He resumes his musing on the subject, and comes to the conclusion, that although the command be not now extant, yet, if ever it existed, he shall find, in the Christian Scriptures and the other documents to which he. has been referred, satisfactory evidence that the rite enjoined by it was observed from the very first promulgation of Christianity, and was adopted in every Christian Church as soon as it was planted. If such was not the fact, he will feel convinced that the observance of the rite could not have originated in a divine command, which, he will say, must, if ever given, have been at once, and universally, obeyed. Now, I ask, is there in the Christian Scriptures, or elsewhere, any such evidence of instant and universal obedience to the alleged command as would be likely to satisfy the unprejudiced Hindoo? Most assuredly there is not.

Wherever he might reasonably expect to find such evidence he would encounter disappointment. He would seek for it in the history of the first converts to Christianity, which is given in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles: it is not there. He would next turn to the writings of the Apostles themselves—their epistles to the Churches which they had founded: neither is it there. He would then glance at the evidence tendered to him out of non-Scriptural writings, and would at once perceive it to be too vague in its character and too remote in its date to be worthy of the slightest consideration.

On the other hand, upon the question if the rite were of human invention, the Hindoo might be expected to reason thus. If it was of human invention, he would say, it must have originated with some individual who, with a few associates, piously disposed like himself, practiced the

observance of it, at first, perhaps, scarcely attracting the notice of their fellow-Christians, but its probable tendency, under due regulation, being to promote religion and good morals, it would gradually, though slowly, make its way, till in the course of time, but not till long after its first origin, it would become established as a recognized rite throughout the Christian world. If such was its origin, would the Hindoo say, I should expect to find its precise date unknown, its probable date extremely uncertain, and the first notices of its observance slight and obscure. Here I ask, whether in effect this be not the true character of the evidence adduced by the Sabbatarians respecting the rise and progress of Sunday observance as a prayer day? I think I have already shown it to be so; for I have shown that that evidence presents to us nothing from Scripture,* and nothing from any other source except the mention which is made by some unknown writer (the author of the epistle ascribed to Barnabas), that he and other Christians of some unknown community, "observed the eighth day with gladness."⁷ It would be difficult to imagine any description of Sunday observance more vague than this, or more consistent with the belief that its origin must have been voluntary, and not of divine appointment.

The first five of the Six Sabbatarian Texts prove nothing. The sixth, which is the text from the Revelation, whether it has or has not reference to Sunday observance, is, for the reasons which I have stated when examining the Text, No. 6., of no importance to the point now in discussion. I, therefore, here reckon that that text also proves nothing.

There are also some facts in point which I have not yet, or only slightly, adverted to, but which, with the legitimate conclusions to be drawn from them, will, I trust, make it perfectly clear to impartial inquirers, that the observance of Sunday, as a stated day of assembling for public prayer and religious instruction, is of no other than of human origin. They are but two in number, but each of them is strikingly indicative of the human origin of Sunday observance.

The first I shall notice is this, that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries of the Christian era has attributed the origin of that observance either to the injunction or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself.

The other fact is, that the two writers of that period who undertake to give reasons for the observance of the Sunday, do not agree in their reasons for it, and that each of them assigns as one reason, what is either too absurd or too improbable for belief; which proves that nothing certain was known on the subject: a most unlikely circumstance, if the practice itself had been enjoined by Divine or Apostolic authority.

With respect to the fact first mentioned, I have to remark that Barnabas (or whoever else wrote the epistle ascribed to him), Justin Martyr (A.D. 147), Dionysus, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 170), Tertullian (A.D. 192), Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 192), Origen (A.D. 230), and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (A.D. 250), all mention or allude to the religious observance of the Sunday, but not one of them even hints that it originated in any precept of Christ, or in any recommendation of the Apostles, either by precept or example. Yet had any such precept been given, or example set, it is incredible that it should not have been known in the times of the writers above named, and hardly to be believed, that, if known, it would not have been mentioned by them, or by some of them.

I do not, however, pretend to assert, as from my own knowledge of the writings of these fathers, that they are thus silent as to any Divine or Apostolic authority for Sunday observance: I infer the fact, that they are so, from the circumstance that, with a single exception, no one of the Sabbatarian writers whose works I happen to be acquainted with has ever quoted any one of the fathers of the first three centuries as affirming that Sunday observance had its origin in any precept of Christ, or in an injunction or the example of the Apostles. The writer above excepted is Bishop Andrews, who, in his "Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine," states, that Justin Martyr, "in 2 Apol. Antonin., saith, that the Apostles received from Christ himself the celebrity of this day."

Now, as to this passage from a work by Bishop Andrews, great as was his knowledge of the writings of the fathers, I shall venture to assert, that no reliance can be placed upon it. Bishop Andrews, probably quoting from memory, has, in this instance, though unintentionally, misrepresented his author. I can take it upon myself to say, from a most careful search, that no sentence in Greek corresponding with "Apostolos it Christo hujus diei celebritatem accepisse" is to be found in Justin's second Apology, nor in his first, which was, I believe, in the time of Bishop Andrews, by mistake, considered to be his second. There is, however, a sentence in the first Apology, which we may reasonably conjecture to be that which the bishop had in his mind if quoting from recollection. That the reader may be the better enabled to form his own judgment upon that point, I here quote in the original Greek, and in Thirlby's Latin version, the whole passage, of which the sentence in question forms the conclusion. "On the Sunday we all commonly meet together, because it is the first day, in which God, turning the darkness (into light), and chaos (into form), made the world; and on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead. For on the day before the Saturday he was crucified, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, appearing to his Apostles and disciples, he taught those things which we have related to you for your consideration."

There can be little doubt that, as the sentence (or rather, its equivalent in Greek), is not to be found in Justin Martyr's "Apology," the above is

the passage to which Bishop Andrews intended to refer in his memoriter quotation. Yet what does Justin there assert? That Christ taught the celebrity of the day, or, in other words, that it was a day to be celebrated?

No: Justin says, addressing himself to the emperor, Christ "taught those things which we have related to you for your consideration." And what were "those things?" Most certainly not those which he had related immediately before, one of which was, that Sunday was observed because God made the world on the first day. No one now believes, no Sabbatarian believes, that Christ taught his Apostles and disciples that Sunday was to be observed for that reason. Therefore, what Justin referred to as being "the things," which he had related to the emperor, was not what he had just before told him, but the great mass of information which he had been giving to the emperor respecting Christ and his doctrines in the ninety-seven preceding sections of the "Apology."

It is certainly a somewhat bold license of speech to say that Christ taught all this, when he appeared to his Apostles and disciples on the day of his resurrection. Justin must, of course, be understood to include what Christ had taught at other times during his ministry. Justin is, however, to some extent, borne out in the expression he has used, by what we read in St. Luke's Gospel, where it is said that, on the day of his resurrection, Jesus appeared to two of his disciples as they were on their way to Emmaus, "and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself," (24. 27.)

But put the case either way, the result, as bearing on the fact which is now under discussion, is the same. If Justin did not mean to tell the emperor that Christ taught Sunday observance to his Apostles and disciples, Justin is no exception to my remark, that no ecclesiastical writer in the first three centuries attributes that origin to Sunday observance. If Justin did mean to tell the emperor that Christ so taught, he, in the same passage, tells him that Christ gave a reason for the observance, which it is incredible that Christ should have given: thus proving, on his own showing, that he had no authority for anything which he, in that passage, represents Christ to have said.

If, therefore, Bishop Andrews is (as he appears to be) decidedly and essentially inaccurate in his quotation from Justin Martyr, I may conclude the fact, which I state to be undeniable, that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries of the Christian era has attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to an injunction or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself: a fact which is exceedingly strong evidence, that at no time during that period did there exist in the Christian Church any belief or tradition that the religious observance of the Sunday originated in a divine appointment; and, consequently, that the notion of such an origin of the observance must have sprung up among Christians in after times; and is for this reason, in addition to many others before suggested, unworthy of belief.

The other fact which I have undertaken to establish as tending to the same conclusion is, that the two writers who have at different times in the course of the above-mentioned period taken upon themselves to give reasons why the Sunday was observed, do not agree upon the subject, and that each of them assigns as one of his reasons what is either too absurd or too improbable for belief.

The writers thus referred to are the Pseudo-Barnabas (whom I shall here call Barnabas) and Justin Martyr. I have already incidentally stated their reasons for Sunday observance. Barnabas, it will be recollected, after propounding some grave nonsense about a millennium (see p. 226), says this: "Lastly, he (the Lord God) saith unto them, Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it. The Sabbaths, says he, which you now keep are not acceptable unto me; but those which I have made, when resting from all things. I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world: for which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, on which also Jesus rose from the dead."

According to Barnabas, therefore, the reason for religiously observing the first day of the week was to do honor to the eighth day of the other world—for such he calls the Sabbath which was to belong to his imaginary millennium. Barnabas, it is true, alludes to the day of the resurrection; but, as will have been remarked, not till after he has mentioned the millennium as the reason for observing the day; so that the day of the resurrection is referred to by Barnabas, not as a reason, but as a coincidence.

What Justin says (see ante, p. 305) is this:—"On the Sunday we all commonly meet together, because it is the first day in which God, turning the darkness (into light) and chaos (into form), made the world: and on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead."

Justin, I admit, mentions the day of the resurrection, not as a coincidence, but as one of his two reasons why the Christians of his time observed the first day of the week. But in assigning the commemoration of the first day of the creation as the other (and seemingly in his opinion the chief) reason he is unquestionably mistaken, as all modern Sabbatarians must acknowledge.

When, therefore, we find that of the two writers who attempt to account for Sunday observance, one of them (Justin Martyr) assigns an erroneous and the other (Barnabas) an absurd reason, and that the erroneous reason of the one and the absurd reason of the other are essentially

different in their kind, what can we rationally infer from such discrepancy but that, in fact, no one then knew anything authoritatively on the subject? Under such circumstances we may fairly conjecture, that those who first conceived the idea of devoting a stated day in every week to the purpose of Christian worship chose the day on which the resurrection took place as the most appropriate for carrying out their design, but that, having no apostolical authority to support them in their choice of this particular day, others, who followed their example in the observance of the day, had fancies of their own in regard to the events to be commemorated by it; but that, finally, good sense prevailed, and in subsequent ages the commemoration of Christ's resurrection came to be esteemed, as it is still, the true and exclusive reason for the first day of the week having been selected as the stated day of assembling for Christian worship.

Will it be said that a Divine command to observe religiously a particular day of the week might have been given, and yet no reason stated in the command why the day was to be so observed; and that, consequently, Barnabas and Justin might err in assigning the reason, but that their error would afford no just inference against the existence of the command? The case supposed is possible, but it seems at variance with all probability; and surely if Barnabas and Justin had known that such a command had been given and no reason for it had been assigned, they would not have presumed to state their own reasons without particularly noticing them to be such, and would have expressly said, " We meet once a-week by Divine command." This course they have not followed; they do not mention or allude to any command, and they express themselves in language quite consistent with the fact, that the practice of Sunday observance was in their time, find from the very first had been, purely voluntary.

Barnabas, as we have seen (p. 308), says little, but that little seems to imply a voluntary purpose; it certainly does not necessarily imply obedience to command.

The language of Justin is more remarkable in this respect. " On the Sunday (he says) we all commonly meet together, because it is the first day in which . . . God made the world." I have here, as before (p. 308), translated the word *communiter* literally, but I apprehend it may with more propriety in this instance be construed " with one accord," or " by common assent." That the literal translation, " commonly," is not appropriate in the ordinary sense of the word (*viz.* usually, but not always,) is clear, for Justin could never mean to say that the Christians in his time met usually but not regularly on the Sunday. If the Sabbatarians put this construction on Justin's words, they in effect admit that Sunday observance was not an institution of Divine appointment.

That the word *communiter*, should, therefore, in order to avoid ambiguity, be translated by some other word or phrase than " commonly" is certain; that it is capable of the interpretation above suggested is equally certain; and that it is a word which Justin used as significant of some meaning or other no one can deny; and yet, what is very remarkable, it does so happen that Mr. Gurney omits all notice of it in his translation of the above passage. He translates it, " We all meet together on the Sunday, because," etc. (" Brief Remarks," p. 84). And what renders the omission in this place still more remarkable is, that he omits all notice of this same word in his translation of another passage in Justin, which almost immediately precedes the above. having now to quote it again in reference to the point in discussion, I shall again use Mr. Gurney's translation, given before in p. 273.

On the day called Sunday there is a meeting in one place of all the Christians who live either in the towns or in the country, and the memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read to them as long as is suitable. When the reader stops the president pronounces an admonition, and exhorts to the imitation of these noble examples, after which we all arise and begin to pray.

Here, again, Justin could not mean to say the Christians commonly, that is, usually, but not always, rose to pray after the reading was concluded, for unquestionably that was the invariable course of the Church service; and therefore, as some meaning must be given to the word, I apprehend the proper translation to be, " after which we all with one accord arise and begin to pray."

Another circumstance worth noting is, that in each of the passages here quoted we have exactly the same phrase, which renders it the more probable that the meaning of is in each passage the same; and as in the passage last quoted it can scarcely have any other meaning than that of " one accord," so may we fairly conclude that in the other passage, where Justin speaks of the Sunday meetings, it has the like signification, and that consequently it will with more certainty express the sense of the writer, if we translate that passage thus: " On the Sunday we all with one accord (or, by common assent) meet together, because it is the first day, in which God . . . made the world, and on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead."

Even as translated by Mr. Gurney, without notice of the word, the passage is not inconsistent with the opinion that Justin intended to represent Sunday observance as a self-imposed and voluntary rite; but translated as it ought to be, by giving significance to that word, the opinion that such was Justin's intention becomes a certainty.

In any view of the case, Mr. Gurney's conduct in thus quietly passing over the significant little word *zesq* is most strange, and considered in connection with other instances of somewhat similar conduct before called into question (see p. 132 and p. 242), authorizes a suspicion that Mr. Gurney has an habitual propensity to avoid coming into contact with words which exhibit an anti-Sabbatical aspect.

Such, then, are the facts and circumstances which make up the history of the rise and progress of Sunday observance as a stated day of public prayer and religious instruction,— a history which presents us with nothing certain as to the time when the practice first began, and with but few,—and those but meagre,—notices of its progress, and with no satisfactory information of its actual establishment as an ordinance of the Christian Church, till more than a century after that Church had been founded. Such a history is perfectly reconcilable with the opinion, that it was a rite originating with some well-intentioned zealots in the latter part of the first century, and in process of time obtaining universal acceptance, but can never be the history of a rite which had been instituted by Divine command.

It is, indeed, most unaccountable, on any rational principle, why our divines should expect us to believe any institution to be specially of Divine appointment upon only slight, or upon any other than irresistible evidence of the fact. To me it seems that the trite classic maxim,— *Nec Deus interisit nisi dignus vindice nodus Inciderit*, should always be kept in view, and acted upon in all theological questions, lest the presumptuous imaginings of men should pass for the oracles of God. In the question now under discussion, why not consider that the useful and commendable practice of holding religious meetings on every recurrence of a stated day originated in the good sense and piety of man, when, to say the least, there is nothing in Scripture opposed to such an opinion? Why, since that is the case, conjecture that it had its origin in a Divine appointment?

I do not overlook the circumstance (material in itself, but in this instance without consequence,) that the date of a writing which mentions the observance of a custom is not the date of the origin of that custom. If nothing be said to the contrary, it must be presumed to have existed for some, perhaps many, years before. When, therefore, Justin, in or about A.D. 147, says, " We Christians meet for public worship on the first day of the week," it may be taken for granted that this custom of so meeting was not then of very recent origin; but if we carry back the custom some twenty or thirty years, which in the absence of all express testimony on the subject is making a fair, and indeed a large allowance, it would not be brought within the range of the times of St. Peter and St. Paul, the true age of the Apostles. The evidence that no such universal custom existed in St. Paul's time, is, besides, too strong to be shaken by mere conjectures to the contrary.

That the religious observance of the Sunday had this origin is impossible, and for a reason to which I have often alluded. I will now give it in a more distinct form, and substantiate it by the best of evidence, the evidence of Scripture.

I have one postulate to premise (not that I am under any necessity to premise it, for I shall presently show that I am not,) but it is one which cannot be denied to me, and that is, that if Sunday observance was of Divine appointment, its practice in the times of the Apostles must have been universal. But that it was not universal in St. Paul's time we learn from himself by the text before quoted from his Epistle to the Romans (14. 5, 6), where he says expressly, that at that time one man esteemed one day above another, and another man esteemed every day alike; and moreover, instead of censuring this indifference in some men to the observance of days, he gives full license to all men to act in this respect as they please. Now, this St. Paul COULD NOT DO, if to esteem the first above every other day of the week was a law of Divine appointment. Yet this he did; for this is what he says:—" One man esteemed one day above another, another esteemed every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regarded the day, regarded it unto the Lord; and he that regarded not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

That this is language expressive of indifference to the religious observance of days, and that it gives, under the authority of an Apostle, unqualified permission to all who should be so disposed, not to regard any day whatever as a stated day of religious observance, cannot be denied, if there be meaning in words. The text, therefore, is Scripture proof both of the fact that the Sunday was not then universally observed, and of the fact that its observance was not of Divine appointment.

If any one should say, (as it will have been seen in my previous notice of this text in the chapter on Counter-evidence, I am aware may be said,) that St. Paul intended to except the Sunday from his remarks, my reply to this answer, if made to my present argument, would be, How can you know that St. Paul so intended? The only direct and unevasive reply that my opponent could make to this question would be, Because the Sunday was universally observed in the time of the Apostles, and there was, therefore, no occasion for St. Paul to except it. Granted, I should say, there would in such case have been no occasion, that is, no absolute necessity for St. Paul's excepting it, though there would, as I have before noticed (p. 190), have been, even in such case, a peculiar propriety in his so doing, But how (I should add) do you know that the Sunday was then universally observed? You are reasoning in a circle. You assume in the outset that which you should begin by proving. You assume in effect the whole subject in controversy. Prove that Sunday was then universally observed, and you will have established a just foundation for the assertion that St. Paul, when expressing his indifference to the observance of days, intended to except the Sunday, and you will then also,

but not till then, have refuted my Scripture proof, that the practice of Sunday observance cannot by any possibility have been of Divine appointment.

Dr. Paley, I well know, has expressed himself as though he had seen reason to come to an opinion the very reverse of that which I am maintaining; for he says in his " Scripture Account of Sabbatical Institutions," (Philos. 2. 91,) " The conclusion from the whole inquiry . . . is this. The assembling upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment."

This conclusion, although it is Paley who maintains it, I shall attempt to show is not warranted by his own premises, and I trust that my presumption in venturing upon this attempt will not be found so great as at first it may appear to be. No one can hold in higher reverence than I do the extraordinary talents of Dr. Paley, and, pre-eminently, his power of close and lucid reasoning upon all subjects where he was perfectly free to express the convictions to which his own arguments would naturally lead him; as when, in his "Natural Theology," he is proving the existence of a God; or when, in his " View of the Evidences of Christianity," and in his " Horse Paulinm," he is proving the Divine origin of the Christian religion; but on the Sabbath question perfect freedom of discussion was restricted in his case by his position in society. When reasoning upon that subject, although he showed a daring spirit, he evidently felt the weight of the chains which bound him to the University and the Church; and it is partly to this cause that I attribute his illogical conclusion in the instance before us.

Indeed, were it not my belief that in this instance he did purposely, though with the best intention, overstate the legitimate inference from his own argument, I should, perhaps, have shrunk from the attempt to show that so practiced a logician may for once have drawn an illogical conclusion.

Let me not be understood as intending by this remark to withhold or diminish the praise so deservedly due to this great and good man for the noble and successful efforts which he made in the field of free inquiry. They were such as he could not but be conscious would prove, as no doubt they did, an effectual bar to high preferment. An everlasting reproach will it be to the times in which he lived, that so zealous and able a defender of the truths of natural and revealed religion should not have been raised to the episcopal bench. Had he condescended to personal controversy—had he, like Mr. H. E. Davis, B.A. (who obtained a royal pension for his pains), published small criticisms upon the great work of some celebrated infidel, or (still more to his purpose, if he were ambitious) had he fiercely assailed the writings of some troublesome Dissenter, then might he have received that reward which was justly due to his better services. Dr. Priestley would assuredly have made Paley (as he made Horsley) a bishop, could he have drawn him into controversy upon the doctrines of the Established Church.

In entering upon my task I have to remark, that the only proofs Dr. Paley offers of the premises upon which he founds the conclusion in question are five of the six Sabbatarian texts, which I have already examined in a preceding chapter. He excludes from his proofs the Text, No. 3., relating to the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; and he rejects entirely the aid which most Sabbatarians endeavor to draw from the Sabbaths of the Old Testament. Not only does he decidedly deny the obligation of the Fourth Commandment; he also argues against the commonly received opinion that the text in Genesis (ii. 3) was a command to sanctify the seventh day. He looks upon that text as proleptical only, and is of opinion that the religious destination of the seventh day was not known before the time of Moses (vol. 2. 75). Thus the consideration of Dr. Paley's argument, from which he draws the conclusion that the religious observance of the Sunday is " a law of Christianity of Divine appointment," will consist simply of an examination of the inferences

which he has drawn from the five texts selected by him from the Christian Scriptures.

He, however, has a preface to his argument which cannot be passed by without some notice. " The practice of holding religious assemblies upon the first day of the week was (he says) so early and universal in the Christian Church, that it carries with it considerable proof of having originated from some precept of Christ, or of his Apostles, though none such be now extant:" (p. 87). Upon which preface it is to be remarked:— First, He assumes as a fact, before attempting to prove it, that the practice of holding those assemblies was early and universal, or, rather, early and general; for " so universal" would be a solecism, but " so general" proves nothing. If the practice was in obedience to a Divine precept, it must have been universal.

Secondly, All that Dr. Paley says of the fact which he thus assumes is, that " it carries with it considerable proof." Now " considerable proof " is, as I have before had occasion to remark, not complete proof. Some doubt remains of a fact, the proof of which is only considerable. Such proof disposes the mind to belief, but does not authorize belief itself; it authorizes only a strong opinion, in the actual truth of which, however, the party entertaining it feels he ought not to place full confidence without further evidence.

I now proceed to consider Dr. Paley's inferences from his five texts. Those inferences, it is to be borne in mind, constituting the premises from

which he draws the conclusion above stated. My aim will be to show, that with respect to the four first texts, he is himself not quite certain that his inferences from them are just; and that with respect to the remaining text, although he there feels certain of his inference, that inference is not of a nature to warrant the conclusion he has come to upon "the whole inquiry:" nor does he himself state that this text alone would warrant his conclusion, he rests it in part upon his inferences from the four first texts, and those being, by his own candid admission, not free from doubt, it becomes perfectly clear that, the whole of his premises considered, they can be no warrant for the conclusions which he draws from them; for this would be to draw a certain conclusion from uncertain premises, which is contrary both to the acknowledged rules of logic and to the plain dictates of common sense.

His first text is (John, 20. 19), "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst." Of the meeting recorded in this text, Dr. Paley has the candor to remark, "This, for anything that appears in the account, might, as to the day, have been accidental." Now what might be accidental cannot be assumed to have been by design: proof of design, however, Dr. Paley had it not in his power to give, except it be found in the inference which, impliedly, he draws from his second text, where he goes on to say, "But in the 26th verse of the same chapter we read that 'after eight days,' that is, on the first day of the week following, 'again the disciples were within;' which second meeting upon the same day of the week looks like an appointment and design to meet on that particular day." No one, however, can maintain that what only "looks like" proof is proof itself. Yet Dr. Paley, who is candid throughout in the statement of his premises, is, we see, too cautious to infer anything more from this (his second) text than that, in connection with his first, it exhibits some appearance that the meetings mentioned in both the texts were designedly held on the first day of the week. It would, therefore, be absurd to believe that Dr. Paley himself believed he had actually proved that these two meetings were designedly held on that particular day. Let us imagine for a moment that his "Natural Theology," and his "Evidences of Christianity," had been made up, or even consisted but in part, of "look-like" proofs, where would have been his present deservedly high reputation as the most powerful advocate of natural and revealed religion in modern times? Believers would have disregarded, and infidels would have derided, his feeble efforts to establish grave propositions by such a mockery of evidence as this.

It is undeniable, therefore, that thus far Dr. Paley's own premises do not afford him any assistance whatever in sustaining his conclusion that Sunday observance is a law of Christianity, for it is manifest that he himself doubts if they do.

Of his third text he thus speaks:—"In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we find the same custom" (he had not yet proved any custom) "in a Christian Church at a great distance from Jerusalem. . . . 'And we came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days; and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' The manner in which the historian mentions the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week shows, I think, that the practice by this time was familiar and established."

"By this time was familiar and established" is a remarkable phrase, considering it is the accurate Paley who uses it; for, strictly speaking, it should signify that the practice was not established before this time. Could Dr. Paley mean this? If he did, he expressed an opinion which, if well founded, is fatal to the Sabbatarian argument. For if the practice was of Divine appointment it must have been in use, and universally so, from the first preaching of the Gospel, twenty years and more previous to the time when Paul preached at Troas, and, therefore, if Dr. Paley was of opinion that it had been in use during all that period, surely the correct phrase for him to have employed on the occasion would have been "at this time," which would not necessarily have implied, as "by this time" seems to imply, that the practice had only just then become "familiar and established."

Here again we find Dr. Paley using words of qualification in expressing his opinion. Now it has been very justly observed by an able modern writer that there are but three views which the mind can take of propositions submitted to its consideration, namely, belief, doubt, and disbelief, and of these it can take but one in regard to any one proposition, for each of the three views is incompatible with either of the other two.

Where any doubt remains in a man's mind upon any proposition he, properly speaking, neither believes nor disbelieves. If, in the instance before us, Dr. Paley believed that the manner of the historian showed that the practice was "familiar and established," why did he introduce the words "I think?" Without those words the sentence would have been perfect to express his belief; with them, it expresses only an opinion. "I think, but I am not quite certain," is the signification of the sentence as it now stands. And if Dr. Paley did not intend this by introducing the words "I think," those words have no meaning—they are superfluous; yet, if there be any writer who never uses an unmeaning or a superfluous word it is—Paley. He has a doubt, therefore, as to his inference from his third text.

"Every proposition presented to the mind, the terms of which are understood, necessarily occasions either belief, doubt, or disbelief. These are states or affections of the mind on which definition can throw no light, but which no one can be at a loss to understand." (- *Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions.* London, 1826. 2d Edition, p. 3.)

He continues his argument by next adverting to his fourth text. "St. Paul to the Corinthians (he says) writes thus: 'Concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye; upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come;' 1. Cor. 16. 1, 2. Which direction affords a probable proof that the first day of the week was already, amongst the Christians both of Corinth and Galatia, distinguished from the rest by some religious application or other."

"Already." Here again we have an expression which, like "by this time," is consistent with the belief that the practice spoken of had only just then come into use, and this was not till twenty-three years after the Gospel had been first preached

Why "probable proof," if it was Dr. Paley's belief that the direction afforded actual proof? The word "probable" is superfluous, unless it be intended to express a doubt. This, therefore, is not a text from which Dr. Paley can be entitled to draw any certain conclusion; neither can he be entitled to draw any such conclusion from this and the preceding text, considered in connection with each other; for, if he is not sure, but only thinks, that the one shows a custom to meet, and if with respect to the other he is not sure that it affords actual proof, and, therefore, says only that it affords "probable proof" that the first day of the week was distinguished by some religious application or other, it is evident that he still remains in uncertainty whether or not the two texts taken together prove a custom to meet on that particular day for purposes of religion.

Dr. Paley then proceeds to state the last portion of his premises by quoting the text from the Revelation, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." Mark now the change in his style. Here he is confident of his fact, and he states it with confidence accordingly. Here we shall find no traces of imperfect conviction as to the truth of this part of his premises—no admission as in his remark upon his first text, that that "might have been accidental," which it was essential he should state (and prove if he could) was designed—no parenthetical expression intimating doubt, as "I think," in his third text—no phrases which imply probability but nothing more, such as "probable proof" and "looks like," in his two other texts. This is what he says of the text from the Revelation: "At the time that St. John wrote the book of his Revelation the first day of the week had obtained the name of the Lord's Day. I was in the Spirit (says he) on the Lord's Day;" which name and St. John's use of it sufficiently denote the appropriation of this day to the service of religion, and that this appropriation was perfectly known to the churches of Asia. I make no doubt but that by the Lord's Day was meant the first day of the week."

Undertaking, as I did, to show that Dr. Paley is not warranted in the conclusion which he draws from his own premises, I am bound for this purpose to admit the certainty of those premises so far as it appears that Dr. Paley believed in their certainty himself. I am, therefore, to take for granted, although it is not my opinion, that St. John the Apostle was unquestionably the author of the Book of Revelation, and also that by the phrase of "the Lord's Day" the writer of that book meant the first day of the week, and that the use of it denotes the appropriation of that day to the service of religion; but these inferences from the text in the Revelation being for the present purpose granted, the question arises, Does the text of itself warrant Dr. Paley in coming to the conclusion that Sunday observance is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment? I maintain that it does not; because proof of a religious practice prevailing among the churches of Asia towards the close of the first century, even though it had the approbation of one of the Apostles, and though we should suppose (for the text does not show) it to have been universal, can be no proof that it originated in a Divine appointment. Love-feasts were a religious usage observed so early as in the time of the Apostle Paul, and with his sanction, and they very possibly had their origin in a usage of the first converts to Christianity, which had the sanction of all the Apostles (Acts, 2. 46); yet they could not have been enjoined by Divine authority, for if they had, they never would have been discontinued, and it would have been a religious duty with us to hold love-feasts at this day. It is, moreover, to be recollected, that if St. John esteemed one day more than another, St. Paul did not; so that the alleged sanction of St. John to the practice of Sunday observance in his extreme old age, more than sixty years after the first preaching of the Gospel, can impose no religious obligation upon Christians at this day to practice that observance. Without other proof, therefore, than the text itself, it cannot be maintained from the text in the Revelation, that the practice of Sunday observance is of Divine appointment.

Nor does Dr. Paley himself, as I have before remarked, attempt to rest his conclusion upon this text. He shows, by the preface to his argument, that he felt it to be incumbent upon him to prove, if he could, that the custom of Sunday observance had its origin and was universal in the earliest times of Christianity, and that to prove only that it was observed at the close of the first century, would be to effect nothing. Hence it is that he first brings forward in succession four of his five texts to prove the early and universal usage of the custom; and hence it is that he draws his conclusion, not from his fifth text alone, but from "the whole inquiry." He is evidently, therefore, not certain that his fifth text (the text from the Revelation) taken singly, would sustain his conclusion; and he had previously shown he was not certain it could be sustained by his four preceding texts. However, then, we may and must admire his candor in stating his premises doubtfully, we may justly deny his logic in drawing

a conclusion as certain from premises admitted by himself to be doubtful. It is this manifestation of imperfect Conviction on his part, and in some form or other pervading his argument from its outset to its close, which constitutes my proof, that, when Dr. Paley states the result of his "whole inquiry" to be this:—"The assembling upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment:" he is drawing a conclusion not warranted by his own premises.

I cannot but be aware that, if it be a false conclusion, Dr. Paley must have been himself conscious of its being so; but, as I have before intimated (p. 318), I believe his motive to have been good. -Whether the end, if good, can in every case justify the means, is questionable. But whether, therefore, the conduct of Dr. Paley, if it be such as I have supposed, be in strictness defensible, or not, I believe him to have been actuated by a wish to put down the mischievous fanaticism of Judaizing Christians, and to establish among Christians a rationally religious observance of the Sunday, such as would most effectually serve and promote the cause of piety and virtue. Whoever has read his admirable chapter "on the Use of Sabbatical Institutions," will have seen with what zeal, sincerity, and success, he has advocated the utility of appropriating a stated day to the purposes of devotion and instruction in the duties of religion and morality. But he probably was of opinion, that unless the masses of the people were taught, that this practice was not only useful, but "of Divine appointment," his scheme of Sunday observance would not only fail of receiving support from any converts which his previous arguments might have made to anti-Sabbatarianism, but that the practice itself would, for want of an assurance that it was originally of Divine appointment, be generally neglected. In the latter opinion, if he entertained it, I think it possible that he was mistaken, and that, on the contrary, the Sunday would be more generally and more religiously observed than it is, were the observance of it placed upon the secure ground of utility, rather than on the debatable ground of Scripture authority. One great advantage would be sure to attend the belief, that the observance of Sunday as a day of public prayer and instruction, though so conducive to the promotion of religion and good morals, is, nevertheless, an institution of human origin: that advantage would be found in the free scope which it would give to all our clergy to advocate from their pulpits the religious observance of the day. As it is, many of the clergy, and those not the least intelligent and eloquent amongst them, are silent upon this subject in their public discourses, because, being opposed in opinion to the puritanical doctrine of a Sunday Sabbath now so extensively prevailing, they prefer saying nothing to saying what they would wish to say, lest it should create a spirit of dissension and controversy. They do, indeed, sometimes venture to express their opinions freely in published tracts; but they leave the pulpit,—that powerful engine of persuasion,—in the exclusive possession of the Sabbatarian clergy.

Archbishop Whately, in the preface to his "Thoughts on the Sabbath," has said, "The Lord's Day is so precious in the eyes of every right-minded Christian, and its proper observance of such manifold utility, that it cannot, I trust, be regarded as labor misapplied, to adduce such considerations as may tend to promote this observance. And I am convinced that the most effectual, as well as the only justifiable, means for accomplishing this object, will be found in the placing of this duty on its true foundation." Yet I doubt much if the archbishop has ever advocated from the pulpit the observance of the Lord's Day. If he never has, it can only be because he would not choose to proclaim there what he freely states in his pamphlet, that the true foundation of the duty of Sunday observance is neither the fourth commandment of the Decalogue nor the command supposed by some to have been given at the creation to sanctify one day in seven.

I shall also venture to guess that the Rev. T. S. Hughes, "Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Peterborough," if he ever preaches on the duty of Sunday observance, never attempts to place it on what he conceives to be its true foundation, or, at least, that he is always careful to avoid disturbing the Sabbatical notions of his congregation by proclaiming from his pulpit what he admits and maintains in his pamphlet, that the doctrine of a Sabbath for Christians is a vulgar error, and that St. Paul exhorted his converts to omit the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and other ordinances, all of which "Christ had, as it were, blotted out, nailing them to his cross." ("Letter to G. Higgins, Esq." title-page and p. 5.) If Mr. Hughes forbears from preaching on the subject, because he feels that he cannot treat it freely, I should cite this as one of the many instances in which (and for that very reason) the cause of rational Sunday observance loses the support of an able and judicious advocate.

I shall not at present pursue this topic any further; and, indeed, were it not that the respect I bear to the great authority of Paley's name demanded of me a full examination of the opinion which he has expressed on the Sabbath question, I should have to acknowledge that I have already been far too long unmindful of the questions proposed for discussion in this present chapter. That which was in the course of discussion previous to this digression from it, related to the probable time when the observance of the Sunday, as a prayer day, had its rise. Little, however, remains to be said on the subject.

Did we know the date of the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, we might conclude from the vague allusion to Sunday observance contained in it, that that observance was just then, in some form or other, coming into use; and we may from that epistle, considered in connection with Pliny's testimony relating to the Christians in Bithynia, infer it to be, on the whole, most probable that the religious observance of the Sunday had its rise in the latter part of the first century. It is, indeed, quite possible, nor would the supposition be at all inconsistent with the argument, which I have been maintaining on this point, that, even in St. Paul's time, but most certainly not with his approbation, some over-zealous individuals

(overzealous because outrunning the teaching of the Apostles) had begun to practice this observance. It is also very possible (and Heylyn has a conjecture somewhat to this purport) that the practice might originate with some Jewish converts after the destruction of the temple (A.D. 70), they being thereby suddenly and for ever deprived of their stated sacrifices and festivals; or, if we suppose that the practice had already sprung up and attracted some notice, nothing can be more probable than that upon the happening of the event, and for the reason above stated, many of the Jewish converts would become proselytes to the practice, and thereby give it an impulse, which would tend materially to its growth into general repute. These considerations, however, are offered only as conjectures. We, in fact, know nothing positively respecting the origin of Sunday observance as a prayer-day. What we do know respecting it, is of a negative character, but, nevertheless, of the highest importance, for it is this; that we have no grounds for believing that its observance was, and, on the contrary, we have much evidence to show, that its observance was not in use by the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Hence it is a question of mere curiosity, how soon after that time it came into general, and, at length, into universal use as a Christian rite; for the observance of it cannot be a religious duty incumbent upon Christians at this time, if it was not so (and most certainly it was not) during the ministry of the eminent Apostles above named, one of them more especially the teacher of the Jewish nation, the other the great teacher of the Gentile world.

But whilst we are thus in complete uncertainty as to the exact time when the Sunday first began to be observed as a prayer-day, we are in none whatever as to the exact time when it first came to be observed as a Sabbath: for the edict of Constantine, in A.D. 321, fixes its date.

With nothing, therefore, in the probable date of the former, or in the unquestionable date of the latter to contradict, and with much in both to confirm my previous arguments on the main questions, which have been discussed in these pages, I shall now repeat, with that perfect confidence which knows no doubt, the all-important proposition which, from the outset of the discussion it has been my design to maintain and to prove, namely, that in the Christian Scriptures no warrant is to be found for the belief that we are enjoined by Divine authority to observe the Sunday either as a Sabbath day, or as a stated day of " assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction."

The Sabbatarians, however, as is well known, appeal for aid in their distress to the Jewish Scriptures, some arguing the obligation to observe a Christian Sabbath both from the fourth commandment of the Decalogue and the command alleged by them to have been given at the creation to sanctify the seventh day; whilst others appeal directly to the latter only, but of those there are some who, though they look upon the former command to be, as it were, defunct, contend that its spirit survives in a shape which they fancifully call " the moral equity" of the fourth commandment. This spirit, therefore, they duly invoke.

To these discordant appeals to the Jewish Scriptures, (although I conceive that upon no just principle can proof of the duty of Christians to observe a particular day, a day observed only by Christians, be sought for in any other than in Christian Scriptures,) it is my intention fully to respond in a work now in progress, which I have before referred to, and which will be entitled, " An Enquiry into the supposed Obligation of the Sabbaths of the Old Testament"

Examination Of The Six Witnesses

1) " WHETHER in the evening, which belonged to that day, is uncertain:" 1. e. is uncertain from the text itself. St. John, the writer of it, is therefore supposed to give the evidence as to the mode of reckoning time among the Jews. He was himself a Jew by birth, and a conformist to all the customs of the Jews at the time when the meeting mentioned in the text was held, and was himself present at the meeting. He may, therefore, reasonably be supposed to give this evidence. (See ante, p. 156 and 157.)

2) " They did not believe in the resurrection." This part of the evidence is supposed to be given by the Evangelists Mark, Luke, and John, particularly by Mark. Matthew makes no mention of this meeting. (See ante, p. 157.)

3) Luke, chapter 24. See ante, p. 35.

4) See ante, p. 168.

5) The text affords no evidence on the subject.

6) Luke, chapter 24. See ante, p. 27.

7) See ante, p. 69 and the note at foot.

8) St. Luke, the writer of this text, may properly be supposed to give this testimony; since, whether a Jew himself, or not (for this is doubtful), he must have been well acquainted with the customs of the Jews. As to the custom here noticed, see ante, p. 74.

9) There is abundant reason to conclude from his history of the Acts that St. Luke would give this testimony. (See ante, pp. 76, 79.)

10) See ante, p. 93.

11) St. Luke. See ante, p. 90.

(12) We are justified in supposing that this evidence would be given by St. Luke, the writer of the text. He was the companion and historian of St. Paul's travels, and the historian of the first thirty-two years of the progress of Christianity, after it was for the first time preached by the Apostles, which was on the memorable day of Pentecost.

(13.) See ante, p. 104.

(14 and 15.) These answers are not supposed to be given by St. Paul himself. They merely represent the fact, that the text yields us no information upon the subject of either of the two questions asked.

Were I to state the evidence which is afforded by St. Paul in some of his other epistles, I should represent the witness as stating most positively that Christian Churches in his time did not observe the first day of the week either as a Sabbath day or a stated prayer day; but in adopting this course, I should be bringing forwards prematurely the counter-evidence, which will be the subject of a subsequent chapter, and which is, for that reason, supposed not to be produced on the trial.

(16.) This supposed discussion among the advocates in the cause represents the doubts prevailing among many of the early Christians whether St. John were the author of the Book of Revelation,—doubts which have never been satisfactorily removed. (See ante, p. 117.)

(17 and 18.) If the answers to the two questions here asked were to be sought for only in the text itself, the witness must have been represented as saying nothing more than that he could give no information: for in reality the text in the Revelation asserts nothing on the subject of either of those two questions.

Nor does St. John, the supposed writer of the Revelation, either elsewhere in that book, or in any of his epistles, give any information by which the meaning of the phrase in the text can be ascertained. Nowhere, in fact, except it be in this text, does he make any, even the most distant, allusion to the custom of religiously observing the first day of the week, or the custom of calling that day of the week by the name of the Lord's Day.

I have, however, supposed the witness to give from other sources such opinions, or rather conjectures, on the two questions as seem to me to be on the whole the most probable. Of the probability of those conjectures the reader will form his own judgment. As to actual proof, respecting the meaning of the text, there is none to be had from any source whatever. See ante, p. 116, as to the question, Whether the first day of the week was called the Lord's Day when the Book of Revelation was written? Upon the other question, Whether that day of the week was then stately observed? I can only refer generally to my examination of The inclination of my opinion in favor of the conjecture that it had then begun to be so observed is founded chiefly on a piece of non-Scriptural evidence which is considered in chapter 7.—Pliny's Letter to Trajan.

THE END.

A Supplement To The Sabbath

Or, an examination of the six texts commonly adduced from the new testament in proof of a Christian Sabbath.

By A Layman, London: Chapman And Hall, 1853

IN page 302 of " The Sabbath " I have ventured to assert, that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries of the Christian era has attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to an injunction or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself.

If this proposition be true, it ought to be no matter for surprise that the Church fathers felt themselves at a loss how to account for its origin. That they actually were so, is my second proposition; and, in pp. 307-309, I have stated some facts, which tend materially to support it.

Since publishing "The Sabbath" I have had the satisfaction of finding, in a work entitled "The Christian Sabbath," by the Rev. George Holden, A.M., a most ample and valuable store of information respecting the testimony of the Church fathers to the religious observance of the Sunday in the times in which they severally lived. This learned and industrious Sabbatarian writer has extracted from the works of the Greek fathers to the end of the fourth century, and from those of the Latin fathers to the time of Augustine, who died in the fifth century, all the passages which in his opinion bear upon the question of Sunday observance, and in none of them do I find any contradiction to either of the two propositions above stated. On the contrary, the passages thus extracted are replete with evidence which serves to confirm them.

I shall first bring under consideration the proposition which maintains that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributes the origin of Sunday observance to Christ or his Apostles.

Mr. Holden's main object in collecting his extracts from the writings of the Church fathers is to prove, by the aid of their testimony, that the first day of the week (the Lord's Day) has been observed by Christians from the earliest times of Christianity. That it has been observed by them from the time of Justin Martyr I do not dispute. I have in "The Sabbath" stated Justin's testimony to its observance, and noticed also (in p. 303) five other fathers of the second and third centuries as having mentioned or alluded to it. But Mr. Holden's purpose being to carry up the observance of it to the time of the Apostles, he cites with this view the testimony of Justin's predecessors; Barnabas, Ignatius, and Clemens Romanus.

As to BARNABAS and IGNATIUS, I have, in "The Sabbath," shown by anticipation that Mr. Holden's extracts from the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, and from the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, are nothing to his purpose. (See, as to Barnabas, pp. 217-236, and as to Ignatius, pp. 237-251.)

CLEMENT, bishop of Rome, is, indeed, an important witness for Mr. Holden, if he rightly interprets Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, for that father lived in the time of the Apostles. Mr. Holden's statement of his testimony is as follows:—"Clement Romanus, whom St. Paul calls his fellow-laborer, whose name is in the book of life, says, that we are to do all things in order whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do. We are to perform our offerings and services at the stated times; for he hath ordered them to be done, not rashly or disorderly, but at certain determinate times and hours:" but what stated and determinate times (Mr. Holden adds) can be so probably meant as the returns of the weekly festival? Clement is clearly speaking of religious services, for which, he says, there were, even at that early period, appointed seasons; and it cannot rationally be doubted that the Lord's Day was the principal." (P. 293.)

["Even at that early period." The reader will observe it is Mr. Holden, and not Clement, who says this.]

If the reader will refer to pp. 284-289 of "The Sabbath" he will there find reasons which, as it seems to me, fully authorize the belief that Clement is speaking only of the determinate times "and hours" of sacrifice,—the stated festivals of the Mosaic law and the morning and evening hours of the daily sacrifice enjoined by it, and that the just inference from the whole of Clement's epistle is, that the observance of the Lord's Day was a rite unknown in his time. Moreover, to the question, What can Clement so probably mean as the Lord's Day festival when speaking of religious services? I answer,—If I prove, as I here shall, that Clement's successors, the fathers of the second and third centuries, did not attribute the origin of that rite to a command of Christ, it is impossible they could believe that Clement intended to assign that origin to it. For, had they believed this, they unquestionably would have quoted, yet none of them have quoted, his epistle as proof, on the evidence of a witness who spoke from his own knowledge, that the Lord's Day was observed in the Apostolic age, and that, in the opinion prevalent in that age, the rite owed its origin to a command of Christ. But since Clement's successors did not, because they could not, put this interpretation on the epistle, what probability can there be that we should be justified in so interpreting it?

Having thus disposed of Mr. Holden's extracts from the writings of the Church fathers who preceded Justin, I have now to bring under consideration his extracts from the writings of that father and his contemporaries and successors in the second and third centuries. To notice all these extracts is unnecessary, because they for the most part do nothing more than prove the undisputed fact that the Lord's Day was observed in the time of each writer. What will be expected of me is, that I shall lay before the reader every passage in the extracts which is apparently opposed to my two propositions, or to either of them; and this I engage to do.

With respect to the proposition under present consideration, that none of the fathers of the three first centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance to Christ or his Apostles, the reader will, I fear, be inclined to suspect me of not keeping good faith with him, when I assure him,

that in all Mr. Holden's extracts from writings in and subsequent to the time of Justin I can discover but one passage which, even in appearance, militates against it. The single instance here referred to is from TERTULLIAN. Mr. Holden says, " he speaks in some passages of the Lord's Day's solemnities,' " and that, " in adverting to the interruption of the sacred rites of the Christians by the military, he thus reasons:--- But you will say, how shall we assemble? How shall we celebrate the Lord's Day's solemnities? Just as the Apostles did, who were safe by faith, not by bribery. If faith can remove mountains, it may with much greater ease the soldiery.' " (P. 300.)

Mr. Holden quotes this passage as alluding, in his opinion, to the observance of the Lord's Day by the Apostles, but when the context of the words, " just as the Apostles did," is duly considered, it becomes evident that Tertullian did not mean to speak of their observance of it. It is in adverting to the interruption of the sacred rites of the Christians by the military that Tertullian puts the proposed questions, How shall we assemble? How shall we celebrate the Lord's Day's solemnities? And- therefore, when he answers them by saying, " Just as the Apostles did," we ought to infer his meaning to be, just as they did when they were interrupted by the military. Now it is certain that the only instances in which the Apostles are known or supposed to have assembled together, or to have assembled individually with disciples or companions on the first day of the week, afterwards called the Lord's Day, are the meeting on the day of Pentecost mentioned in the Acts (chapter 2) which, it is generally supposed, happened then to fall on the first day of the week, and the meeting of St. Paul and his companions with the disciples on the first day of the week at Troas, as also mentioned in the Acts, and on neither of these occasions was the meeting interrupted by the military.

When we take into consideration also the important fact, that nowhere in all his numerous writings does Tertullian ever directly assert that the Apostles practiced the observance of the Lord's Day, the supposition that in the passage here quoted he meant to say that such was their practice, becomes wholly untenable.

Tertullian, therefore, forms no exception to the proposition, that not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to his Apostles.

Far, indeed, are the writers of that period from attributing any such origin to the religious observance of the Sunday. It is, on the contrary, a most remarkable fact, a fact which, from the negative testimony borne to it by Mr. Holden's extracts, is indisputable, and to which, therefore, I invite, though ineffectually I fear, the serious attention of our Sabbatarian writers, orators, and preachers, that none of the fathers belonging to the first three centuries appeal to the Christian Scriptures in proof of a Christian Sabbath. Not one of them asserts that Christ sanctioned its observance by his appearance to the disciples in the evening following the morning of his resurrection, and again after eight days, not one appeals to the meeting of the Apostles with one accord in one place on the day of Pentecost⁴ as proof of an intention on their part to observe a Christian festival; not one appeals either to the text in the Acts, § relating to the meeting at Troas, or to that in the Corinthians, relating to the collection for the saints, as a proof of St. Paul's sanction to the religious observance of the first day of the week; nor does any one of them appeal to the text in the Revelations, " I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day."

This refers to the first of " the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in proof of a Christian Sabbath."

Text, No. 2.

Text, No. 3.

Text, No. 4.

See Note (A) at the end of the Supplement.

Text, No. 5.

Text, No. 6.

How happens it that none of these appeals are made by the Church fathers of the three first centuries? More especially, I ask, why is an appeal to the text in the Revelations not to be found in any writing of the fathers of that period? The answer is so obvious as scarcely to need stating,— Either they did not consider the phrase of " the Lord's Day" as meaning there the first day of the week, or the phrase itself was an interpolation made in some later century. From the horns of this dilemma, Sabbatarians, you have no escape.

It cannot be requisite that I should extend the proposition under consideration to the fathers of the fourth century; for if none of the fathers of the three first centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observances to Christ or his Apostles, it is impossible to believe that the fathers of the succeeding century should be able to assign this origin to it on any trustworthy authority. On the other hand, if it should appear that the fathers of the fourth century are silent upon the question of a Divine or Apostolical origin, this circumstance may justly be deemed a valuable, though not a requisite, confirmation of the proposition as it respects the fathers of the first three centuries. I shall, therefore, avail myself of Mr. Holden's extracts from the patristic writings of the fourth century, and shall prove from them that I might safely extend my proposition to the fathers of at least the first half of that century, if not also to those of the remaining half.

I begin with the celebrated champion of that only true faith, which, except a man do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. Need I name—ST. ATHANASIUS?

The usual Sabbatarian quotation from his writings is given by Mr. Holden,— "The Lord hath exchanged the Sabbath for the Lord's Day." Athanasius does not here assert that Christ ordained the observance of the Lord's Day; and what he means to say is, that Christ, by his rising from the dead on the first day of the week, gave occasion to the institution of the rite for observing it. That this is his meaning is made apparent by the following extracts from his writings:— In his exposition of the Psalm cxvii. verse 24, This is the day which the Lord hath made,' Athanasius (says Mr. Holden) remarks, What day can here be meant but the day of our Lord's resurrection? " But why did not Athanasius add, — " the day which our Lord commanded to be observed? " Why, but because he knew of no such command? If he did, here was an occasion so opportune for noticing it, that he would not have failed to avail himself of it.

The original is, I believe, generally so translated. Mr. Holden's translation is, " The Lord hath transferred the Sabbath day to the Lord's Day." The quotation is from the treatise " De Semento."

Further, Mr. Holden states that " in another place Athanasius says, The Sabbath was the end of the first creation, but the Lord's Day the beginning of the second, when he renewed the old (creation). Therefore, as he formerly ordered the Sabbath day to be observed in commemoration of the end of his first works, so we venerate the Lord's Day as a commemoration of the beginning of his second." Why not,— " so he now has ordered us to venerate the Lord's Day as a commemoration, etc.?" Instead of this, Athanasius says, " So we venerate," which, in effect, is an admission that the observance of the Lord's Day by the Christian Church was a self-appointed rite.

Another extract from Athanasius is: " So also we celebrate the Lord's Day on account of the resurrection." Just so; on that account, and on no other.

In none of the passages above quoted is allusion made to any precept of Christ, or to the practice of the Apostles. They, therefore, afford inferential evidence, which is irresistible, that the festival of the Lord's Day was, in the opinion of the infallible Athanasius, founded on no other authority than that of an ordinance of the Church.

In a note (p. 314), Mr. Holden says, there are doubts as to the genuineness of the treatises De Sabbato and De Semento. His extracts from these two treatises are, in my judgment, so very favorable to my argument, that I should be sorry to be convinced they are not genuine works of Athanasius. I would renounce even his creed rather than his testimony.

EUSEBIUS, Mr. Holden observes, was born, it is thought, about A.D. 270, but whatever may have been the year of his birth, he certainly must be classed among the writers of the fourth century, his writings all belonging to that period. Mr. Holden gives extracts from them to prove that the Lord's Day was observed in the time of Eusebius, a fact which admits of no question. I shall, therefore, confine myself to noticing a remark which he makes upon one of them. " Eusebius," he says, " mentions the Lord's Day as a festival dedicated to Christ, without the slightest hint of its being a recent institution." Very true; but neither does he give the slightest hint of its being as ancient as the time of the Apostles. He must have known that it had its origin as early as in the time of Justin; he, therefore, would not have been expected to speak of it as a recent institution. In fact, the extracts which Mr. Holden has made from his works exhibit nothing in the smallest degree adverse to the opinion that Eusebius, as well as Athanasius, regarded the festival of the Lord's Day as a religious rite, possessing no higher claim to authority than that which the Church had conferred upon it.

The next writer quoted by Mr. Holden is EPIPHANIUS, who belongs to the latter half of the fourth century, the date assigned to him being A.D. 368. An extract is given (in p. 314 of Holden) from his treatise against heresies, which in the Latin version, as quoted by Mr. Holden, is as follows: (Moreover, holy meetings were appointed by the Apostles, to be held chiefly on these days; the fourth and sixth-day festival and the Lord's Day.)

Here, then, we have an instance of a father of the fourth century attributing the institution of the Lord's Day to the Apostles. Epiphanius, however, stands alone among the fathers of that century in his assertion of its apostolic origin, unless Augustine (A.D. 395) be excepted.

The uncertainty whether Augustine is to be accounted an exception arises from the fact, that the quotation given as from his works is from a homily, of which Mr. Holden, with his usual candor, states, that " some doubt whether it be the production of Augustine."

As to Augustine's assertion on this subject, it is thus stated by Mr. Holden (p. 321): " The Apostles and apostolical men " (i.e. says Mr. Holden, men employed by Christ as apostles in preaching the gospel) " sanctioned the Lord's Day by a religious solemnization, because on it our Redeemer rose from the dead."

It appears, from Dr. Lardner's account of Augustine that, although not skilled in the Greek language, he was able to read it. " He often " (says Dr. Lardner) " speaks of Epiphanius. It is undoubted that he was well acquainted with his work against heresies; that is, the synopsis or recapitulation of it." (Cred. 5. 82, 83.) Here, then, in the quotation from Augustine, we, in all probability, have the assertion of Epiphanius in his work against heresies repeated, though in a different form. But whether it be a repetition from Epiphanius, or an original assertion by Augustine, neither the one nor the other has given any authority for the statement which he makes. It may indeed be said, both of Epiphanius and Augustine, that they, perhaps, had seen documents on the subject which are not now extant. Mr. Holden has remarked (p. 312), that " the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries had access to numerous productions of a prior age, and to many records, which have unfortunately perished." This may be so; but where, as in the case of Epiphanius and Augustine, they neither quote from nor refer to a lost document, it is too much to suppose that they have this authority for their assertions as to matters of fact occurring in a prior age.

Moreover, it is scarcely credible that the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries should have had access to documents of a prior age, which had not been seen by their predecessors of the three first centuries, or by some of them; and if any such documents asserted the apostolic origin of Sunday observance, they would doubtless, on that account, have been quoted by the fathers who had seen them. Still less credible is it, that the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, who lived and wrote in the early part of the fourth century, and who has quoted, and thus has preserved, so many passages from valuable writings now lost, should not have seen every work worth reading, which was known to other fathers of that century. Yet that he never met with any which could authorize Epiphanius and Augustine to attribute to the Apostles the institution of assemblies for celebrating the Lord's Day, his total silence on the subject is unquestionable proof.

The fathers referred to by Mr. Holden, who, in point of date, intervene between the time of Epiphanius and that of the death of Augustine, are, of the Greek fathers, Basil, A.D. 370, Ephrem, same date, Gregory of Nyssa, A.D. 371, Gregory Nazianzen, same date, Chrysostom, A.D. 398, and Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, about the same period; and of the Latin fathers, besides Hilary (who was prior to Epiphanius, A.D. 354), Ambrose, A.D. 374, and Jerome, about the end of the same century. None of them make any allusion to the Apostles as having instituted or practiced the observance of the Lord's Day. There is, however, a very strange passage in Martianay's edition of the works of Jerome, which Mr. Holden has quoted as evidence that Jerome testified to St. Paul's having observed the Lord's Day; and if Jerome really did write this passage, he must be accounted an exception to the above remark. The reader will find it stated, with some comments upon it, in a note (Note B) at the end of the Supplement.

The mention made of Theophilus of Alexandria by Mr. Holden is adverse rather to him than to me, as it shows that the bishop and his synod were far from attributing the observance of the Lord's Day to any other than a human origin. " About the same period," says Mr. Holden, " lived Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who asserts (in a synodical epistle) that both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the Lord's Day, and keep it as a festival, since on that day our Lord Jesus Christ completed his resurrection from the dead." " Evidently no authority for honoring the Lord's Day was known to this bishop and his synod beyond that of custom and reason.

But although it appears from Mr. Holden's extracts that Epiphanius and Augustine (if he be the writer of the homily) are the only fathers of the fourth century who assert that the Apostles instituted or practiced the observance of the Lord's Day, the reader may be disposed to inquire, — Do none of the fathers of that century appear by those extracts to have attributed the origin of that observance to Christ himself?

My answer is, —Not one of them. There is, indeed, one who, following the example of Athanasius, makes use of this 117th Psalm to assert of the Lord's Day, that " this is the day which the Lord hath made;" but, like Athanasius, he obviously intends by such vague reasoning to assert nothing more than that Christ, by rising from the dead on the first day of the week, gave occasion to the voluntary institution of the rite for the observance of that day in after times. I allude to Ambrose, bishop of Milan (A.D. 374), who says, as quoted by Mr. Holden, " The prophet teaches us to exult on the Lord's Day, saying, This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."—" Jesus, by his resurrection, sanctified the eighth day, the same that is the first day, which obtains prerogative from its numerical order, and its sanctity from the resurrection of our Lord." But instead of thus arguing the propriety of observing the Lord's Day from the sanctity which the first day of the week derived through Christ's resurrection upon it, and instead of encumbering the argument with the silly remark upon the prerogative of the day, as being the first in the numerical order of days, why did not Ambrose prefer simply asserting as the true reason for observing the day, that Christ had commanded it to be observed? Most assuredly because even a tradition of any such command was unknown in his time.

Every passage in Mr. Holden's extracts that is even in appearance adverse to me, I have now transcribed. I have at the same time, as hath been seen, taken advantage of the opportunity which his ample extracts from the patristic writings have afforded me, of quoting many other passages

from those writings; and I trust that the reader, after giving an attentive consideration to the whole of them, will come to the conclusion, which to me seems irresistible, that, far from opposing, they, in their combined result, confirm my first proposition, that no ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to an injunction, or the example of the Apostles, or to any precept from Christ himself.

The proposition still remaining for consideration (see ante, p. 1.) is this:—That the Church fathers were at a loss to account for the origin of Sunday observance.

When speaking of their observance of the Lord's Day, the fathers usually remark,—We observe it for such or such a reason; and as might be expected, since they could not appeal to any actual authority for their reasons, they differ with each other respecting them. They do, indeed, invariably assign as one that it commemorates the day of the resurrection, but they also generally assign some other, as though this alone were insufficient. That which seems to find most favor with them as their second reason, is the great honor in which the first day of the week had always been held.

Thus Justin Martyr says,—“ On the Sunday, we all commonly meet together, because it is the first day, in which, God turning the darkness (into light) and chaos (into form), made the world, and on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead.”

Augustine, in the homily before mentioned, assigns amongst other reasons for “ honoring and reverencing the Lord's Day,” that “ its solemnity indeed is apparent in the Holy Scriptures, since it is the first day of the world; in it the elements of the world were made; in it the angels were created; in it Christ rose from the dead; in it the Holy Spirit descended from heaven upon the Apostles;* in it manna was first rained down from heaven in the wilderness. By these circumstances the Lord's Day is distinguished; and, therefore, the doctors of the Church” (observe, reader, not Christ nor his Apostles, but the doctors of the Church) “ have decreed that the honor belonging to the Jewish Sabbath should be transferred to it (the Lord's Day).” (Holden's Christian Sabbath, p. 321.)

From this remark of Augustine, it may perhaps be argued that if none of the fathers of the third century appealed to the meeting of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost mentioned in the Acts, as proof of an intention on their part to observe a Christian festival, Augustine is an instance of a father of the fourth century who has thus appealed to it. That, however, this cannot justly be said of him, I shall show in a note (Note C) at the end of the Supplement.

Origen is so fanciful and so injudicious—not to say absurd—as to argue more strenuously than Augustine the superiority of the Lord's Day over the Jewish Sabbath from the Scripture fact that manna began to fall on the first day of the week. Commenting upon the 16th chapter of Exodus, he says:—“ I ask, on which day was manna first given from heaven? and I desire to compare our Lord's Day with the Jewish Sabbath. From the sacred Scriptures it appears that manna was first given on the Lord's Day; for if, as the Scripture says, it was gathered on six successive days, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, it ceased, without doubt it commenced on the first day, which is the Lord's Day.” (Holden, p. 302.)

Cyprian has a fancy still more strange to illustrate and prove the pre-eminent importance of the first day of the week. He discovers a mystery in the Jewish rite of circumcision which foreshadowed the appearance of the Lord's Day. “ Asserting that the Jewish circumcision being on the eighth day contained a mystery fulfilled in Christ, he argues, ' Because the eighth day, that is, the first after the Sabbath, was to be the day on which our Lord should rise and quicken us, and give us the spiritual circumcision, this eighth day, that is, the first after the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day, preceded in the image, which image ceased when the truth supervened and the spiritual circumcision was given to us.' ” (Holden, p. 304.)

Mr. Holden says: “ This testimony (in favor of “ a septenary Christian Festival”) is of the greater value since it is not the testimony of one father alone, but of many; for it is taken from a synodical epistle of Cyprian and his colleagues, who were present at the third Carthaginian council under the episcopate of Cyprian, A.D. 253.” But surely the assent of “ the learned men of whom this council consisted,” serves only to render it still more manifest how much at a loss the fathers of the third century were to account for the origin of Sunday observance. We see, in this instance, that a whole synod of fathers could discover no better evidence of a divine authority for it than the alleged fulfilment of a mystery of their own invention. Had even a tradition existed in their time that the festival of the Lord's Day had been instituted by Christ or his apostles, their common sense, had they chosen to make use of it (which, however, was not always a custom with the Church fathers), would certainly have led them to resort to the tradition, rather than to a mystical application of a Jewish rite to a festival of the Christian Church with which it had no obvious or probable connection.

Whence originated this manifest solicitude on the part of the Church fathers to accumulate reasons for the observance of the Lord's Day?

Whence, if not in their inability to trace its origin to, any divine or apostolical authority, and in their consciousness, moreover, that in observing the Lord's Day and other stated festivals of the Church they were even acting in opposition to apostolical authority—the teaching and example of St. Paul? It is not improbable that their enemies reproached them with their inconsistency in thus disregarding their own Scriptures; for it would seem to be in consequence of some such reproach that Jerome has said: "Fasts and assemblies on certain days were instituted by prudent men on account of those who are more devoted to the world than to God."

Mr. Holden has had the candor to quote this very remarkable passage, although so adverse to the whole scope and purpose of his argument upon the testimony of the Church fathers, and although, as he must be well aware, it could not but appear astounding to all those of his readers, who had imagined that Sunday observance was a rite of divine or apostolical origin. He, however, yet somewhat doubtingly, suggests, the possibility that Jerome may be there "stating the allegation of an objector, not his own opinion."

To enable the reader to decide for himself on this question, I will here transcribe from Jerome's works the entire passage of which the above quotation from them forms a part:—

("Some one may say, If it is not lawful to observe days, and months, and seasons, and years, we also are guilty of a like sin in observing the fourth day of the week, and Good Friday, and the Lord's Day, and the feast of Lent, and the festivity of Easter, and the joyfulness of Pentecost, and the several seasons appointed for various places in honor of the martyrs. To which he who would answer with simplicity will say, that the days observed by the Jews are not the same as ours. For we do not (at Easter) celebrate the feast of unleavened bread, but that of the resurrection and of the cross. Nor do we, according to the custom of Israel, reckon seven weeks to Pentecost, but we celebrate the descent of the Holy Ghost (on that day); and lest the unregulated assembling of the people should diminish their faith in Christ, certain days have for this reason been appointed that we should all with one accord assemble at the same time. Not that the day itself on which we meet is of greater celebrity, but that, on whatsoever day we are to meet, a greater delight may arise from seeing each other thus assembled. But he who endeavors to answer the objection with more acuteness affirms that all days are equal, that Christ was crucified not only on the Friday, and rose again not only on the Lord's Day, but that every day is the holy day of his resurrection, and that at all times the Lord's body may be eaten. But fasts and assemblies on certain days were instituted by prudent men on account of those who are more devoted to the world than to God, and who cannot, nay, who will not go to church every day of their lives, and offer up their prayers to God before entering upon their worldly occupations.")

Mr. Holden's extract from Jerome begins at this mark and ends at the mark f. His translation of that portion of the passage is as follows:—"Jerome," he says, "declares that all days are equal; that Christ was not only crucified on the Friday and rose again only on the Lord's Day, but that every day is the holy day of his resurrection, and that at all times the Lord's body may be eaten (in the sacrament). But fasts and assemblies on certain days were constituted by men of prudence, on account of those who are more devoted to the world than to God, and who are neither able nor willing to assemble in the church continually."

Mr. Holden does not give the Latin. In a note to p. 293 he states his reason for the course he has adopted of not citing the original texts of the extracts which he makes from the writings of the Church fathers. A few exceptions are admitted on account of some peculiarity in the passage quoted; as in p. 303, where he gives the original text, assigning as his motive, that it is perplexed, if not corrupt. But, with these exceptions, his extracts consist of translations only.

Can it be reasonably doubted that in the passage under discussion Jerome is not stating the allegation of an objector, but is seeking by that very allegation to apologize for his own inconsistency in observing days and times, when he could not deny that St. Paul neither taught nor practiced any such observance?

But Jerome is not the only Church father who felt the pressure of the difficulty how to reconcile the observance of days and times with the teaching of the Apostle Paul. The renowned Origen had long before admitted the apparent inconsistency; and, what is very remarkable, he had stated the charge supposed to be made by an objector in language so nearly resembling the phraseology afterwards used by Jerome, that scarcely a doubt can be entertained of the latter having in that respect made Origen his model. But he copied no further. He could not but feel that Origen by his reply had not overcome the difficulty, but evaded it, and that some answer more specific must be given, if it were hoped to satisfy any intelligent objector. I shall now quote the passage alluded to from the Latin version of Delarue's edition of Origen's works; and I think the reader will, as probably Jerome did, look upon it as a mere flourish of theological rhetoric, in which the subject is intentionally mystified. Nevertheless, what Origen has said, by its ending in signifying nothing, or nothing to the purpose, is, in effect, an ample admission by him that the custom of observing the Lord's Day had no foundation in any precept of Christ, nor any sanction from the teaching or example of the Apostles.

It is here worthy of remark that Origen and Jerome were amongst those who received the book of Revelation as having been written by the Apostle John (Lardner, 2. 466, and verse 33); but neither of them has appealed to the text, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day." Yet had they believed that the Apostle by the phrase of "the Lord's Day" intended the first day of the week, how easy and natural would it have been for them to quote this text as apostolical authority for the observance of that day, instead of inventing the labored apologies for their anti-apostolical observance of it, which are to be found in their writings, and are here presented to the reader.

The passage is as follows: ("Wherefore it appears to me to have been a splendid saying of the Apostle Paul, 'Ye observe days and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.' Here, if any one shall object to those things which we are accustomed to do on the Lord's Day, on Good Friday, at Easter, and at Pentecost, the answer to be given is, that the perfect Christian who, in his words, his actions, and his thoughts, communes with the Word of God, by nature his Lord, lives all his life in the days of the Lord, and is every day celebrating the Lord's Day.")

Mr. Holden has given in an English translation the latter part of the above passage; and, as it seems to me there is some difficulty in rendering that portion of it satisfactorily, I shall give the reader Mr. Holden's translation, and subjoin to it the Greek original of the entire passage.

If anyone object to our observances of the Lord's Day, (Good) Friday, Easter, and Pentecost, it is answered that a perfect (Christian) who, in word, deed, and thought, is ever with his natural Lord, the Word of God, always observes the days sacred to him and keeps the Lord's Days.— (The Christian Sabbath, p. 301.)

Thus have I been enabled by the aid, which I gratefully acknowledge, of Mr. Holden's laborious investigation of the patristic writings, to corroborate by additional unexceptionable evidence my previous proof that the Church fathers of the three first centuries never ascribed the institution of the Lord's Day observance to Christ or his Apostles, and were, moreover, at a loss to account for its origin. But I have this further obligation to Mr. Holden's extracts: they have enabled me, by the undeniable inference which their negative testimony affords, to bring into notice (as the reader has seen in page vii), the striking fact that not one of the fathers of the three first centuries has appealed to the Christian Scriptures in proof of a Christian Sabbath. I ask, then, Is it not astonishing, if not absolutely incredible, that all the Church fathers of that period, and I may safely add all their successors, should have overlooked the Scripture proof, if there was any, and that it should be reserved for the ingenuity of the Puritans in the seventeenth century to find it in the Six TEXTS to which Sabbatarians now commonly appeal? The fathers were, indeed, some of them, marvelously credulous; some, also, were not over-scrupulous in their regard for veracity (qualities by the way which would have disposed them to adopt and give currency to any tradition, however idle, as to a divine or apostolical origin of Sunday observance). Still there were many among the fathers who were remarkable for great intellectual abilities. They were, in general, not wanting in talent, nor deficient in knowledge of the Scriptures, and not a few wrote huge volumes of commentaries and homilies to interpret and recommend them. All had before their eyes the very same Christian Scriptures which we now possess, and yet not one of them discovered evidence in favor of a Christian Sabbath in the Six TEXTS, which have since been picked out of those Scriptures, and are in our days paraded before the unreflecting readers of Sabbatarian treatises as containing indubitable proof of it. It is, I grant, within possibility, that the sagacity of modern theologians may have found evidence where the Church fathers were so stupid as to find none. But is this the fact? Have the moderns found actual proof in the Christian Scriptures? Most assuredly they have not: for in "The Sabbath" I have, by a close and fairly-conducted "Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament, in proof of a Christian Sabbath," clearly shown that the first five of those texts contain no proof of it whatever, and that the sixth affords none but what is founded on conjecture; and now the conjectural proof from the sixth text has been wholly deprived of the little, if any, value it had, by the further remarks upon that text in the present SUPPLEMENT.

It may fairly be assumed as an admitted fact, that none of the fathers who wrote, or of the synods and councils that were held after the three first centuries, have appealed to the Christian Scriptures to prove the divine or apostolical origin of the Lord's Day observance, since if any such appeal has been made, the advocates of that tenet would not have failed to discover it and to make their discovery known.

October 1853.

Notes.

Note (A).

Chrysostom, who wrote at the end of the fourth century (about A.D. 398), mentions the meeting at Troas on the first day of the week, but he speaks of it as a meeting not of the disciples, but of St. Paul and his companions; and so far from considering that the object of it, which the text says was to break bread, had any religious character, he speaks of it as being nothing more than a meeting to partake of an ordinary meal, and

appears amused at the assurance of the disciples at Troas in obtruding themselves upon St. Paul at his meal-time. His words, as translated by Heylyn, I have stated in p. 99 of " The Sabbath."

I have, since publishing that work, ascertained that the passage in question occurs in Chrysostom's forty-third homily, which is in the ninth volume of the folio edition of Montfaucon. (Paris, 1721.)

I have since also seen a critical edition of the Greek Testament by Scholz, who, I find, follows Griesbach in his emendation of the text relating to the meeting at Troas. He gives numerous authorities for it, and refers to Chrysostom as one of them.

The passage extracted by Mr. Holden from Martiauay's edition of Jerome's works, is (in his English version), " I wish we could always fast, as we read in the Acts that St. Paul and his fellow-believers did, on the Pentecost and the Lord's Day." In? The emendation is stated in p. 91 of " The Sabbath."

This occurs in an epistle to Lucinius Bceti-ens, and might well warrant a suspicion that the epistle itself was not genuine; but Erasmus in his edition places it among Jerome's genuine works, — " eorum quite vere sunt Hieronymi." Still this particular passage in it may have been interpolated for it is certain his genuine works have been tampered with. This is admitted by Martianay; see p. 320 of Mr. Holden's treatise. However this may be, it fortunately happens that the passage in question, by referring to the Acts of the Apostles, gives the authority upon which the assertion in it is founded, and thereby refutes itself. For where do we read in the Acts that Paul fasted on the first day of the week (the Lord's Day), or on the day of Pentecost? The only instances there related of Paul's fasting are in chapters 13. 2, 3, and 14. 23, but nothing is there said of the day of the week on which he fasted. The only instance of mention being made in the Acts of what Paul did on the first day of the week is, that which is to be found in chapter 20. 7, where the narrative, instead of saying that Paul fasted on that day, expressly informs us that the purpose of Paul and his companions on their coming together was— to eat. Mention is made in the Acts (xxvii. 9) of St. Paul, and of a fast, but it is not said that he observed it. Besides, it is to be noted that the fast there spoken of, being the great Jewish fast of expiation (Levit. 16.), was always held on a stated day, not of the week, but of the month (the month Tisri).f The only instance in which Pentecost is mentioned in the Acts, in connection with St. Paul, is that which occurs in chapter 20. 10, and there all that is said of him is, " He hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost."

In the edition of Jerome's works by Valarsius (Venice, 1766), reference is here made to Acts 13. 20,21, a reference as unaccountably strange as the passage itself.

Jennings' "Jewish Antiquities," vol. 2. p. 256.

These facts considered, it is surely more rational to believe that the passage quoted as from Jerome is a forgery, than that Jerome should be the author of it.

NOTE (C).

Whether Pentecost did or did not always fall on the first day of the week has long been a vexata quastio among the learned. An old Sabbatarian treatise by Benjamin Beach, minister of the gospel, and published in 1700, entitled, " The Jewish Sabbath abrogated," discusses at great length this controverted subject. The author, himself, is of opinion, with what he states (p. 196), to be the opinion of Bishop Usher, that " the Feast of Pentecost was a moveable feast, but immoveable as to the day of the week, so varying that it might always fall upon the day immediately following the ordinary Sabbath."

Whether, if it did not always fall on the first day of the week, it did so on the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2., is also an unsettled question. See Mr. Holden's treatise on the Christian Sabbath, pp. 237-4255, and a pamphlet published in 1833 by the Rev. W. James, M.A., entitled, " A proof that the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2. was the Lord's Day." The author, after stating this to be an opinion commonly entertained, adds the following curious remark, which shows that no reliance can be placed upon it. " Seldom," he says, " has an agreement in opinion been upheld by such a diversity of argument directly overthrowing each other."

Augustine, it appears (see p. xvii), has remarked, that " in the first day of the week the Holy Spirit descended from heaven upon the Apostles." On what he founded this remark, whether upon a calculation with respect solely to the day of Pentecost mentioned in the Acts, or on considerations which have induced some of the learned in modern times to believe that the Pentecost always fell on the first day of the week, is, with reference to the object of this note, a matter of no importance. The only material question here is, for what purpose did he make the remark? Was it to prove that the Apostles assembled on the day of Pentecost, because, being the first day of the week, it was their design to

celebrate the Christian festival, afterwards called the Lord's Day? That this could not be the purpose is manifest, since Augustine unquestionably notices the fact of its being the first day of the week, merely as one of the many instances in which great events recorded in Scripture history mark with honorable distinction that day of the week.

I have an argument in "The Sabbath," on the text in Acts 2. (see "The Sabbath," Text No. 3), to prove that the Apostles did not then meet to celebrate the Lord's Day. That argument, far from being prejudicially affected by Augustine's remark, derives additional strength from it. For if he had believed that the Apostles met on the day of Pentecost, because it was the day of the Christian festival, afterwards called the Lord's Day, he most assuredly would have said so, were it only to offer something like proof of his otherwise entirely unsupported assertion (see ante, p. xii), that the Apostles and apostolic men sanctioned the Lord's Day by a religious solemnization.

www.CreationismOnline.com