

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07994726 7



ZICA  
Lewie







# A CRITICAL HISTORY

— OF —

# THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY

IN THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY A. H. LEWIS, D. D.,

*Author of "Sabbath and Sunday; Argument and History,"  
"Biblical Teachings Concerning the Sabbath and the  
Sunday;" Editor of "The Outlook, and Sabbath  
Quarterly," and of "The Light of Home."*

— 0 —

THE AMERICAN SABBATH TRACT SOCIETY,

ALFRED CENTRE, N. Y.

1886.

5, 0

COPYRIGHT, 1886, BY A. H. LEWIS.

W. W. W. W. W.  
W. W. W. W. W.  
W. W. W. W. W.



## P R E F A C E .

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

No department of church history has been less thoroughly worked than the history of the Sabbath and the Sunday. They both antedate Christianity and Judaism. Their fountains are back of Calvary and Sinai. The chief interest centers in the New

Testament, and in the Patristic period. The former is usually treated polemically, while the latter is almost an unknown region to the average Christian. Few, at the present time, have more than a confused knowledge of the Sabbath question since the Puritan movement of three hundred years ago. That movement has been forced to seek some support for itself in early church history. In seeking this, many quotations have been claimed from the Fathers, which subsequent investigations have shown to be notoriously incorrect. These have been passed from hand to hand, apparently without examination or question. Forged writings have been treated as genuine. Unknown dates have been assumed to be definite. Important expressions, such as "Christian Sabbath" and "*Dominicum servasti*," have been manufactured and interpolated. In this way facts have been perverted, or withheld, and good men have been misled. Few American writers have attempted any careful survey of this field, and the most valuable European works are out of print. Most of the books in defense of Sunday, within the last fifty years, have been hastily written to meet the demands of some convention, or some emergency in the decline of the Puritan theory, and the secularization of the "Anglo-American Sabbath." This

has forbidden patient and efficient original research.

Still stronger reasons have sat at the elbow of every writer in defense of the Puritan, or the Anglo-American Sunday. The facts of the first four centuries destroy the foundation on which Puritanism rested its "Sunday Sabbath." We express no judgment concerning the men who have written thus imperfectly. The difficulty of obtaining the facts, and the seeming necessity of saving Christian worship, by attempting to save the Sunday, have been powerful causes. We only state the facts.

Because these things are so, this book has been written. It is the product of twenty years search. It is written in the interest of the church universal, and of the preservation of the Sabbath, without which Christianity is shorn of one of its chief elements of power, and humanity is robbed of one of its chief blessings. We have given our authorities, willing to burden our pages with copious references, that who will may follow, and test our work. As these pages are not the product of yesterday, so they are not written for to-morrow alone. We know full well that they must make their way against the prejudice of creed and the power of popular custom. We know they must take their way, with all else, between the upper and nether millstones of

eternal verities. Nothing less than sifted facts can abide as the foundation for hope, or faith, or practice. Men build pleasant theories and indulge in beauteous fancies concerning what they think ought to be, but the relentless hand of history gathers all which is not in accord with eternal verity, for the dust heap of the past.

Conscious that every page must die which is not born of verity, and equally conscious that every page thus born will live in spite of creed or custom, this book goes forth, willing to await the broader knowledge and the calmer judgment of coming years.

A. H. L.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., February, 1886.

# CONTENTS.

---

- CHAPTER I. Introductory.
- CHAPTER II. History of the Sabbath in the Gospels.
- CHAPTER III. History of the Sunday in the Gospels.
- CHAPTER IV. History of the Sabbath in the Book of Acts.
- CHAPTER V. History of the Sunday in the Book of Acts.
- CHAPTER VI. The Apostolic Fathers.
- CHAPTER VII. Pliny's Letter to Trajan, and a Famous Falsehood.
- CHAPTER VIII. Justin Martyr ; the First Reference to Sunday ; and the Rise of No-sabbathism.
- CHAPTER IX. Other Writers, and the Development of No-sabbathism.
- CHAPTER X. Tertullian and his Followers.
- CHAPTER XI. Wednesday and Friday as Fasts.
- CHAPTER XII. Post-Apostolic History of the Sabbath, to the Fourth Century.
- CHAPTER XIII. Constantine the Great, and the beginning of Legislation.

- CHAPTER XIV. Sunday from the time of Constantine to the close of the Fifth Century.
- CHAPTER XV. Sunday in the Church Councils.
- CHAPTER XVI. The Sabbath from Constantine to the Dark Ages.
- CHAPTER XVII. Sunday during the Dark Ages.
- CHAPTER XVIII. The Sabbath in the Western Church during the Dark Ages.
- CHAPTER XIX. The Sabbath in the Eastern Church.
- CHAPTER XX. Sunday in the German Reformation.
- CHAPTER XXI. Sunday in the Swiss Reformation.
- CHAPTER XXII. Sunday in the English Reformation.
- CHAPTER XXIII. Puritanism and the Sunday in England.
- CHAPTER XXIV. The Sabbath in Europe since the Reformation.
- CHAPTER XXV. The Sunday in America; Colonial Period.
- CHAPTER XXVI. The Sabbath in America.
- CHAPTER XXVII. Sunday in the Creeds of the Churches.
- CHAPTER XXVIII. Observance of Sunday in the United States.
- CHAPTER XXIX. Elements of Agitation now at work in the United States.
- CHAPTER XXX. The Verdict of History.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY.

History is an organic development. The phenomena which appear on the surface, are the result of underlying principles, true, or false. Nothing in history comes by chance. If human choices did not lead men to disobedience of God's laws, and to a disregard for truth, there would be no discord, but rather a continuous, straightforward advancement. What men call the "power of truth," "the logic of events," and the "guiding hand of Providence," is but another way of saying that truth, God's ideas, his eternal laws concerning right and wrong, are stronger than any or all human choices and will ultimately prevail. It is the unfolding of God's ideas in history that gives to it organic power and irresistible force. Human disobedience, designed or undesigned, may check or deflect the progress of truth. This is always possible where freedom of choice is granted to the finite intelligence, under the general limitation of the Infinite. All such checking or deflection must be temporary. Disobedience is the conflict of the less with the greater. It may go so far as to destroy the less, as an individual, but it can never at-

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

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



The Sabbath question has had a prominent place in the religious history of our race. The week, measured by the Sabbath as its closing day, is the oldest division of time. It is found wherever history reaches. The question comes closer to human life than any other so-called practical question. Social life, business life, religious worship and culture are all blended with it, and are dependent on it. It is a question that has never been kept in abeyance, for any great length of time, however much it may have been ignored. It was prominent in the Jewish Church and State. It claimed early attention in the history of Christianity. It came to the front in the Reformation. It was a central figure in our own early national history. It is to-day, though much ignored by some, and treated vigorously with narcotics by others, one of the "burning questions" which still demands recognition and solution. The real history of the Sabbath question is not well understood. The earlier centuries have not been carefully explored by the masses, or even by the religious teachers. Much has been taken for granted, where the facts are unknown. Under such circumstances, the writer is glad to lay before the reader the results of twenty years careful investigation in the field of Sabbath history. He only asks that the final judgment of the reader be founded not upon the opinions or suppositions with which he comes to the perusal of these pages, but upon the facts presented. The ultimate facts in the whole field will appear, and be marshaled. The issue may be de-

layed, but cannot be avoided. These pages are sent forth, prayerfully, to contribute their part toward the final settlement of the question. The personal opinions of the author appear in the last chapter, the "Verdict of History."

## CHAPTER II.

# HISTORY OF THE SABBATH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### THE GOSPELS.

The Bible is the ultimate authority upon the Sabbath question. The facts therein form the source of obligation, and of history. It is therefore pertinent to begin our historic investigation by placing before the reader whatever of history there is in that book which is the Christian's especial charter. Sabbath-keeping is a matter of doing, rather than of theorizing; hence the history we seek must be found in what Christ and his apostles did, more than in what they said. If either the Sabbath or the Sunday has a history in the New Testament it will be found in the actions and customs of Christ and his apostles. Before examining the record of these actions it is well to remember some important facts, which, being disregarded, lead to wrong conclusions, since we thus fail to consider the circumstances under which Christ spoke and acted. These facts are:

(1) During the centuries immediately preceding Christ's coming, Sabbath-keeping had become a prominent mark of distinction between the Jews and the surrounding nations. It was a peculiar "sign"

of loyalty toward Jehovah, and became a distinguishing mark of exclusiveness.

(2) As their spirituality decreased, unscriptural formalism increased, and since Sabbath-keeping gave a wide field for acting or not acting, the Sabbath became the central figure in their formalism. It was the stronghold of Phariseeism. And since Christ's mission was to remove rubbish and restore God's law to its primitive purity, while he fulfilled it by a sinless obedience, the Sabbath was a necessary point of controversy. Remembering, then, that Christ's aim was not the destruction or removal of the Sabbath, but rather to set it free from Judaistic taint and misconception, we shall be able to comprehend the real nature of the incidents which form its history in the Gospels. Taking up these incidents in their order, we come first to the following :

“At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath-day through the corn, and his disciples were a hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath-day. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did when he was a hungered, and they that were with him. How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law how that on the Sabbath-days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you, that in this place is *one* greater than the temple. But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have con-

demned the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day. And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue. And behold, there was a man which had *his* hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift *it* out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* forth: and *it* was restored whole, like as the other.”\*

Here we have two incidents occurring, probably, on successive Sabbaths, which illustrate two important points: works of necessity, and works of mercy. There is nothing in Christ's acts or teachings which even intimate that he designed to abolish the Sabbath, or to disregard it. On the contrary it is fully recognized as a day of rest and worship, but not a day of false and burdensome restrictions.

The parallel accounts of these incidents, as given by Mark and Luke, differ in some points, but in nothing essential. Mark writes as follows, concerning the second event:

“And it came to pass, that he went through the corn fields on the Sabbath-day; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the Sabbath-day that which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was a hungered, he and

---

\* Matt. 12: 1-13.

they that were with him? How he went into the house of God, in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful to eat, but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him? And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.\*

Luke's history is in these words:

“ And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing *them* in *their* hands. And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath-days? And Jesus answering them, said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was a hungered, and they which were with him; how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shew-bread, and gave also to them that were with him, which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone? And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath. And it came to pass also on another Sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue, and taught, and there was a man whose right hand was withered: And the scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the Sabbath-day; that they might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose, and stood forth. Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing: Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy *it*? And looking round about upon them all, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his

---

\* Mark 2: 23-28.

hand was restored whole as the other. And they were filled with madness ; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.”\*

A careful comparing of these three accounts shows that they agree perfectly in the fact that Christ's actions and words are all aimed at the false notions, and extravagant claims made by the Pharisees, and not at the Sabbath. They form the clear starting point of the history of the Sabbath in the New Testament, as an institution honored by Christ, and by him shorn of false notions, that it might be brought into accord with his Christian dispensation.

The history of Christ's life, as given by Mark, notes first a Sabbath scene in Capernaum:

“ And they went into Capernaum ; and straight-way on the Sabbath-day he entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his doctrine; for he taught them as one that had authority and not as the scribes. And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit ; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone : what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth ? art thou come to destroy us ? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace and come out of him. And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him.”†

Luke tells of this occurrence in these words :

“ But he passing through the midst of them went his way, and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath-days. And they were astonished at his doctrine : for his word

---

\* Luke 6 : 1-11. † Mark 1 : 21-26.

was with power. And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, *thou* Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not."\*

Christ's *habit* of preaching on the Sabbath is told by Luke as follows :

"And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and there went out a fame of him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all. And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord *is* upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth."†

The following is a similar instance :

"And when the Sabbath-day was come, he began

---

\* Luke 4: 30-35. † Luke 4: 14-22.



to teach in the synagogue; and many hearing him were astonished, saying, From whence hath this man these things; and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?"\*

It will be seen that Christ was accustomed to unite works of mercy with his teaching and worship at the Sabbath services.

Luke gives another instance as follows:

"And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath. And behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up *herself*. And when Jesus saw her, he called *her to him*, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid *his* hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath-day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath-day. The Lord then answered him, and said, *Thou* hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or *his* ass from the stall, and lead *him* away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him."†

John recounts a scene in which the Jews were especially enraged because Christ commanded a healed

---

\* Mark 6: 2. † Luke 13: 10-17.

man to carry his mattress with him after he was healed :

“ And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time *in that case*, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool : but while I am coming, another step-peth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked : and on the same day was the Sabbath. The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the Sabbath-day; it is not lawful for thee to carry *thy* bed. He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed and walk? And he that was healed wist not who it was : for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in *that* place. Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole : sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee. The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus which had made him whole. And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath-day. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.”\*

On another occasion at a temple service, Christ

---

\* John 5 : 5-18.

defends his acts with reference to the Sabbath, from the custom of the Jews concerning the rite of circumcision. Speaking in the temple, he said :

“Did not Moses give you the law, and *yet* none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee? Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the Sabbath-day circumsise a man. If a man on the Sabbath-day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath-day? Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.’\* ”

Still another case is recorded by John in the following words :

“And as *Jesus* passed by, he saw a man which was blind from *his* birth. And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world. When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent). He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing. The neighbors therefore, and they which before had

---

\* John 7: 19-24.

seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged? Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him: *but* he said, I am *he*. Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened? He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus, made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam, and wash: and I went and washed, and I received sight. Then said they unto him, Where is he? He said, I know not. They brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind. And it was the Sabbath-day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes. Then again the Pharisees also asked him how he had received his sight. He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see. Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them."\*

Such is the history of the Sabbath in the Gospels. Viewed in the light of the facts suggested at the opening of this chapter, relative to the false notions of the Jews concerning it, the history shows unmistakably that Christ labored only to correct abuses and misconceptions, but never to destroy or annul the Sabbath. This history shows, not only the continual recognition of the Sabbath, but also what it ought to be from the Christian stand-point. Through this example of Christ the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment has a more prominent place, and more copious history, than any other one of the laws of the Decalogue.

---

\* John 9: 1-16.

This history accords fully with Christ's plain declaration wherein he says :

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven ; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.”\*

---

\* Matt. 5 : 17-19.

## CHAPTER III.

# HISTORY OF SUNDAY IN THE GOSPELS.

Only one first day of the week is spoken of, definitely, in the Gospels, that is the day which *followed* the resurrection of Christ. (For a discussion of the time when Christ arose, namely, "late in the Sabbath," *i. e.*, before sunset on the Sabbath, see "Biblical Teachings concerning the Sabbath and Sunday, p. 60, seq.) Each of the Evangelists refers to the day, and the scenes of the early morning when the resurrection was reported. The more sanguine supporters of the Sunday attempt to begin its history with John's account of what Christ did on the evening after that day, and Luke's account of certain occurrences on the afternoon of that day. The latter comes first in order as being the earlier:

"And behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem *about* threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, that, while they communed *together*, and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden, that they should not know him. And he said unto them, What manner of communications *are* these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of

them, whose name was Cleopas, answering, said unto him. Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God, and all the people: And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and besides all this; to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre. And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive. And certain of them which were with us, went to the sepulchre, and found *it* even so as the women had said: but him they saw not. Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went; and he made as though he would have gone farther. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed *it*, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with

them, Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things *were done* in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them *his* hands and *his* feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb. And he took *it*, and did eat before them. And he said unto them, These *are* the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and *in* the prophets, and *in* the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.\*

John's account takes in only the scene of the evening after the day. It runs as follows:

“ 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. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them *his* hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace *be* unto you:

---

\* Luke 24: 13-46.



as *my* Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: *and* whosoever *sins* ye retain, they are retained."\*

We have given the foregoing in full in order that the reader may see that all the events took place for one definite purpose, namely, to prove to the doubting disciples that Christ had really risen. The day and the events are in no way related only by the fact that on the morning of that day the resurrection had been reported: in the afternoon and evening Christ appeared to them as detailed above, in order to convince them of the fact. The day has no other history, and the absence of all evidence that it was even mentioned for any other reason, precludes the claim that this bit of history teaches, even in any way, the doctrine of the Sabbath as transferred to the Sunday.

Because this, the only direct reference to the first day, is so meager, modern theorists have sought to prove that Christ met with his disciples on the next Sunday, also, and so instituted some sort of observance of it. This claim is based upon the following words:

“But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into

---

\* John 20: 19-23.

his side, I will not believe. 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. Then saith he to Thomas, behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust *it* into my side; and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed *are* they that have not seen, and *yet* have believed.\*

The trouble with making any history for Sunday out of this passage, is:

(1) There is no evidence that it was the next first day. If the language be taken exactly, then "after" eight days must have been the ninth day at least. If it be an indefinite expression the case is equally bad, since the day would be wholly unknown.

(2) The reason for mentioning the event is that Thomas being present, was convinced.

(3) The utter absence of any mention of a new or specific reason for the meeting at that time forbids even the supposition that any reason was intended beyond the one which the facts detailed indicate.

Only one conclusion is possible, viz., the first day of the week has no history in the Gospels except the single day which succeeded the resurrection of Christ, and during which, and in the evening after which, he appeared to his disciples to prove his resurrection. As a day of rest or worship, it has no history whatever.

---

\* John 20; 26-29.

## CHAPTER IV.

# HISTORY OF THE SABBATH IN THE BOOK OF ACTS.

The Book of Acts constitutes the second department of New Testament history. It details the doings, sermons, etc., of the apostles during the first *thirty years* after Christ's ascension. It is the inspired source of *apostolic, church history*. What we know concerning the example of the apostles during the first generation after Christ, we learn from Acts. Let us inquire what it contains of history concerning the Sabbath. Be it remembered that the Book from the 10th chapter forward, is not the history of merely Jewish converts, but largely of Gentiles. We find the thread of Sabbath history appearing in the record of the public missionary labors of Paul and Barnabas, as follows:

“ And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews. And they had also John to *their* minister. . . . But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down. And after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, *Ye men and brethren*, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on. Then Paul stood up, and beckoning with his

hand said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience. The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with a high arm brought he them out of it. And about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness. And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, he divided their land to them by lot. And after that he gave *unto them* judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet. And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years. And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the *son* of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my will. Of this man's seed hath God, according to *his* promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus: When John had first preached before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel. And as John fulfilled his course he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not *he*. But, behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes of *his* feet I am not worthy to loose. Men *and* brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and who-ever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent. For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath-day, they have fulfilled *them* in condemning *him*. And though they found no cause of death *in him*, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took *him* down from the tree, and laid *him* in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead: And he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.

And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, *now* no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another *psalm*, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: But he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption. Be it known unto you therefore, men *and* brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you. And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath. Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas; who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God. And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the Word of God. But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn

to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed.”\*

Here is the continual and habitual recognition and observance of the Sabbath and the gathering of the nuclei of churches, by Sabbath-keeping apostles. Paul's sermon which is woven into the history was of such a nature, and was so connected with the question of Christ's Messiahship and resurrection, that it must have discussed the "Sunday question," had there been any to discuss. The 42d and 44th verses show that the Gentiles separately besought that they might hear more of the truth on the following Sabbath,—not on the next day, Sunday. The apostles complied with their request, and on the next Sabbath, "almost the whole city" came out to hear the Word. Had this occurred in a strictly Jewish quarter, like Jerusalem there might be some shadow for thinking that this was done to meet a Jewish prejudice. As it is, such a conclusion is not deducible from the history. Passing to the next chapter, we find this same history continued:

"And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed. But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds

---

\* Acts 13: 5, 14-48.

evil-affected against the brethren. Long time therefore abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.”\*

Note that this is not a temporary act. They *abode there a long time*, teaching thus. We next find Paul at Philippi in Macedonia, some ten years later, observing the Sabbath and seeking a place of worship even where there was no synagogue:

“ And from thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, *and* a colony: and we were in that city abiding certain days. And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted *thither*. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard *us*: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought *us*, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide *there*. And she constrained us.”†

In the 17th chapter the history of Sabbath runs on as follows:

“ Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews: And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ. And

---

\* Acts 14: 1-3. † Acts 16: 12-15.

some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry. Therefore disputed he in the synagogue with the Jews, and with devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him. Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection."\*

Let the reader not fail to note that Paul is here preaching far from Jerusalem, at Athens, among the Gentiles, *par excellence*, and preaching about "Jesus and the resurrection," as a Sabbath-keeper with no hint or word about a "resurrection day," or a transferred Sabbath.

Passing to the next chapter, the Holy Spirit takes pains to tell us of the *continued habit* of Paul in Corinth, the heart of Gentiledom, as a Sabbath-keeper:

"And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

\* \* \* \* \*

"And he continued there a year and six months teaching the Word of God among them."

\* \* \* \* \*

"And Paul *after this* tarried *there* yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him Priscilla, and Aquila; having shorn *his* head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but

---

\* Acts 17: 1-4. 16-19.



he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired *him* to tarry longer time with them, he consented not: But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus.”\*

Before returning to Ephesus Paul visited Cæsarea, Antioch, and “all the country of Galatia and Phrygia.” Returning to Ephesus, we find him still observing the Sabbath as shown by the following:

“And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.”†

Following the chronology of the common version, these references bring us down to 55 or 56 A. D. They include a period of ten years at least, commencing *after* the work was begun among the Gentiles, and most of the occurrences being entirely outside of Palestine and immediate Jewish influence. These facts give the Sabbath a distinct, definite history in the Book of Acts, in which it has the highest sanction of continued apostolic example in its favor. As a fact in history every church or congregation which is noticed in the Book of Acts, *was founded by Sabbath-keeping apostolic missionaries.*

---

\* Acts 18: 4, 11, 18-21. † Acts 19: 8-10.

CHAPTER V.  
HISTORY OF SUNDAY IN THE  
BOOK OF ACTS.

The first day of the week is mentioned but *once* in the Book of Acts. We give that reference in full:

“ 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; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep: and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing *him* said, Trouble not yourselves: for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted.”\*

Analyzing this bit of history the following facts appear:

---

\* Acts 20: 6-12.

1. The occasion for mentioning the day of the week is found in the fact that at its beginning, on what is now called "Saturday evening," a farewell meeting was held, preparatory to the leaving of Paul on the following morning. This fact, and the miraculous restoration of the young man Eutychus, are the only ones which appear, or are implied, as marking the time or the occasion. On the other hand, the theory that this was the Sabbath by a transfer of the law and the customs of rest and worship from the seventh day, is positively forbidden by the facts relative to the Sabbath and its observance, by the fact that this is the only time when the first day is mentioned in the entire book, and by the still more significant fact that in this mention there is no hint, even remote, of anything Sabbatic or commemorative about the day, or the meeting; and farther still, by the fact that this meeting must have been on the evening before Sunday, and that Paul and his party pursued their journey on that day. Still farther; in the seventh verse the best manuscripts give "we" instead of "disciples," showing that the "breaking of bread," was probably the ordinary evening meal of the traveling party. If, in order to put something into this history, it be insisted that this was the Lord's Supper, and that the meeting was on the evening *after* Sunday, then all the occurrences were on the second day of the week, according to the prevalent mode of reckoning, and the breaking of bread, was on the second day, even according to the modern reckon-

ing, since it was past midnight. The first day of the week, therefore, has no history in the Book of Acts, as it has none in the Gospels. In a word, the most careful and honest search finds no history of Sunday in the Bible, either as a Sabbath, a prayer day, or a resurrection festival. The sources of its history are not found in the Word of God.

But lest some one shall say that the non-historic writings of the New Testament contain references which are fairly historic, we will notice what is said of the first day, outside of the Gospels and of the Acts. Looking through all of the

#### EPISTLES,

our search is well nigh fruitless, for the first day of the week is *mentioned but once*, in them all. Here it is:

“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. And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by *your* letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem.”\*

Analyzed as an historic statement, the above gives us the following:

1. Certain help is needed for the poor at Jerusalem. and Paul gives certain directions concerning it.

---

\* 1 Cor. 16: 1-3

It is only a temporary arrangement for a specific purpose.

2. The order is that every man shall "put aside at home," on the first day of the week what God has enabled him to give for this purpose.

This interpretation is supported by Alford, Schaff, Meyer and others. Neither the historian nor the exegete can find anything in this to indicate a public assembly, or any recognition of the day except as a proper one on which to set aside, each man by himself, his benefaction for the poor. To begin the business of the week thus, was an excellent way to insure a careful consideration of the claims of benevolence and a systematic training in well doing.

These considerations are all that appear in the text, or the circumstances, and they are quite sufficient for the order given.

Polemists quote one passage from the

REVELATION,

from which they seek to infer an argument for the observance of Sunday. They presumptuously assert that the passage forms the source of the use of the term "Lord's-day," as applied to the first day of the week. It reads thus:

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest. write in a book, and send *it* unto the seven churches which are in Asia," etc.\*

Granting, for sake of the argument, that the expres-

---

\* Rev. 1: 10.

sion is correctly rendered, which, however, is fairly questioned on philological grounds, there are serious objections against using it as a source of history.

1. The expression does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

2. The Revelation was, probably, written a quarter of a century *before* the Gospel of John, and the absence of the term "Lord's-day" or any similar term from the gospel in which the first day is distinctly mentioned, (See John 20,) is against every natural conclusion. If Sunday was so sacred as to be called Lord's-day twenty-five years before John's Gospel was written, it is utterly unhistoric to suppose that the term would not appear in the subsequent writings of John and others. This idea is strengthened by the fact that the term does not appear in the post-apostolic writings until about 170 A. D. The passage, therefore, cannot be made a foundation for the history of Sunday as the Lord's-day, because of what it contains; and the circumstances, viewed in the light of the philosophy of history, forbid any application of the term to Sunday.

Thus our survey of the Epistles and of Revelation reveals no history of the first day of the week in the Bible.

For the analysis of the arguments adduced in connection with these passages see, "*Biblical Teachings Concerning the Sabbath and Sunday*," by A. H. Lewis, pp. 76-105.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The material for history during the century immediately succeeding the apostolic period is meager and imperfect. The earlier post-apostolic writings are fragmentary. In many instances neither the date of the treatise nor the name of the author is known. Forgeries abound and real literary ability is sadly wanting. Apocryphal Gospels, Epistles, and the like meet the investigator at every step leading the unwary and over-credulous astray. The stream of written Christian history which runs clear, through the Gospels and the Book of Acts, drops out of sight like a "lost river," for a time, and when it reappears it is not a little polluted by the influences which it has gathered in its under-ground wanderings. Modern scholarship has selected a few things from the mass of material that has come to us claiming to be the product of the immediate post-apostolic age, which are called, "The writings of the Apostolic Fathers." A momentary comparison of these with the genuine shows that they fall infinitely below the apostolic standard. There is "a great gulf between them." Since Sunday has no history in the New Testament, its Puritan and semi-Puritan advocates have labored strenuously to find some support for it in the earlier

post-apostolic productions. Willing to grant unto it all that can be found we will examine these in their order.

THE EPISTLE OF CLEMENT OF ROME, TO THE CORINTHIANS.

This was, probably, written about the year 97 A. D. It is attributed to the companion of Paul spoken of in Phil. 4: 3. A few defenders of Sunday have referred to, or quoted from the fortieth and forty-first chapters, seeking therefrom inferential argument in favor of their theories. The passage with its context is as follows:

“ Seeing then these 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 these he has commanded to be done, not by chance 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 him 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 ail 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; that which is offered being first diligently examined by the high priest and the other ministers we before mentioned. They therefore who do anything which is not agreeable to his will are punished with death.\*

The foregoing evidently refers to the temple worship. Certainly it contains nothing relative to any change of the Sabbath, abrogation of the Sabbath law, or introduction of Sunday. Neither is there any reference or hint relative to any such thing in any other part of the epistle. More; a writer who is thus particular concerning the ceremonies of an outgoing system would not fail to note so prominent a feature of the new system as Sunday observance would have been.

Next in order is a long allegory, which is attributed to the

#### HERMAS

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

Next comes the epistle of

#### POLYCARP TO THE PHILIPPIANS,

which is attributed by some to a disciple of St. John.

---

\* Clement to the Corinthians, chaps. 40, 41. Wake's Trans.; also, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, Dressel, Leipsic, 1857; also Apostolic Fathers, T. & T. Clark, Edinburg, 1879, the latter being somewhat preferable as a translation.

This is evidently incorrect since the best authorities give its probable date as about the middle of the second century. This is also silent concerning Sunday.

#### PAPIAS.

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

#### BARNABAS.

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

"The writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers are, alas! come down to us, for the most part, in a very uncertain condition; partly, because in early times writings were counterfeited, under the name of these venerable men of the church, in order to propagate certain opinions or principles; partly, because, those writings which they had really published were adulterated, and especially so, to serve a Judao-hierarchical party, which would fain crush the free evangelical spirit. We should here, in the first place, have to name Barnabas, the well known fellow traveler of St. Paul, if a letter, which was first known in the second century, in the Alexandrian church, under his name, and which bore the inscription of a Catholic epistle, was really his com-

position. But it is impossible that we should acknowledge this epistle to belong to that Barnabas who was worthy to be the companion of the apostolic labors of St. Paul, and had received his name from the power of his animated discourses in the churches. . . . We find, also, nothing to induce us to believe the author of the epistle was desirous of being considered Barnabas. But since its spirit and its mode of conception corresponded to the Alexandrian taste, it may have happened, that as the author's name was unknown, and persons were desirous of giving it authority, a report was spread abroad in Alexandria, that Barnabas was the author."\*

Mosheim says:

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

Also, this from the same author:

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

Eusebius says:

"Take these which follow for forged works—The Acts of Paul, the book called Pastor, the Revelation

\* Hist. of the Christian Church of the First Three Centuries pp. 407, 408, Rose's Trans.

† Church history, Vol. 1, p. 113, Maclaine's Trans.

‡ Historical Commentaries, Century 2, Sec. 53.

of Peter: moreover, the Epistle fathered upon Barnabas, and the Doctrine called The Apostles.”\*

Prof. Hackett says:

“The letter still extant, which was known as that of Barnabas, even in the second century, can not be defended as genuine.”†

Milner says:

“Of the apostle Barnabas, nothing is known, except what is recorded in the Acts. There we have an honorable encomium of his character, and a particular description of his joint labors with St. Paul. It is a great injury to him, to apprehend the epistle which goes by his name to be his.”‡

Kitto says:

“The so-called epistle of Barnabas, probably a forgery of the second century.”§

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

“But the epistle was not written by Barnabas; it is not merely ‘unworthy of him,’ it would be a disgrace to him, and, what is of much more consequence, it would be a disgrace to the Christian religion, as being the production of one of the authorized teachers of that religion in the time of the apostles, which circumstance would seriously damage the evidence of its divine authority.”||

Prof. W. D. Killen, a prominent representative of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, bears testimony as follows:

\* Hamner’s translation of Eusebius’ Hist. Ecc., liber 3, chap. 22, p. 49, London, 1650.

† Commentary on Acts, p. 251.

‡ Vol. 1, p. 126, Church History.

§ Cyclopaedia Biblical Literature, article Lord’s-day.

|| An Examination of the Six Texts. p. 233.

“The tract known as the ‘Epistle of Barnabas,’ was probably composed in A. D. 135. It is the production, apparently, of a convert from Judaism, who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretations of Scripture.”\*

Rev. Lyman Coleman says:

“The Epistle of Barnabas, bearing the honored name of the companion of Paul in his missionary labors, is evidently spurious. It abounds in fabulous narratives, mystic allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, and fanciful conceits: and is generally agreed by the learned to be of no authority. Neander supposes it to have originated in the Alexandrian school; but at what particular time he does not define.”†

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

“The author was probably a converted Jew from Alexandria, (perhaps by the name of Barnabas, which would easily explain the confusion), to judge from his familiarity with Jewish literature, and, apparently, with Philo, and his allegorical method of handling the Old Testament. In Egypt his Epistle was first known and most esteemed, and the Sinaitic Bible which contains it was probably written in Alexandria or Cæsarea in Palestine. The readers were chiefly Jewish Christians in Egypt, and the East, who overestimated the Mosaic traditions and ceremonies.”‡

The Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, (article Barnabas’ Epistle), speaking of Barnabas the companion of Paul, says:

---

\* History of the Ancient Church, p. 367, New York, 1859.

† Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 2, sec. 2, p. 47, Philadelphia, 1852.

‡ History Christian Church, Vol. 2, p. 677, New York, 1883.

“He could not be the author of a work so full of forced allegories, extravagant and unwarrantable explications of Scripture, together with stories concerning beasts, and such like conceits, as make up the first part of this epistle.”

In the presence of the foregoing evidence, but one conclusion is possible, viz., the Epistle of Barnabas is a vague, fanciful production of some dreamer, forged at an uncertain date in the second century. If the reader cares to look into it, he will find portions of it to be unfit for a respectable page. The passage quoted in favor of Sunday observance reads as follows:

“Even in the beginning of the creation he 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 as a thousand years; as himself testifieth, 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 meaneth 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 on 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, in which Jesus rose from the dead; and having manifested himself to his disciples, he ascended into heaven."\*

It is to be regretted that many writers in favor of Sunday have quoted only the last clause of the foregoing, beginning with the words, "For which cause," etc. They have thus perverted the meaning, and sought to make it appear that the "resurrection" was the main reason assigned for "observing the eighth day with gladness." Whereas, the fanciful notions concerning the creation and the millennium constituted the main reason for such notice of the eighth day. Hence, another conclusion must be added, viz.: If any persons joined with the forger of this epistle in observing the eighth day, their action was predicated on grounds very far removed from common sense, and from the Word of God.

#### IGNATIUS.

One production which is classed with the "Apostolic Fathers" remains to be examined—the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians. This production, like that attributed to Barnabas, is a *forgery*, and the passage adduced in favor of Sunday is caricatured into a seeming reference only by interpolating the word *day*. In support of these statements, we offer the following testimony. First, the passage in full, with its contexts. It is as follows:

---

\* Apostolic Fathers, Epistle Barnabas, chap. 15, Wake's Translation; also, Latin Edition, Dressel, Leipsic, 1857; also Clark's Edition Apostolic Fathers, p. 127.

“ Be not deceived 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; and for this cause were they persecuted, being inspired by his grace to convince the unbelievers and disobedient that there is one God who has manifested himself by Jesus Christ his Son. . .

“ Wherefore, if they who were brought up in these ancient laws, came nevertheless to the newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's-day, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, whom yet some deny, by which mystery we have been brought to believe, and therefore wait that we may be found the disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Master; 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.”\*

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

“ But we must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been

---

\* Ignatius to the Magnesians, secs. 8, 9, Wake's Trans.; for the Latin, see Pat. Apos., Dressel; also, Clark's Edition Apostolic Fathers, p. 180. Clark gives also the longer text, into which the word “ day ” is not put.



referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's-day, though it certainly *contains* no mention of it. It occurs in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about A. D. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. It has, however, been understood in a totally different sense, and as referring to a distinct subject; and such we confess appears to us to be the most obvious and natural construction of it.

“The passage is as follows:

*Εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον—μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες—ἐν ἧ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [ὅν τινες ἀρνοῦνται], δι' οὗ μυστηρίου ἔλαβομεν, . . . πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ. . . .\**

“Now, many commentators assume (on what ground does not appear) that after *κυριακὴν* the word *ἡμέραν* is to be understood. On this hypothesis they endeavor to make the rest of the sentence accord with a reference to the observance of the Lord's-day, by further supposing *ἐν ἧ* to refer to *ἡμέρα* understood, and the whole to be put in contrast with *σαββατίζοντες*, in the former clause. For opinions in support of this view, the reader is referred to the Notes in Jacobson's edition, p. 324.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* *Ignatius ad Magnesias*, sec. 9, *Jacobson's Patres Apost.* 2. 322, Oxford, 1840.

“Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of a substantive to which  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring, by the introduction of  $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ . Now, if we take  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\eta\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$  as simply ‘the life of the Lord,’ having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . Again,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \eta\bar{\eta}$  may well refer to  $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$ , and  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\eta\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$ , meaning our Lord’s life, as emphatically including his *resurrection*, (as in Rom. 5: 10, etc..) presents precisely the same analogy to spiritual life of the Christian as is conveyed both in Rom. 5, Coloss. 3: 3, 4, and many, other passages. Thus, upon the whole, the meaning might be given thus:

“‘If those who lived under the old dispensation have come to the newness of hope, no longer keeping Sabbaths, but living according to our Lord’s life, (in which, as it were, our life has risen again, through him, and his death, [which some deny], through whom we have received the mystery, etc., . . .) how shall we be able to live without him?’ etc.

“In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view, the passage does not refer at all to the Lord’s-day; but even on the opposite supposition, it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term ‘Lord’s-day’ (for which it is often cited) since the material word  $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$  is purely conjectural. It however offers an instance of that species of contrast which the early fathers

were so fond of drawing between the Christian and Jewish dispensations, and between the new life of the Christian and the ceremonial spirit of the law, to which the Lord's-day (if it be imagined to be referred to) is represented as opposed."

The foregoing rendering and interpretation are fully sustained by a late writer of high authority concerning Sunday, James Augustus Hessey, D. C. L. Relative to the passage under consideration, he says:

"Here is a passage from his Epistle to the Magnesians, containing, as you will observe, a contrast between Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of it, an opposition between sabbatizing and living the life of the Lord. . . . If they, then, who were concerned in old things, arrived at a newness of hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living according to the Lord's life, by which our life sprung up by him, and by his death, . . . how can we live without him," etc.\*

Sir William Domville, makes the following just criticism:

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

---

\* Bampton Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1860, p. 41.

the probable 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."\*

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

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

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

---

\* Sabbath, etc., p. 242.

attests that, like the last three books of the Sibyl, they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture.\*

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

Rev. Lyman Coleman, testifies in the following words:

"Certain it is that these epistles, if not an entire forgery, are so filled with interpolations and forgeries as to be of no historical value with reference to the primitive Christians and the apostolic churches."†

John Calvin says:

"Nothing can be more absurd than the impertinences which have been published under the name of Ignatius."‡

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

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

2. "Baur and Hilgenfeld think them all spurious, but are of the opinion that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after 150

\* Ancient Church, sec. 2, chap. 3.

† Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 1, sec. 2.

‡ Institutes, Book 1, chapter 13.

A. D., and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek.

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

4. "A strong array of the ablest and soundest critics, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, such as Mochler and Gieseler, Hefele and Uhlhorn, may still be found on the side of the shorter Greek recension."\*

The following conclusions seem to be just and imperative:

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

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

3. To interpolate the word *day* in the oft-quoted passage perverts the meaning, and destroys the grammatical arrangement of the sentence.

Thus it appears that there is *absolutely no explicit testimony* in favor of Sunday, or the Lord's-day as referring to Sunday, by any of the "Apostolic Fathers." This conclusion, so at variance with the popular notion, invites criticism. It is based on the authorities quoted above, and is not the simple conclusion of the author of these pages. The popular view has been accepted by those who have not examined the case critically, as much else is accepted which comes to us dust covered and surrounded by the shadows of the past. It will not bear the daylight of careful examination.

---

\* *American Presbyterian and Theological Review*, January, 1867.

## CHAPTER VII.

### PLINY'S LETTER TO TRAJAN, AND A FAMOUS FALSEHOOD.

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

“ In the meanwhile, the method I have observed towards those who have been brought before me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were Christians? If they confessed, I repeated the question twice again, adding threats at the same time; when, if they still persevered, I ordered them to be immediately punished; for I was persuaded, whatever the nature of their opinions might be, a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved correction. There were others also brought before me possessed with the same infatuation, but being citizens of Rome, I directed them to be carried thither. But this crime spreading (as is usually the case), while it was actually under prosecution, several instances of the same nature occurred. An information was presented to me without any name subscribed, containing a charge against several persons, who upon examination denied they were Christians, or ever had been. They repeated after me an invocation to the gods, and offered religious rites with wine and frankincense before your statue (which for this purpose I

had ordered to be brought, together with those of the gods), and even reviled the name of Christ; Whereas there is no forcing, it is said, those who are really Christians, into a compliance with any of these articles; I thought proper, therefore, to discharge them. Some among those who were accused by a witness in person, at first confessed themselves Christians, but immediately after denied it; while the rest owned indeed that they had been of that number formerly, but had now, (some above three, others more, and a few above twenty years ago) forsaken that error. They all worshiped your statue and the images of the gods, throwing out imprecations at the same time against the name of Christ.

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

The claim which is made concerning this extract, is, that the certain “ stated day,” was Sunday. But when it is remembered that the Bythinian churches were probably organized by Peter at a time when the observance of the Sabbath, was a common practice of the apostles, it is practically certain that the “ stated day ” was the seventh day. This view is supported

---

\* Pliny's Letters, B. x., Epistle 97, Melmoth's Translation.



by natural inferences, and general facts, relative to the observance of the seventh day which continued in the church for some centuries after the date of Pliny's letter. Böhmer, (as quoted by Holden, p. 292,) takes this view. Gesner in his notes on Pliny concurs with this view.\*

“DOMINICUM SERVASTI.”

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

“The Romans, though they had no objection on this score, punished the Christians for the faithful observance of their day of rest, one of the testing questions put to the martyrs being, *Dominicum servasti?*—Have you kept the Lord's day? Such, however, was the success of truth, and of the example of these good men, that the Lord's-day soon passed from being an object of opprobrium into a law of a great empire. And Julian himself was so impressed with the power of its arrangement of rest and instruction as to contemplate the adoption of a similar provision for reviving and propagating heathen error.”†

This statement has been termed “a famous false-

\* See Hessey, Sunday, p. 370, and Cox, Sabbath Literature. Vol. 1. p. 297.

† Sabbath, etc., p. 7.

hood." We are not ready to assume that Mr. Gilfillan, and others who have repeated the statement, so understood, or designed it. But the facts given below, show that anxiety to find support for Sunday in the early times, and incomplete knowledge, or both, have led them into a great error. Mr. Gilfillan gives as authority, ("Baron, *An Eccles*, A. D. 303, Num. 35," etc.), which will be examined. Mr. Gurney shapes his effort as follows:

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

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

"A thing so notorious, so well known even to the

---

\* Brief Remarks on the History, etc. of the Sabbath, p. 36.

heathen themselves, as it was (in the Acts of the Martyrs) ever an usual question of theirs (even of course) in their examining; what? *Dominicum servasti?*—‘Hold you the Sunday?’ and their answer known; they all aver it. *Christianus sum, intermittere non possum*—‘I am a Christian; I can not intermit it, not the Lord’s-day in any wise.’ These are examples enough.”

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

On pages 131 and 132 of a work in favor of Sunday, written by William Twisse, D. D., of the English Church, and published at London in 1641, about ten or twelve years after the publication of Andrews’

work, is the same quotation, which Twisse says is from Andrews' speech against Thraske in the court of the Star Chamber. In the history of the trial of Thraske as given by a contemporary,\* the same passage is quoted from Bishop Andrews' speech against him.

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

But the case is made still more unsatisfactory when we search for the authority on which Bishop Andrews made his loose statement. He refers to the Acts of the Martyrs only in a general way, citing no instance wherein such a question was asked. Careful search reveals the fact that *no such question is anywhere recorded*. Domville states the result of his researches as follows:†

"The most complete collection of the memoirs and legends still extant relative to the lives and sufferings of the Christian martyrs, is that of Ruinart, entitled, '*Acta primorum Martyrum, sincera et selec-*

---

\* Paggit Herisiography, p. 20, London, 1661.

† For Domville's entire discussion, see Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 251-273.

ta.' I have myself carefully consulted that work, and I take it upon myself to affirm, that among the questions there stated to have been put to the martyrs, in and before the time of Pliny, and for nearly two hundred years afterwards, the question, *Dominicum servasti?* does not once occur, or any equivalent question, such, for instance, as *Dominicum celebrasti?*

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

Having stated these questions, Domville continues:

"This much may suffice to show that *Dominicum servasti?* was no question in Pliny's time, as Mr. Gurney intends us to believe it was. I have however still other proof to offer of Mr. Gurney's unfair dealing with the subject, but I defer stating it for the present, that I may proceed in the inquiry, what may have been the authority on which Bishop Andrews relied when stating that *Dominicum servasti?* was ever a usual question put by the heathen persecutors. I shall with this view pass over the martyrdoms which intervened between Pliny's time and the fourth century, as they contain nothing to the purpose, and shall come at once to that martyrdom, the narrative of which was, I have no doubt, the source from which Bishop Andrews derived his question, *Dominicum servasti?* 'Hold you the Lord's-day?' This martyrdom happened A. D. 304. (Baronius puts it one year earlier.—A. H. L.) The sufferers were Saturninus and his four sons, and several other persons. They were taken to Carthage and brought before the proconsul Amulinus. In the account given of their examination by him, the phrases '*Celebrare dominicum,*' and '*agere dominicum,*' frequently occur, but in no instance is the verb *servare* used in

reference to *dominicum* I mention this chiefly to show that when Bishop Andrews, alluding, as no doubt he does, to the narrative of this martyrdom, says the question was *Dominicum servasti?* it is very clear he had not his author at hand, and that, in trusting to his memory, he coined a phrase of his own."

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

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

and the Lord's Supper. For the former they quote among other authorities a canon of the council of *Neo-Cæsarea*. 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.\* 3. Gesner who, in his Latin Thesaurus published in 1749, gives both meanings to the word *dominicum*. For that of the Lord's Supper he quotes Cyprian; for that of a church he quotes Cyprian and also Hillary."

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

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

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

2. Mr. Gurney, Dr. Dwight, and others, have referred to Bishop Andrews' speech and to Pliny's let-

---

\* Vol. 5, pp. 116, 117, Antwerp, 1700.

ter in such a way as to lead their readers into a very grave error concerning the whole matter.

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



were put to the prisoners, whose arrest was made because they had *celebrated the Lord's Supper* against the command of the Emperor. *Dominicum* and *Collectam* are used as equivalent in these questions, and always in such connections as indicate a *rite* performed in Christian assemblies. But the case is rendered still plainer by the fact that Baronius defines these terms when he records the account of this trial, in which they were used. He says: "By the words, *Collectam*, *Collectionem*, and *Dominicum*, the author always understands the sacrifice of the Mass."\* In concluding the account of the martyrdom of this company, he says:

"It has been shown above, in relating these things, that the Christians were moved, even in the time of severe persecution, to celebrate the *Dominicum*. Evidently, as we have declared elsewhere in many places, it was a sacrifice without bloodshed, and of divine appointment."†

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

---

\* Baronius, Tome 2, A. D. 303, No. 29, p. 884, Venetii, 1738.  
 † *Ib.*, *Id.*, No. 82, p. 897.

## "TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES."

Lest we be charged with ignoring the latest discoveries, we must here note the "Teaching of the Apostles," which has lately come to light. When it appeared, a few proclaimed triumphantly, that the early observance of the "Lord's day" was now settled. The facts do not support any such conclusion.

When the document first appeared, after a careful study of it and its surroundings, we spoke of it as follows:

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

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

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

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

"The *Teaching* consists of two distinct parts. The first, which is earliest and more nearly pure, consists of the first six chapters, which are wholly didactic. These represent the genuine 'Teaching'

The second portion, chapters 7-16, are made up of fragments from other writings, and of references to practices and notions of later and indefinite date, and not necessarily contemporaneous. The grounds on which we base this hypothesis are as follows:

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

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

“‘How supreme its law of righteousness, and pure its standard of morals. Like all sound catechisms, this one goes back to the Decalogue. It takes the form of precept and injunction. It prohibits absolutely. There can be no evangelical training of the young with the law omitted.’\* ”

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

---

\* Andover Review, April, 1884, p. 435.

like a single rare diamond among less precious stones.

“3. The additions which follow the sixth chapter are such as a later and more corrupt age would naturally make. Undoubtedly the catechism was designed as, and understood to be the antecedent to baptism, not as a ‘confession of faith,’ but as a guide to life. Apostolic and sub-apostolic Christianity consisted of a life, not a creed. To do, not to believe, was the absorbing thought. As ritualism became more prominent and the church passed into the transition period wherein apostolic Christianity was changed to Patristic, in which philosophy did much abound,—under such circumstances compiling fingers would itch to add to the simple catechism the developing notions and theories concerning Christian life. Naturally, therefore, the seventh chapter opens with baptism, the event for which the catechism was the preparation. The change between the sixth and subsequent chapters is more than the change from the simple didactic to the ritual. The didactic portion is mainly Scriptural; the ritualistic is not. Inferences aside, and the second part of the Teaching will not bear comparison with the New Testament on many points. Baptism, fasting, the eucharist, and forms of prayer form the themes for four chapters—7-10; none of these are treated with reference to their higher and spiritual significance, but rather from the stand-point of a growing ritualism. The Lord’s Prayer, with the Doxology in part, is ordered ‘three times’ in each day. This certainly marks a point later than the middle of the second century.

“The 11th and 12th chapters give directions for the reception and treatment of apostles and prophets, such as indicate a period decidedly post-apostolic. Christ directed his disciples to abide where they first entered during their indefinite stay in any city. Paul labored weeks, months, and years, in

specific fields, as the work demanded. But this 11th chapter forbids an apostle to remain more than *one day* unless necessity compel; in that case he may stay *two days*. 'But if he remain three days he is a false prophet.' It also orders that when he departs he shall be given only bread enough to last until he lodge again, and assures us that if he asks for money he is a false prophet. This is puerile. The same chapter has the following unmeaning sentence: 'And no prophet who orders a meal in the spirit, eateth of it, unless indeed he is a false prophet.' This is as senseless as some of the vagaries of Barnabas and points to a date much later than 120 A. D., or to a degeneracy so rapid as to challenge credulity," etc.\*

When we thus wrote, so far as we knew, no critic had taken that ground. A little later the opinion of Hilgenfeld appeared, as follows:

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

A few months later, the following appeared, which is sufficient to settle the question in the mind

---

\*Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly, July, 1884, pp. 17, 18.

†The Independent, June 26, 1884.

of every one, not blinded by prejudice, or incapacitated by ignorance:

“Bryennios on the ‘Teaching.’”

“BY PROF. E. A. GROVENOR, ROBERT COLLEGE  
CONSTANTINOPLE.”

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

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

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

“Everybody knows that the ‘Teaching,’ as published in the Constantinople edition of Bryennios, contains sixteen short chapters. The first six comprise enforcement of duties and prohibition of sins and crimes; the last ten, commencing with the seventh, consist mainly of liturgical and ecclesiastical prescriptions and ordinances. Now the Bishop says the ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ is limited entirely to those first six chapters and, inasmuch as it is derived through them from the Lord, each word therein is of binding force. But, he says, the last ten chapters are entirely distinct, and have no authority whatever, except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunctions. How far he was correct in these injunctions the Bishop says we cannot know. Their only weight is found in the fact that they are the expression of

opinion of one person who was presumably a good man. To quote as exactly as I can the Bishop's language: 'In the year 100, 120, 140—we are not sure what year—a man says to himself, "I will write down just what the apostles have taught and what they learned from the Lord. I will write down what they said about special duties and sins. I will write down just what they said about the two ways of virtue and vice." So he goes to work and writes it down just as well as he can remember, and, doubtless, he has in it the aid of God's Spirit. All he has written down is from Christ; it is just what the apostles said; it is addressed only to Christians, and this is what should bear the inscription of "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." All this occupies just six exceedingly brief chapters. But when he has done that, the writer is not satisfied. All he has done is that he has been a sort of amanuensis in writing down teachings for the practical guidance of the saints. But the heathen are being converted and pouring into the church. In the manner of receiving them vastly different customs exist. There is no manual of directions on the subject. In one place they do this; in another place they do that. The variety of procedure is becoming a scandal. Christ did not formulate a system. He gave only a faith; and the apostles did hardly more. "Now," says the man, whom we will call the transcriber, inasmuch as nothing in the six chapters was original to him, "I will do something more. I will write what shall be good for those coming into the church, and what shall be a sort of guide or manual to the clergy in dealing with them." We may suppose that, after great study and investigation and reflection, or, possibly, with but little of such study, investigation, and reflection, the man makes up his mind as to what ought to be the course of procedure, or as to what is the course of procedure in the majority of cases, and then, without inspiration, he

writes it down. It is possible, even, that his opinion may be in opposition to that of the vast majority of other believers. Hence the last ten chapters, as authority, have no value whatever. (*Δὲν ἔχουσι οὐδεμίαν ἀξίαν.*) Possibly the *τοῖς ἐδνεσιν* was then put here at the beginning of the seventh chapter, and preceded by the words: "Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles," thus making it in the original as distinct, and yet the writer honestly believing it the Teaching of the Lord because it seemed so wise and so clear to him. Possibly the inscription was simply (*τοῖς ἐδνεσιν*) and, at last, with the title, "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" prefixed, all was transported to the beginning of the book. But the sum of it is, these ten chapters have no authority save as the opinion of the unknown writer. There may have been a hundred men more capable than he of expressing an opinion, only he wrote down his opinion, and others did not. The first six chapters have upon us the binding force of the word of God. The *Διδαχὴ* is, properly speaking, the first six chapters and no more.

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

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

Then the learned Bishop, who is profoundly versed in all the intricacies and subtleties of apostolic and ecclesiastical history, made a remark which, for its ingeniousness and ingenuousness, I must quote. 'We know that many of these rules and directions had no authority save in the mind of the writer,



from the fact that, during the first and second centuries after Christ, the observance and customs of the church, in many respects, were different from what the writer approves and lays down in the last ten chapters. At the same time, we know that the teachings of the first six chapters are exactly the same as those of Christ and his apostles.'

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

" 'But,' said I, 'is this fully in harmony with Your Holiness's discussion of the writer of the *Διδάχῃ* on certain pages of last year's Constantinople edition.'

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

We have treated of this document thus at length, for the sake of many readers who may not have had the opportunity to become familiar with it, and also to show that the second portion, in which occurs the reference that is claimed in support of Sunday, is of a later date, and of less worth than the

---

\* The Independent, Oct. 15, 1884.

earlier. This reference is in the *fourteenth* chapter, and is translated by Hitchcock and Brown, as follows:

“But on the Lord’s day do ye assemble and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure.”

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

“Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ἦ.”

It will be seen that the structure of the opening clause is more than “pleonastic;” it is awkward. If the word *day* be supplied, or if the adjective be used for the substantive, we should have, “On the Lord’s (day) of the Lord,” etc. Dr. Potter suggests another meaning to the passage, which is certainly worthy of careful consideration, for while it does not relieve the imperfect construction of the clause, it accords perfectly with the meaning of the chapter. He says:

“The word *day* in the translation is entirely gratuitous. The word ἡμεραν, is not in the text, and other words are as much entitled to the place as this. The chapter is devoted to the Lord’s Supper and the qualifications necessary to enable one to become a partaker thereof. Should the word *τραπε-*

ξαν, *table*, be supplied instead of ἡμέραν, unity would be maintained and the sense complete, reading as follows: 'Coming together to the Lord's table, break the bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions,' etc."\*

Whatever meaning may be given to the imperfect clause, nothing is gained for the cause of Sunday observance. The portion of the "Teaching" in which it occurs, is certainly later than the time of Justin Martyr, and likely to be contemporaneous with the Apostolic Constitutions. The words of Justin (p. 71,) show how and why Sunday was observed as an eucharist day, in the latter half of the second century. The history of "Sunday," as the resurrection festival, begins there. "Lord's day" comes in *later*.

---

\* Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly, July, 1884, p. 14.

## CHAPTER VIII.

# JUSTIN MARTYR. THE FIRST DIRECT REFERENCE TO SUNDAY, AND THE RISE OF NO-SABBATHISM.

The middle of the second century marks the beginning of a new era in the Sabbath question. The first direct and indisputable reference to any form of Sunday observance by Christians, is made at this time, and simultaneously and by the same man, the No-Sabbath theory is propounded. Up to this time, Monotheism and the Scriptures had held the better part of the church to the Sabbath, as taught in the Decalogue. Polytheism and heathen philosophy ignored this idea, and openly proclaimed a type of no-lawism and absolute no-Sabbathism. It was a part of the fruitage which came from the corruption of the Apostolic Church and the gospel by admixture with heathen fancies and speculations. Under the sway of these loose ideas, Sunday, already a festival among the heathen, found gradual welcome at the hands of the semi-Christianized leaders in the church, and final recognition by a still less Christianized form of civil government during the third and

fourth centuries. Justin Martyr stands as a prominent representative of this no-Sabbathism, and also as an apologist for Christianity, who sought to soften the fury of the heathen Persecutors, by claiming a similarity between Christianity and heathenism. The entire passage concerning Sunday is as follows; only a part of it is usually quoted by writers who support the theory that Sunday is the Sabbath:

“ On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell either in towns or in the country; and the Memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets are read, as long as the time permits. Then, when the reader hath ceased, the President delivers a discourse in which he reminds and exhorts them to the imitation of all these good things. We then all stand up together and put forth prayers. Then, as we have already said, when we cease from prayer, bread is brought, and wine, and water; and the President in like manner offers up prayers and praises with his utmost power; and the people express their assent by saying, Amen. The consecrated elements are then distributed and received by every one, and a portion is sent by the deacons to those who are absent.

“ Each of those also who have abundance, and are willing, according to his choice, gives what he thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the President, who succors the fatherless and the widows, and those who are in necessity from disease or any other cause; those also who are in bonds, and the strangers who are sojourning among us; and in a word takes care of all who are in need.

“ We all of us assemble together on Sunday, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter and made the world. On the same day also Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For he was crucified the day before that of

Saturn: and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, he appeared to his apostles and disciples and taught them what we now submit to your consideration."\*

The foregoing extract will be better understood if the reader remembers that the author was a Grecian philosopher who accepted—we dare not say was converted to—Christianity, after reaching the age of manhood, and who retained many of his heathen notions and sympathies through life. The days referred to, Saturn's and the Sun's, are designated only by their heathen names, and the reasons which are given for meeting on Sunday are at once fanciful and unscriptural. The passage shows Justin in his true place as an Apologist, who sympathized with both parties, and sought to soften the feelings of the emperor by indicating those points in which Christianity and heathenism agreed. The following extracts from the same author show that he could not entertain any idea of the Sun's day as being in any sense *the Sabbath*, or even *a Sabbath*. In his *Dialogue With Trypho the Jew*, the differences between Justin's theories of Christianity, and Judaism, are strongly set forth, and the Sabbath is frequently referred to. In the 23d section of the *Dialogue*, he says:

“If we will not acknowledge this, we must necessarily fall into notions that can not be admitted, either that there was not the same God in the days

---

\* Apology for the Christians to Antonius Pius, sections 87-89, Chevalier's translation, pp. 224-5; also Clark's Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 2, pp. 65, 66.

of Enoch, and all the rest, who did not practice circumcision according to the flesh, and keep the Sabbaths, and those other rites and ceremonies which are enjoined by the law of Moses, or that he did not care that all mankind should always perform the same righteous acts, which suppositions are absurd and ridiculous. We must therefore confess that it was for the sake of sinful men, that he who is always the same, commanded these same things to be observed, and can pronounce him friendly to man, possessed of foreknowledge, needing nothing, just and good. If this be not so, tell me sir, what are your opinions on the subject? When none of them made any reply, I continued, I will then repeat to you, Trypho, and to those who wish to become proselytes, that divine doctrine which I myself heard from the man of whom I spoke. Do you not see that the elements stay not from working, nor do they keep any Sabbaths. Remain as you were born. For if circumcision was not needful before Abraham, nor Sabbath feasts, nor sacrifices before Moses, neither are they so now, when according to the will of God, Jesus Christ His Son has been born without sin, of the Virgin Mary, who was of the race of Abraham.”\*

In another place, he says:

“ The new law commands you to keep a perpetual Sabbath, and you rest on one day and think that you are religious, not considering why that commandment was given you. Again, if you eat unleavened bread, you say that you have fulfilled the law of God, but it is not by such means that the Lord our God is pleased. If any one of you is guilty of perjury or theft, let him sin no more. If any be an adulterer let him repent, and then he will have kept a true and pleasant Sabbath of God ”†

\* Library of the Fathers, Vol. 40, p. 98. Oxford edition; also Ante-Nicene Library. Vol. 2, pp. 115, 116.

† Library of the Fathers, Vol. 40, p. 85; also Ante-Nicene, Vol. 2, p. 101.

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

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

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

Thus it appears that Justin is at once the first of the "Fathers" who makes any authentic mention

---

\* *Dialogue*, chap. 10. † *Ante-Nicene Lib.* Vol. 2, p. 139.



of the pre-eminence of Sunday among Christians, and the first exponent of absolute no-Sabbathism. It is also pertinent to note, as Dr. Hessey has done,\* that Justin always uses “*σαββατιζειν*” “with exclusive reference to the Jewish law,” and that “he carefully distinguishes Saturday, the day after which our Lord was crucified from Sunday upon which he rose from the dead.” In the face of these facts, it is manifestly unjust to claim Justin as an advocate of the sacredness of Sunday, either as the “Puritan,” the “Christian,” or the “Anglo-American” Sabbath. It were better to let him stand in his true place as the exponent of semi-pagan no-Sabbathism.

What we do learn from Justin, inferences and suppositions aside, is this: At the middle of the second century, certain Christians held some form of religious service on Sunday. All that Justin says is compatible with the idea that the day was not regarded as a Sabbath, and his silence concerning any *Sabbatic* observance, is strong negative proof of the absence of any such idea. His no-Sabbathism is added proof of this. It is further apparent that since he undertook to describe the things which were done on Sunday, and to give the reasons therefor, that had anything like the modern theory of a Sunday Sabbath then obtained, he must have mentioned the fact. Domville sums up the case as follows:

---

\* Sunday, p. 43, sec. 11.

“This inference appears irresistible when we further consider that Justin, in this part of his Apology is professedly intending to describe the mode in which Christians observed the Sunday. . . . He evidently intends to give all information requisite to an accurate knowledge of the subject he treats upon. He is even so particular as to tell the Emperor why the Sunday was observed; and he does, in fact, specify every active duty belonging to the day, the Scripture reading, the exhortation, the public prayer, the Sacrament, and the alms-giving: why then should he not also inform the Emperor of the one inactive duty of the day, the duty of abstaining from doing in it any manner of work? . . . If such was the custom of Christians in Justin’s time, his description of their Sunday duties was essentially defective. . . . But even were it probable he should intend to omit all mention of it in his Apology to the Emperor, it would be impossible to imagine any sufficient cause for his remaining silent on the subject in his *Dialogue* with Trypho the Jew; and this whether the Dialogue was real or imaginary, for if the latter, Justin would still, as Dr. Lardner has observed, ‘choose to write in character.’ . . . The testimony of Justin, therefore, proves most clearly two facts of great importance in the Sabbath controversy; the one, that the Christians in his time observed the Sunday as a prayer day, the other that they did not observe it as a Sabbath-day.”\*

Such is the summary of the case at the year 150 A. D. No-Sabbathism, and some form of Sunday observance were born at the same time. Trained in heathen philosophies until manhood, Justin accepted Christianity as a better philosophy than he

---

\* Sabbath. Examination of the Six Texts; p. 274, seq., London, 1849.

had before found. Such a man, and those like him, could scarcely do other than build a system quite unlike apostolic Christianity. That which they did build was a paganized rather than an apostolic type.

## CHAPTER IX.

# OTHER WRITERS, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NO-SABBATHISM,

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

### DIONYSIUS.

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, stands next upon the list of writers, who are claimed as mentioning Sunday. (We shall discuss the expression "Lord's day" in another place.) The passage quoted is said to be from a letter addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome. Only a fragment of the letter is extant, being found in Eusebius.\* A Latin volume of Eusebius, published in 1570, gives chap. 22. The passage is usually translated liberally as follows:

"To day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we read your letter, which we shall hereafter read continually, as we do that of Clemens, that we may be replenished with precepts and wholesome instructions." The passage as found in the Latin

---

\* Ecc. Hist., Book 4, chap. 23.

edition of Eusebius, noted above, is as follows: "*Sanctam hodie Dominicam diem peregrimus, in una vestram legimus epistolam, quam semper admonitionis gratia legemus, sicut et priorem nobis per Clementem scriptam.*" Routh\* gives "transegimus" instead of of "peregrimus," and in the Greek text gives, "*διηγάγομεν.*"

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

## MELITO.

Testimony in favor of Sunday is also sought from Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who wrote a book "on the Sabbath," some say; "on the Lord's-day," say others. The basis on which these and similar statements rest is this: None of the books written by him are extant. Eusebius† pretends to give a list of works written by him. Routh‡ gives the title of this one as *Ὁ Περὶ Κυριακῆς Λόγος*. Thus we have simply a book or discourse "concerning the Lord's—." Evidently an imperfect title, with no clue concerning the important word to be supplied. There were many other themes concern-

\* *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Vol. 1, p. 180. † *Ecc. Hist. Book 4, chap. 25.* ‡ *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Vol. 1, p. 120.

ing which one might write besides the Lord's *day*. It is not surprising that Eusebius should supply the ellipsis with the word "day." He wrote one hundred and fifty years after the time of Melito, and evidently had no authority except a mutilated catalogue, or tradition. He was a great admirer of Constantine, and an earnest supporter of his "Sunday legislation." His comments upon some of the Psalms evince an unwarrantable effort to give a religious character to the Sunday. With such tendencies and under such circumstances, Eusebius would naturally be tempted to claim Melito as a "Sunday author." In the same chapter, Eusebius states that Melito wrote a discourse concerning "Easter," in the preface to which he says that it was written at a time when "there was a great stir at Laodicea concerning the Sabbath, which in those days, by reason of the times, was broken up." (*Mota est Laodiceæ magna questio Sabbato, quod in diebus illis pro ratione temporis, inciderat.*) In this statement, there is, clearly, a reference to the flood of no-Sabbathism which found its first prominent advocate in Justin a quarter of a century before the time of Melito. It also shows that the distinctive y Christian element in the church withstood this semi-Pagan apostasy, and hence a "great stir was made."

## IRENÆUS.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, flourished during the last quarter of the second century. Positive dates concerning him and his writings are wanting. Probably the most of his writings which have come down

to us were written after 180 A. D. One brief passage ascribed to him has been quoted and paraphrased by several modern writers in such a way as to indicate inexcusable carelessness, to say the least. Dr. Justin Edwards, says:

“Hence Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A. D. 167, says that the Lord’s-day was the Christian Sabbath. His words are, ‘On the Lord’s-day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.’”\*

Mr. Gurney and others among English writers have used similar language. Mr. Gilfillan is somewhat more guarded in his use of Irenæus, though not less deceptive as to his real teachings, and the facts relative to the foregoing quotation. The important fact to be considered is this: *The writings of Irenæus contain no such passage.* In support of this statement we offer the following testimony from the pen of Sir William Domville:

“Mr. Gurney, in speaking of the Christians of the second century, says: ‘Irenæus, 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. Gur-

---

\* Sabbath Manual, p. 114.

ney, it is evident from his *Brief Remarks*, is well versed in the original writings of the Fathers; and if so, he ought not to rely on any person but himself for faithful quotations from them.

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

“The quotation from Irenæus occurs in one of these sermons, (Vol. 4, p. 28, ed. 1819.) The original passage in Irenæus is not given in the edition which I have seen; we only have his English version of it, nor is the place where it is to be found in the works of Irenæus pointed out.”\*

We have thus quoted from Domville, because of

---

\*Sabbath, Examination of the Six Texts, p. 127. et. seq.



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

“There is nothing now remaining of Irenæus besides his five books against heresies, and fragments of some other pieces; and those five books, which were written by him in Greek, are extant only in an ancient Latin version, excepting some fragments preserved by Eusebius, and other Greek writers who have quoted them.”\*

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

“But, although not found in Irenæus, there are in the writings ascribed to another Father, namely, in the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, and in one of its interpolated passages, expressions so closely resembling those in Dr. Dwight's quotation, as to leave no doubt of the source from which he quoted. . . . Unwilling to rely merely up-

---

\* Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Vol. 2, pp: 292, 293, London, 1347.

on the identity of the passage in Ignatius, with the quotations made as from Irenæus by Drs. Dwight and Paley, I have carefully searched through all the extant works of Irenæus, 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."\*

We have carefully verified the statement made above by Sir William Domville, and do not hesitate to repeat that Irenæus contains no such passage as the one attributed to him.

Nor is the passage from the interpolated Epistle of Ignatius given in full; why, we do not know, unless it be that when the *whole* passage is given it overthrows the claim which is made concerning a part of it when standing alone. That our readers may see the whole, we insert the passage which is as follows:

“Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for ‘he that does not work, let him not eat.’ For, say the [holy] oracles, ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.’ But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits

---

\* Examination of the Six Texts, pp. 131, 132; also Cox, Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, supplement, p. 329.

which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, 'To the end, for the eighth day,' on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ," etc. (Chapter 9.)\*

Thus it is shown that the oft-quoted passage from Irenæus must be placed upon the list of "things wanting;" and its use by those who have thus incorrectly predicated an argument upon it must be called, putting it mildly, a *serious mistake*. A single passage from the more authentic writings of Irenæus and the only one in which he discusses the Sabbath question, at length, will show the reader his theory concerning the matter of Sabbath keeping. Giving this, we will dismiss him from the witness stand:

"It is clear, therefore, that he loosed and vivified those who believe in him as Abraham did, doing nothing contrary to the law when he healed upon the Sabbath day. For the law did not prohibit men from being healed upon the Sabbaths; [on the contrary] it even circumcised them upon that day, and gave command that the offices should be performed by the priests for the people; yea, it did not disallow the healing even of dumb animals. Both at Siloam and on frequent subsequent occasions, did he perform cures upon the Sabbath; and for this reason many used to resort to him on the Sabbath-days. For the law commanded them to abstain from every servile work, that is, from all grasping after wealth

---

\* Those wishing to examine this passage will find that it is excluded from Wakes' edition of the Fathers. It is given in the "Longer" form of the epistle, which is the most complete, in Ante-Nicene Library—Apost. Fathers, p. 181.

which is procured by trading and by other worldly business; but it exhorted them to attend to the exercises of the soul, which consist in reflection, and to addresses of a beneficial kind for their neighbor's benefit. And therefore the Lord reproved those who unjustly blamed him for having healed upon the Sabbath days. For he did not make void, but fulfilled the law, by performing the offices of the high-priest, propitiating God for men, and cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and himself suffering death, that exiled man might go forth from condemnation, and might return without fear to his own inheritance. And again, the law did not forbid those who were hungry on the Sabbath-days to take food lying ready at hand; it did, however, forbid them to reap and to gather into the barn.'\*

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

“They (the Jews) had therefore a law, a course of discipline, and a prophecy of future things. For God at the first, indeed warning them by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning he had implanted in mankind, that is, by means of the Decalogue (which if any one does not observe, he has no salvation) did then demand nothing more of them.”†

---

\* Against Heresies, Library of the Fathers, B. 4, chap. 8; also Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 5, pp. 397, 398.

† Against Heresies, B. 18, chap. 15.

## CHAPTER X.

### TERTULLIAN AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

The following, from the pen of Neander, will fairly introduce the next writer to be examined:

“Quintus Septimus Tertullianus was born in the later years of the second century, probably at Carthage, and was the son of a centurion in the service of the Proconsul at Carthage. He was at first an advocate or rhetorician, and arrived at manhood before he was converted to Christianity; and he then obtained, if the account given by Jerome is correct, the office of a Presbyter. . . . He was a man of ardent mind, warm disposition, and deeply serious character, accustomed to give himself up with all his soul and strength to the object of his love, and haughtily to reject all which was uncongenial to that object. He had a fund of great and multifarious knowledge, but it was confusedly heaped up in his mind, without scientific arrangement. His depth of thought was not united with logical clearness and judgment; a warm uncontrolled imagination that dwelt in sensuous images, was his ruling power.”\*

Tertullian wrote extensively concerning almost all points of Christian doctrine. The following extracts will show what his opinions were relative to the Sunday. The quotations here made are carefully translated from the Latin edition of Gersdorf,

---

\* Church History, First Three Centuries, p. 425.

Leipsic, 1839, and compared with the English translation found in Library of the Fathers, Oxford, 1842.

“It follows therefore, that inasmuch as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law has been proved, so also the observation of the temporal Sabbath has been demonstrated. For the Jews say that God from the beginning, sanctified the seventh day by resting from all his works; and that Moses said to the people, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy, in it thou shalt do no servile work, but only that work which concerns the soul, by which we know more, namely: that we should always sabbatize from all servile work, not only on the seventh day alone, but through all time. And we must now require which Sabbath God wishes us to keep, for the Scriptures speak of an eternal, and of a temporal Sabbath. For Isaiah the prophet says: 1: 14, ‘Your Sabbaths my soul hateth;’ and in another place, ‘Ye have profaned my Sabbaths;’ from which we learn that the temporal Sabbath is to be considered human, the eternal Sabbath divine. For this is foretold through Isaiah 66: 23. He says: ‘From one moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me saith the Lord;’ which we understand to have been fulfilled in the time of Christ, when all flesh—that is all men—came to Jerusalem to adore God the Father through his Son Jesus Christ, as was foretold by the prophet—Isaiah 4: 9—‘Behold proselytes shall come to thee through me.’ Hence as there was a spiritual, before the carnal circumcision, there was also an eternal Sabbath pre-existing, and predicated before the temporal Sabbath. So they may say, as we have before said, that Adam sabbatized; or that Abel, when he offered the holy sacrifice, pleased God by the observance of the Sabbath; or that Enoch when he was translated, was an observer of the Sabbath; or that

Noah observed the Sabbath in building the Ark on account of the great deluge; or that Abraham offered his son Isaac in the observance of the Sabbath; or that Melchizedek received the law of the Sabbath in his priesthood. But the Jews say that the Sabbath must be observed because it was commanded by Moses.

“It is therefore clear that the precept was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporal, and might at some time cease. Hence I add that the solemnities of the Sabbath, that is the seventh day, are not to be celebrated by idleness, as Joshua showed in the time when he destroyed the city of Jericho. A command was given him from God, that he should direct the people to carry the ark of the testimony around the city seven days, and when the seven days were ended the walls would fall of their own accord, and so it happened when the seven days were ended the walls fell. Now it is very evident that the Sabbath occurred on one of these days. For seven days wherever you begin to reckon must include the Sabbath; upon which day not only the priests worked, but the city was taken at the edge of the sword by the whole people of Israel. Also in the time of Maccabees the people fought bravely on the Sabbath; or in their attack upon Allophytes; and they thus restored the law to its pristine condition. Nor do I believe that they have defended any law except that which they remembered to have been given concerning the Sabbath. Whence it is clear that precepts of this nature were applicable to the necessities of the time, and that God did not give the law to be perpetually observed.”\*

The reader can judge for himself concerning the soundness of the foregoing effort at argument, and

---

\* “Against the Jews,” chap. 4, Lib. Fathers, Vol. 10; also Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 18, pp. 211, 212.

its agreement with the Word of God. It shows plainly that Tertullian was a warm advocate of the no-Sabbath theory. His views reveal a fuller development of that no-lawism which "cropped out" fifty years before, in the writings of Justin. Tertullian's ardent nature accepted and proclaimed the full fruitage of this theory, as is shown by the following from another work:

' The Holy Spirit reproacheth the Jews for their feast days. Your Sabbaths, says he, and your new moons, and your ordinances my soul hateth. And do we, to whom these Sabbaths belong not; nor the new moons; nor the feast days once beloved of God, celebrate the feasts of Saturn and of January, and of the winter solstice, and the feast of Matron's? For us shall offerings flow in, presents jingle, sports and feasts roar? Oh truer fealty of the heathen to their own religion which taketh to itself no rite of the Christians! No Lord's day; no Pentecost; even had they have known them, would they have shared with us. For they would be afraid lest they should be thought Christians. We are not afraid lest we be openly declared to be heathen! If thou must needs have some indulgence for the flesh too, thou hast it, and thou hast not only as many days as they, but even more. For the heathen festival is on but one day in every year, thine upon every eighth day. Gather out the several solemn feasts of the heathen and set them out in order; they will not be able to make up a Pentecost.'\*

Here we have the native character of the Sunday truly set forth. "*If thou must needs have some indulgence to the flesh, thou hast it every eighth day.*"

---

\* De Idolitria, chap. 14, Vol. 10, Lib. Fathers; also Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 11, pp. 162, 163.



Such was the legitimate, the unavoidable fruitage of this semi-pagan festivalism, a fruitage which poisoned the church as fast as it ripened.

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

“As touching kneeling, also prayer is subject to a variation in its observance, though there are certain ones, a scanty few, who keep from their knees on the Sabbath, which disagreement being exceedingly criminated in the churches, the Lord will give grace that they may either yield, or hold their own opinions without offense to others. (Here Tertullian quotes his authority as follows: ‘On all Sabbaths, Lord’s-days, and likewise during the days from Easter to All-saints, not to kneel in prayer. Joann Monach Canonarium apud Morinus de Poenit.’) But we, as we have received, ought, on the day of the Lord’s resurrection alone, to keep from not only that, but every posture of painfulness, and to forbear all offices, deferring even our business, that we *give no place to the devil*. Equally in the season of Pentecost also, which is expended in the same solemnities of rejoicing. But on every day, who would hesitate to prostrate himself before God at least in that first prayer with which we enter upon the dawn” But on the Fasts and Stations, no prayer must be observed without kneeling, and the other usual modes of humiliation. For we are not only praying, but deprecating, and making satisfaction to God our Lord.”\*

In order to understand the foregoing, the reader will need to remember that “kneeling” was deemed

---

\* “Concerning Prayer,” chap. 23, Vol. 10, Lib. Fathers; also Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 11, p. 199.

an expression of sorrow not suited to the *joyful festivals*, but rather befitting to the *sorrowful fasts*. The suggestion relative to "derferring even our business," is made to impress the idea that nothing should be allowed to interrupt the *joys* of the day. The expression is far from denoting a *sabbatic* rest, especially since the whole "season of Pentecost" was to be spent in this manner, with the same immunity from kneeling and from care. In another place Tertullian says:

"On the Lord's-day we account it unlawful to fast, or to wor-ship upon the knees. We enjoy the same freedom from Easter day even unto Pentecost."\*

Bishop Kaye has summed up the testimony of Tertullian concerning the question before us in the following statements:

"From incidental notices scattered over Tertullian's works, we collect that Sunday, or the Lord's-day, was regarded by the primitive Christians as a day of rejoicing, and that to fast upon it was unlawful. The word *Sabbatum* is always used to designate, not the first, but the seventh day of the week, which appears in Tertullian's time to have been also kept as a day of rejoicing. . . . The custom of observing every Saturday as a fast, which became general throughout the Western Church, does not appear to have existed in Tertullian's time. That men who, like our author, on all occasions contended that the ritual and ceremonial law of Moses had ceased, should observe the seventh day of the week

---

\* De Corona, chap. 3, Vol. 10, Library Fathers; also Antenicene, Vol. 11, p. 336.

as a festival, is, perhaps, to be ascribed to a desire of conciliating the Jewish converts.”\*

The foregoing suggestion of Bishop Kaye concerning the consistency of Tertullian's positions and statements leads us to say, in passing, that “consistency” was not Tertullian's forte. He often contradicts himself, asserting in one treatise that which he denies in another. The first quotation which we presented to the reader is full of no Sabbathism. In other places he asserts the perpetuity of the Sabbath, at least in a spiritual sense. Note the following:

“You do not, however, consider the law of the Sabbath: they are human works, not divine, which it prohibits. For it says, ‘Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work.’ What work? Of course your own. The conclusion is, that from the Sabbath-day he removes those works which he had before enjoined for the six days, that is, your own works; in other words, human works of daily life. Now, the carrying around of the ark is evidently not an ordinary daily duty, nor yet a human one; but a rare and a sacred work, and, as being then ordered by the direct precept of God, a divine one. . . . Thus, in the present instance, there is a clear distinction respecting the Sabbath's prohibition of human labors, not divine ones. Accordingly, the man who went and gathered sticks on the Sabbath-day, was punished with death. For it was his own work which he did; and this the law forbade. They, however, who on the Sabbath carried the ark round Jericho, did it with impunity. For it was not their own work, but

---

\* *Eccles. Hist. of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*, p. 388, London; 1845.

God's, which they executed, and that, too, from his express commandment."\*

A late writer, J. N. Andrews, aptly describes the position and character of Tertullian in the following words:

"This writer contradicts himself in the most extraordinary manner concerning the Sabbath and the law of God. He asserts that the Sabbath was abolished by Christ, and elsewhere emphatically declares that he did not abolish it. He says that Joshua violated the Sabbath, and then expressly declares that he did not violate it. He says that Christ broke the Sabbath, and then shows that he never did this. He represents the eighth day as more honorable than the seventh, and elsewhere states just the reverse. He asserts that the law is abolished, and in other places affirms its perpetual obligation. He speaks of the Lord's day as the eighth day, and is the second of the early writers who makes an application of this term to Sunday, Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 194, being the first. But though he thus uses the term like Clement he also like him teaches a perpetual Lord's-day, or, like Justin Martyr, a perpetual Sabbath in the observance of every day. And with the observance of Sunday as the Lord's-day he brings in 'offerings for the dead' and the perpetual use of the sign of the cross. But he expressly affirms that these things rest, not upon the authority of the Scriptures, but wholly upon that of tradition and custom. And though he speaks of the Sabbath as abrogated by Christ, he expressly contradicts this by asserting that Christ 'did not at all rescind the Sabbath,' and that he imparted an additional sanctity to that day which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father. This

---

\* Against Marcion, B. 2, chap. 21, Lib. Fathers, as above; also Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 7, pp. 100, 101.

strange mingling of light and darkness plainly indicates the age in which this author lived. He was not so far removed from the time of the apostles but that many clear rays of divine truth shone upon him; and he was far enough advanced in the age of apostasy to have its dense darkness materially affect him. He stood on the line between expiring day and advancing night. Sometimes the law of God was unspeakably sacred; at other times tradition was of higher authority than the law. Sometimes divine institutions were alone precious in his estimation; at others he was better satisfied with those which were sustained only by custom and tradition.”\*

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

The lesson which is taught in the writings of Tertullian, and which is especially pertinent to our present inquiry is this, told in a single sentence. Under the influence of no-Sabbathism, at the close of the second century, the observance of the Sabbath was declining, and the semi-pagan Sun’s day had become a festival for “indulgence to the flesh.” The “mystery of iniquity” was rapidly working, preparing the way for a corrupt and corrupting union of church and state with the attendant evils which swarmed in upon the spiritual life

---

\* Testimony of the Fathers, p. 63.

of Christianity when the "Man of Sin" began to change times and laws.

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

"I deem it scarcely necessary to observe that Clement never applies the name Sabbath to the first day of the week, which he calls the Lord's-day."\*

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

"And the fourth word is that which intimates that the world was created by God, and that *he gave us the seventh day as a rest*, on account of the trouble that there is in life. For God is incapable of wear-

---

\* Some Account of the writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria, by John, Bishop of Lincoln, p. 413, London, 1835.

ness, and suffering, and want. *But we who bear flesh need rest. The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest—abstraction from ills—preparing for the primal day, our true rest; which, in truth, is the first creation of light, in which all things are viewed and possessed. From this day the first wisdom and knowledge illuminate us.*"\*

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

“ Now, we are commanded to reverence and to honor the same one, being persuaded that he is Word, Saviour, and Leader, and by him, the Father, *not on special days* (‘ selected times ’), *as some others*, but *doing this continually in our whole life*, and in every way. Certainly the elect race, justified by the precept, says, ‘ seven times a day have I praised thee.’ Whence not in a specified place, or selected temple, or at *certain festivals*, and on *appointed days*, but *during his whole life*, the Gnostic in every place, even if it be alone by himself, and whenever he has any of those who have embraced the like faith, honors God; that is acknowledges his gratitude for the knowledge of the way to live. If the presence of a good man, by his reverential and decorous behavior, continually improves them who associate with him, how much rather, in all reason, shall not he, who, by knowledge, and manner of life, and Eucharist, is ever present with God, be continually improving in every particular, in his actions, and his words, and his disposition. Such is he, who is persuaded that God is everywhere present, and fancies not that he is shut up in certain definite places, so that, supposing himself ever out of his presence, he may give way to licentiousness by night or by day. We, then,

---

\* Stromata, Book 6, chap. 16, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 10; also Ante-Nicene, Vol 12, p. 386. The whole of chapter 16 is a vague and fanciful discussion of the properties of the number seven, of which we have quoted the most sensible part.

making our whole lives a festival, persuaded that God is everywhere present, praise him as we toil in the fields, praise him as we sail on the sea, in any other mode of life have our conversation according to rule."

Again he states that "one, having fulfilled the command according to the gospel, makes that day the Lord's-day, on which he casts off evil thoughts, and takes those which are according to knowledge, glorifying the Lord's resurrection as wrought in himself."\*

Thus the reader finds Clement teaching the same no-Sabbathism, and making the same analogies and contrasts between the old and new dispensations, and between sin and holiness, which abound in the representative writings of his time. A passage in which, as Bishop Kaye remarks, Clement is trying to bring out "the properties and virtues of the numbers six, seven, and eight, the hidden meanings of which numbers he frequently speaks of," has been so paraphrased and interpolated, as to make it appear that a contrast is being drawn between the seventh and eighth *days*. It is as follows:

"Having reached this point, we must mention these things by the way; since the discourse has turned on the seventh and the eighth. For the eighth may possibly turn out to be the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the latter properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work. For the creation of the world was concluded in six days. For the motion of the sun from solstice to solstice is completed in six months—in the course of which

---

\* Stromata, b. 7. chaps. 7 and 12. Library of the Fathers: also Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 12, pp. 431. 432 and 461.



time the leaves fall, and at another plants bud and seeds come to maturity.”\*

The passage goes on thus fancifully, through several paragraphs, some of which could not appear here without the charge of impropriety. Comment is not necessary to show that Clement belongs to the ultra school of no-Sabbathists.

.ORIGEN.

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

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

---

\* *Stromata*, book 6, chap. 16, Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 12, p. 386

third Homily, moreover, only a Latin translation is extant.”\*

The passage as usually translated is as follows:

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

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

‘In quoting as Origen’s opinion, in the text, ‘As for the Sabbath it has passed away as a matter of obligation (as every thing else purely Jewish has passed away,) though its exemplary and typical lessons are evident still,’ I had in mind his Twenty-third Homily on Numbers.† I did not cite it in the first and second editions, because I conceived it impossible that any one could so far mistake its meaning as to imagine that Origen’s words *Sabbati Christiani* were to be taken as equivalent to what has sometimes been termed the *Christian Sabbath*, viz.: the Lord’s-day. But as this mistake has occurred, I now give a sort of Analysis of the Homily.”‡

\* Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, P. 348.

† Tome ii, p. 358, seq.

‡ Bampton Lectures on Sunday, Note 120, p. 287. London, 1866.

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

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

We were at first inclined to dissent from the foregoing exegesis by Dr. Hessey, but after carefully

examining the whole chapter as found in the Original,\* we are certain that such is the meaning, that Origen is contrasting a life-rest in well doing, with the weekly Sabbath rest of the former dispensation. In full keeping with this view are his words in another place,† where he is trying to evade the charge that Christians were not consistent, since, by observing festivals they ignored the teachings of Paul in Gal. 4. 10. He says:

“ But if any one should object to that which takes place among us on the Lord’s-day, or the Preparation days, or on the days of the Passover or of Pentecost, the answer is, that the perfect Christian who continually, by words, works, and thoughts, lives in accordance with the Word of God, his natural Lord, is ever in his days, and daily keeps a Lord’s-day. He also who continually prepares himself to live in accordance with truth, and abstains from the pleasures of life, by which many are deceived, who does not feed the desires of the flesh; but keeps his body under, he is always keeping a Preparation day.”‡

Thus does Origen surpass his predecessors, opposing even the idea of any specific time for public worship, as a religious duty. He teaches a mixture of no-Sabbathism and of higher spiritual Sabbathism, which ignores specific time as sacred, and makes all time sacred in a certain degree. Judging by the then present state of the church and the subse-

---

\* *Origensis Opera Omnia*, etc., Liber second, p. 358, Paris, 1733.

† *Contra Celsum*, Lib. viii. chap. 22.

‡ *Opera*. Liber I. p. 758. Edition above quoted; also, *Ante-Nicene Lib.* Vol. 23, p. 509.

quent results, Origen's teachings helped to swell the tide of practical no-Sabbathism.

CYPRIAN.

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

"For in that in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh the eighth day was observed, a mystery was given beforehand, in a shadow and in a figure; but when Christ came it was accomplished in reality. For because the eighth day, that is the first after the Sabbath, was to be that whereon our Lord would rise again and quicken, and give us the spiritual circumcision, this eighth day, that is the first after the Sabbath, and the Lord's-day, was promised in a figure. Which figure ceased when the reality afterwards came, and when the spiritual circumcision was given to us. On which account we think that no one should, by that law which was before ordained, be hindered, from obtaining grace. Nor should the spiritual circumcision be hindered by the circumcision of the flesh, but every one is to be by all means admitted to the grace of Christ, inasmuch as Peter also, in the Acts of the

Apostles, speaks and says, 'The Lord hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.'" Acts 10: 28.\*

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

#### CONCLUSIONS.

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

1. No traces of the observance of the Sunday are found until about the middle of the second century. Those appear first in Justin Martyr's First Apology. The leading reason assigned by him for its observance is founded on a mystical interpretation of certain passages supposed to refer to the millennium. The *supposed*† resurrection of Christ on that day is

\* Epistles, chap. 64, sec. 4, Oxford Edition of Lib. of the Fathers, but numbered as 58 in Ante-Nicene Lib. Vol. 8, p. 196.

†We say "supposed," because the New Testament makes no *definite statement* that Christ rose on Sunday. So far as the Sabbath question is concerned, we are willing to grant that he did. But the Gospels do not explicitly state this. For discussion of the time of the resurrection, see Sabbath and Sunday, Vol. I., pp. 52-56.

mentioned incidentally as a secondary reason. About the close of the second century, the idea of commemorating the resurrection by the observance of the Sunday increases, and the term "Lord's day" begins to be applied to it.

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

3. The observance of the Sunday which then prevailed was not *sabbatic*. In the second century there is no trace of the sabbatic idea connected with it. It is a day, some part of which is used for the purpose of public religious instruction. In the third century, the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Sunday seems to have become quite general. This was also done regularly on at least three other days in each week. The interdiction of "business and kneeling" on that day, which appears during the last half of the third century, was made because business cares interrupted the *fest et* enjoyment of the day, and not

because any true idea as of a Sabbath was entertained. This is shown from the language of those passages in which such interdiction appears, and in the fact that these same writers plead strenuously for the Sabbath as a *life-rest* from sin, and not as a weekly rest from labor. Dr. Hessey, in speaking of the "Lord's-day" at this period, says:

"It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but was carefully distinguished from it as an institution under the law of liberty, observed in a different way and with different feelings, and exempt from the severity of the provisions which were supposed to characterize the Sabbath."\*

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

"But although Christian theology had not at this time assumed the systematic form which it afterwards attained, there is no ground for saying that the Fathers, or 'the Church' represented by them, had formed no theory, Sabbatarian or dominical, of the Lord's-day. Often did the question occur to them, Why do we honor the first day of the week and assemble for worship upon it? And to this question not one of them who lived before the reign of Constantine has either answered, with Mr. Gilfillan, 'Because the fourth commandment binds the Christian Church as it did the Jews, and the Sabbath-day was changed by Christ or his apostles from Saturday to Sunday,' or replied, with Dr. Hessey, 'Because the apostles, who had a divine commission, appointed the Lord's day to be observed as a Christian festival.' On the contrary, they give sundry other reasons of their own, fanciful in most cases, and ridiculous in some. The best of them is that

---

\* Lectures on Sunday, p. 49, London, 1866.



on the first day the Saviour had risen from the dead; and the others chiefly are, that on the first day God changed darkness and matter, and made the world; that on a Sunday Jesus Christ appeared to and instructed his disciples; that the command to circumcise children on the eighth was a type of the true circumcision, by which we were circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week; and that manna was first given to the Israelites on a Sunday. From which the inevitable inference is, that they neither had found in Scripture any commandment—primeval, Mosaic, or Christian—appointing the Lord's-day to be honored or observed, nor knew from tradition any such commandment delivered by Jesus or his apostles.”\*

---

\* Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1; p. 353.

## CHAPTER XI.

### OTHER DAYS OF WORSHIP.

Before considering the next era in the Sabbath question, which was ushered in through civil legislation, it is well to notice certain other days of worship, which sprang up previous to the fourth century.

#### WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY.

The fourth and the sixth days of the week as semi-religious fasts were made prominent among the public days of the church during the third century. Joseph Bingham speaks of them as follows:

“However, it was not long after Justin Martyr’s time, before we are sure the church observed the custom of meeting solemnly for divine worship on Wednesdays and Fridays which days are commonly called stationary days, because they continued their assemblies on these days to a great length, till three o’clock in the afternoon. . . . Tertullian assures us, that on these days they always celebrated the communion, from whence we may infer, that the same service was performed on these days as on the Lord’s day, unless, perhaps, the sermon was wanting. Some there were, he says, who objected against receiving the communion on these days, because they were scrupulously afraid they should break their fast by eating and drinking the bread and wine in the Eucharist; and therefore they chose rather to absent themselves from the oblation prayers, than break

their fast, as they imagined, by receiving the Eucharist. Whom he undeceives by telling them that to receive the Eucharist on such days would be no infringement of their fast, but bind them closer to God; their station would be so much the more solemn for their standing at the altar of God; they might receive the body of the Lord and preserve their fast too, and so both would be safe, whilst they both participated of the sacrifice and discharged their other obligation. Since, therefore, they received the Eucharist on these days, we may conclude they had all the prayers of the communion office, and what other offices were wont to go before them, as the psalmody and reading of the Scriptures, and prayers for the catechumens and penitents, which, together with the sermons, were the whole service for the Lord's day. But, because even all this could not take up near so much time, as must needs be spent in these stations, it seems most probable, that in two particulars, they enlarged their service on these days, that is, in their psalmody, and private prayers, and confession of sins. The Psalms, as we shall see hereafter, were sometimes lengthened to an indefinite number, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more, as the occasion of a vigil or a fast required, and between every psalm they had liberty to meditate and fall to their private prayers; and by these two exercises, so lengthened and repeated, it is easy to conceive how the longest station might be employed. . . . St. Basil agrees with Tertullian, in making these days not only fasts, but communion days; for, reckoning up how many days in the week they received the communion, he makes Wednesday and Friday to be two of the number. Yet, still it is hard to conceive what business they could have to detain them so long in the church since their collects and public prayers were but few in comparison, and therefore it seems most probable that a competent share of this time was spent in psalmody, and as I

find a learned person\* inclined to think, in private devotion, which always had a share in their service, and was generally intermixed with their singing of psalms, as shall be showed in their proper places."†

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

"He also ordered that they should reverence those days which immediately precede the Sabbath, because, as it seems to me, of the memorable acts of our Saviour upon those days."‡

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

"He also enjoined the observance of the day

\* Stillingfleet, *Orig.*, Britan, p. 224.

† *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Book 13, chap. 9. Also Book 14, chap. 1, and Book 15, chap. 1, sec. 1.

‡ *De Vita Constantini*, Liber 4, chap. 18.

termed the Lord's-day which the Jews call the first day of the week and which the Greeks dedicate to the sun, as likewise the day before the seventh, and commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on those days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications. He honored the Lord's day because on it Christ arose from the dead, and the day above mentioned because on it he was crucified."\*

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

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

---

\* Ecc. Hist., Book 1, Chap. 8.

days were of such antiquity as Epiphanius saith they were, I will not meddle. Certain it is, that they were *very ancient* in the Church of God, as may appear by that of Origen and Tertullian before mentioned.\*

Coleman says:

“It appears, however, from his (Origen’s) observations, that at Alexandria, Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as fast days, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the Church at the end of the fourth century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: ‘In the whole Christian Church, the following fast days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour, (*i. e.*, three o’clock in the afternoon,) except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, in which it is usual neither to kneel or to fast at all.’”†

Neander says:

“And further, two other days in the week, Friday and Wednesday, particularly the former, were consecrated to the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, and of the circumstances preparatory to them, congregations were held on them, and a fast till three o’clock in the afternoon. But nothing was positively appointed concerning them; in respect to joining in these solemnities every one consulted his own convenience or inclinations. Such fasts, joined with prayer, were considered as the watches of the ‘*Milites Christi*’ on their part as Christians, (who compared their calling to a warfare—the *Militia Christi*,

\* Hist. Sab., Part 2, Chap. 3, Sec. 4.

† Ancient Christianity, etc., pp. 552, 553.

and they were 'stationes'—and the days on which they took place were called dies stationum."\*

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

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

---

\* Hist. Ch., First Three Cen., p. 186.

second century, by Justin Martyr, and also that he is the first to promulgate a broad unscriptural no-Sabbathism. We have seen that the first mention of Sunday by him is in an "apology" to a Pagan Emperor whom he is seeking to placate toward Christians. These facts cannot appear in their true light unless we know the general state of the church, especially west of Palestine, at this time. It is well known that in the Apostolic Age there was no distinct organization nor specific separation of those who accepted Christ, from the Jewish Church. They were still held as members, or at least, as a party in that Church. The first converts were Jews, and a sharp struggle took place before the gospel could be carried to the Gentiles, or Gentile converts admitted to the fellowship of the believers in Christ. Even as late as the time of the earlier persecutions, these were waged against the followers of Christ as a sect of the Jews. There was no definite line of distinction organically between the Christian and the Jewish Churches, until the opening of the second century. We offer the following testimony from high authority:

"With the beginning of the second century there came a great change in the situation of the Christians. The separation of Christianity from Judaism was completed so as to be recognized even by heathen eyes. The destruction of Jerusalem put an end to the outward existence of the Jewish nationality. The temple fell, the sacrifices ceased. . . . Spread abroad over the earth, without a local center, or the bond which had existed hitherto in the temple serv-



ice, Judaism henceforth was united only by the common law, and by the common doctrine contained in the newly collected Talmud. Thus it became completely separated from Christianity. Talmudic Judaism severed all the connections which had hitherto bound it to Christianity. Henceforth three times every day in the synagogues was invoked the awful curse on the renegades, the Christians. It came to be a rare exception for a Jew to go over to Christianity, while the heathen thronged into the church in ever increasing numbers. The remainder of the Jewish Christians dwindled away or disappeared entirely in the churches of heathen Christians, or turned heretics and were cut off from the church. The church now found the field for its work and growth almost exclusively in the heathen world, and became composed entirely of Gentile Christians. It was therefore no longer possible to confound the Christians with the Jews.”\*

These facts referred to by Dr. Uhlhorn have a much deeper bearing on the question of Sunday observance than may at first appear. There is no mention of any form of Sunday observance in the church, until nearly or quite fifty years after the time when the church was thus crowded with what he calls the heathen Christians. Even Pliny's letter, so often quoted for the sake of its “stated day,” was written after that time; and Justin's Apology was not written until these “heathen Christians” had held possession of the Western Church for more than a generation. It was this influx of Pagan converts which brought in Sunday, their “venerable day,” and gradually, though slowly, displaced the Sabbath. The

---

\* Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, by Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, Hanover, Germany, pp. 253, 254.

changes which followed during the second and third centuries, strengthened this heathen element *in the church*, and at length revived the sun worship at Rome. A strong tendency to religious syncretism prevailed, and the Egyptian and Oriental gods were much honored. Speaking of this, Uhlhorn says:

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

This was A. D. 218–222. It shows how, by the growth of sun worship, Sunday was naturally exalted in the Roman Empire, and necessarily in the church which was being steadily crowded by heathen converts, many of whom, like Justin Martyr, accepted Christianity as a superior philosophy in keep-

---

\* Conflict, etc., pp. 314, 315.

ing with the prevailing tendency to religious syncretism. This same Elagabalus made room for a chapel for Christianity in his temple for all the gods, and offered "Christ a place in the Roman Pantheon, by the side of Jupiter, Isis, and Mithras."\* During the last half of the third century the influx of the Pagan converts was still greater, and although Christianity was thus steadily preparing for the political victory under Constantine, during the first quarter of the next century, yet that was gained only at a cost to the purity of the church which made the victory a sad defeat, in many respects. The truths of Christianity could not be destroyed, but the church became so corrupted by the Pagan influences, that it was no longer the counterpart of the apostolic model. So the third century closes with the European branch of the Christian Church filled with "Pagan Christians." Its literature is full of undisguised and unscriptural no-Sabbath theories. The Sunday has become a popular weekly festival, which formed a sort of common ground for all, by uniting the Pagan elements of popular sun worship, with the idea of a resurrection festival, at the time when festivals of all kinds formed a characteristic feature of the age. Up to this time not a word appears in any of the literature which indicates the transference of the Sabbath to the Sunday, or the making of Sunday a Sabbath according to the fourth commandment. On the contrary we have found so noted a man as Tertullian seeking to draw professed Christians away from oth-

---

\* Uhlhorn, p. 334.

er Pagan festivals by reminding them that they had, in the Sunday, a day of "indulgence for the flesh." Well does Uhlhorn call the leading men of these times "Pagan Christians."

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

## CHAPTER XII.

# POST-APOSTOLIC HISTORY OF THE SABBATH TO THE FOURTH CENTURY.

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

Since the Sabbath was a prominent feature in the Jewish creed and practice, the bitter prejudice which grew up between the heathen and the Jewish elements in the church, bore heavily upon it; and when the heathen element gained control of the church, it set about the development of theories and practices which would efface, if possible, this so-called feature of Judaism from the church. The fact that Justin and his successors pressed their no-

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

Another important fact must be remembered here, namely, the authors of the no-Sabbath theories, which began with Justin, were men of Pagan not

Apostolic culture. The doctrine was the residuum of Pagan philosophy. There was a modicum of Christian truth in that part of the theory which some propounded, that the true Christian made every day a Sabbath. But that statement is rather a description of certain results in high spiritual culture which can never be attained except through the agency of the Sabbath in lifting men to that high standard. Another element of truth was that the Sabbath should not be kept by merely formal idleness as the Jews were charged with doing. But the fundamental misconception lay in teaching that the law was abrogated, that men were free from restraint, and might give themselves up to *festival* indulgences. These elements of truth gilded the theory to eyes which looked with bitter prejudice on all things as associated with Judaism, while the fundamental, practical *lawlessness* of the theory was regarded as its great merit by the low spiritual culture of the prevailing Paganism. Men whose gods had been, hitherto, only enlarged editions of themselves, reveling on Olympus, and delighting in sensuous indulgences, were not ready to embrace the new religion until the rigidity of the fourth commandment had been so softened that the Sabbath could be put aside, and a weekly *festival* put along side of it, and at length in its place. But the facts show that in spite of this abrogation of the Sabbath in the theories of the *philosophers*, the influence of Apostolic Christianity was so strong that the people continued to keep the Sabbath long after the philoso-

phers had decried it. Keep in mind the fact that neither the Sunday festival nor the doctrine of no-Sabbathism appears in history until a half a century after the time when Uhlhorn says the western wing of the church was ruptured from the Jewish element, and filled with Pagan converts.

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

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



offices should be performed by the priests for the people; yea it did not disallow the healing even of dumb animals. Both at Siloam and on frequent subsequent occasions, did he perform cures upon the Sabbath; and for this reason many used to resort to him on the Sabbath-days. For the law commanded them to abstain from every servile work, that is from all grasping after wealth which is procured by trading and by other worldly business; but it exhorted them to attend to the exercises of the soul, which consist in reflection, and to addresses of a beneficial kind for their neighbors benefit. And, therefore, the Lord reprov'd those who unjustly blamed him for having healed upon the Sabbath-days. For he did not make void, but fulfilled the law, by performing the offices of the high priest, propitiating God for man, and cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and himself suffering death, that exiled man might go forth from condemnation, and might return without fear to his own inheritance."\*

We have also certain "Remains" of one Arche-laus, a Bishop who also wrote against Heresies. His *Disputation with Manes*, dates probably from 280 A. D. In this he speaks as follows:†

"Again, as to the assertion that the Sabbath has been abolished, we deny that he has abolished it plainly (plane). For he was himself also Lord of the Sabbath. And this, the law's relation to the Sabbath, was like the servant who has charge of the bridegroom's couch, and who prepares the same with all carefulness, and does not suffer it to be disturbed or touched by any stranger, but keeps it intact against the time of the bridegroom's arrival; so

---

\* Irenæus Against Heresies, Book 4, chap. 8, Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 1, p. 397.

† Sec. 42.

that when he is come, the bed may be used as it pleases himself, or as it is granted to those to use it whom he has bidden along with him.\*

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

"Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath. He kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of his disciples (for he indulged them with the relief of food when they were hungry), and in the present instance cured the withered hand, in each case intimating by facts: 'I came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it'; although Marcion has gagged his mouth by this word. For even in the case before us he fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition. [Moreover.] He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath, [and] while imparting to the Sabbath-day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by his own beneficent action. For he furnished to this day di

---

\* Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 20, p. 373.

vine safeguards,—a course which his adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honoring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it. Since, in like manner, the prophet Elisha, on this day restored to life the dead son of the Shunammite woman, you see, O Pharisee, and you too O Marcion, how that it was [proper employment] for the Creator's Sabbaths of old to do good, to save life, not to destroy it; how that Christ introduced nothing new, which was not after the example, the gentleness, the mercy, and the prediction also of the Creator. For in this very example he fulfills the prophetic announcement of a specific healing: 'The weak hands are strengthened,' as were also, 'the feeble knees,' in the sick of the palsy."\*

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

---

\* Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 7, pp. 219, 220.

† Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 14, p. 423.

The foregoing extracts show that no-Sabbathism did not come in unchallenged, but that it was opposed as a *heresy*, and that the truth was defended on good and Scriptural grounds. There is no reason to believe that Sunday gained any pre-eminence over the Sabbath, even though it did appeal to the lower elements of men's nature by its festal character, until after the time of Constantine, when it was exalted through civil legislation. No one claims that the "Longer" form of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, is genuine. Its date is unknown; but we deem it to belong to the last half of the fourth century, or to the fifth. But we are willing, for sake of the argument, to grant it an Ante-Nicene place, that is, before 325 A. D. Whenever it was written, it shows that at that time, the writer taught a just and Scriptural view of Sabbath observance, and asked for Sunday only a festal character. It was to him the "Queen," of the days because it was a *feast* as opposed to the Sabbath, the Friday, and the Wednesday which were held to be sorrowful fasts. In chapter 9, — long-form, speaking of Christ, the writer says:

‘The prophets were his servants, and foresaw him by the Spirit, and waited for him as their Teacher, and expected him as their Lord and Saviour, saying, ‘He will come and save us.’ Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for ‘he that does not work, let him not eat.’ For say the [holy] oracles, ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.’ But let every one of you keep the Sabbath

after a spiri'tual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's-day as a festival, the resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]."\*

The foregoing from authors who wrote previous to the fourth century, is fully sustained by the statements of both earlier and later historians.

*Socrates* says:

"Such as dwell at Rome, fast three weeks before Easter, except the Sabbath and Sunday. . . . Again touching the communion, there are sundry customs, for although all the churches throughout the whole world do celebrate and receive the holy mysteries each returning week upon the Sabbath, yet the people inhabiting Alexandria and Rome, from an old tradition, refuse thus to do. The Egyptians, who are neighbors to the Alexandrians, together with the Thebians, celebrate the communion on the Sabbath."

Again he says:

"Therefore, when the festivals of each week occurred, namely, the Sabbath, and dominical day, in which they (Christians) were wont to assemble in the churches, they (the Arians) congregating in the porches of the gates of the city, sung such songs as were fitted to the opinions of Arius."† etc.

*Sozomen*, a contemporary of *Socrates*, writing

---

\* Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. 1, p. 180.

†Ecc. Hist., Book 5, chap. 21; and Book 6, chap. 8, Latin Edition, 1570.

probably ten or fifteen years later, (about A. D. 460,) has the following:

“The Sabbath, from the evening forward, for a suitable time, is used in vigils and prayers; and the day following there is a public meeting of ail in common, when each partakes of the mysteries.”\*

The phrase “*From the evening forward,*” shows that these vigils were kept on Sixth day night, and the meeting on the following day was upon the Sabbath. It can not mean the evening after the Sabbath, for at sunset the Sabbath closed.

Again Sozomen says:

“Likewise some meet both upon the Sabbath and upon the day after the Sabbath, as at Constantino-ple, and among *almost all* others. At Rome and Alexandria they do not. Among the Egyptians likewise, in many cities and villages, there is also a sacred custom among all of meeting on the evening after the Sabbath, when the sacred mysteries are partaken of.”†

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

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

---

\* Liber 7, chap. 18.

† Liber 7, chap. 19.

Corresponding with this is the testimony of modern writers.

Lyman Coleman, says:

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

Heylyn, after giving the words of Ambrose, that he fasted when at Rome on the Sabbath, and when away from Rome did not, adds:

“ Nay, which is more, St. Augustine tells us, that many times in Africa, one and the self-same church, at least the several churches in the self-same province, had some that dined upon the Sabbath, and some that fasted. And in this difference it stood a long time together, till, in the end, the Roman church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast, almost through all parts of the Western world; and of that alone; the Eastern churches being so far from altering their *ancient* custom, that, in the

---

‡ Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chap. 26, sec. 2.

sixth Council of Constantinople, Anno, 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day, upon pain of censure.\*

King says:

“For the Eastern churches in compliance with the Jewish converts, who were numerous in those parts, performed on the seventh day the same public religious services that they did on the first day, observing both the one and the other, as a festival. Whence Origen enumerates Saturday as one of the four feasts solemnized in his time, though, on the contrary, *some* of the Western churches, that they might not seem to Judaize, fasted on Saturday. So that, besides the Lord’s-day, Saturday was an usual season whereon many churches solemnized their religious services.”†

An old work on the “Morality of the Fourth Commandment,” by William Twisse, D. D., has the following:

“Yet, for some hundred years in the primitive church, not the Lord’s-day only, but the seventh day also, was religiously observed, not by Ebion and Cerinthus only, but by pious Christians also, as *Baronius* writeth, and *Gomarus* confesseth, and *Rivert* also.”‡

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

“And especially because it is certain (and little do you know of the ancient condition of the church if you know it not,) that the ancient Sabbath did re-

\* History of the Sabbath, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 3.

†“Primitive Church,” first published 1691, pp. 126, 127.

‡P. 9, London, 1641.



main and was observed (together with the celebration of the Lord's-day,) by the Christians of the East Church, above three hundred years after our Saviour's death."\*

The learned Joseph Bingham, says:

"We also find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish Sabbath. It is not easy to tell the original of this practice, nor the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin churches, (excepting Milan,) it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek churches, as a festival; I consider it here only as a day of public divine service. . . . Athanasius, who is one of the first that mentions it, says: They met on the Sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. And Timothy, one of his successors in the See of Alexandria, says, the communion was administered on this day. . . . Socrates is a little more particular about the service; for he says: In their assemblies on this day they celebrate the communion; only the churches of Egypt and Thebias differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbors at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place, speaking of the churches of Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday and Lord's-day, the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church assemblies. And Cassian takes notice of the Egyptian churches that among them the service of the Lord's day and the Sabbath, was always the same; for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament, only one out of the Gospels; and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles;

---

\* P. 77, London, 1630.

whereas, on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament, and partly out of the New. In another place he observes that in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebias, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord's-day, when they met at (three o'clock,) that is nine in the morning, to celebrate the Communion.\*

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

“The Sabbath, or Saturday, for so the word *Sabbatum* is constantly used in the writings of the fathers when speaking of it as it relates to Christians, was held by them in great veneration, and especially in the Eastern parts, honored with all the public solemnities of religion. For which we are to know, that the Gospel in those parts mainly prevailing amongst the Jews, they being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath, as that which had been appointed by God himself as a memorial of his rest from the work of creation, settled by their great master Moses, and celebrated by their ancestors for so many ages as the solemn day of their public worship, and were therefore very loth that it should be wholly anti quated and laid aside. . . . Hence they usually had most parts of divine service performed upon that day; they met together for public prayers, for reading the Scriptures, celebration of the Sacraments, and such like duties. This is plain, not only from some passages in Ignatius, and Clement's Constitutions, but from writers of more unquestionable credit and authority. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria tells us that they assemble on Saturdays, not

---

\* Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 13, chap. 9, sec. 3.

that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath; and Socrates, speaking of the usual times of their public meeting, calls the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, the weekly festivals on which the congregation was wont to meet in the church for the performance of divine services. Therefore the council of Laodicea amongst other things decreed,\* that upon Saturdays the gospels and other scriptures should be read. Upon this day also, as well as upon Sunday, all fasts were severely prohibited, (an infallible argument they counted it a festival day) one Saturday in the year only excepted, viz.: that before Easter day, which was always observed as a solemn fast; things so commonly known as to need no proof. . . . Thus stood the case in the Eastern church; in those in the West we find it somewhat different. Amongst them it was not observed as a religious festival, but kept as a constant fast. The reason whereof, (as it is given by Pope Innocent, in an epistle to the Bishop Eugubium, where he treats of this very case,) seems most probable. 'If [says he] we commemorate Christ's resurrection, not only at Easter, but every Lord's day, and fast upon Friday, because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy; the apostles themselves spending those two days, viz.: Friday and the Sabbath, in great sorrow and heaviness; and he thinks no doubt ought to be made, but that the apostles fasted upon those two days; whence the church had a tradition, that the sacraments were not to be administered on those days, and therefore concludes that every Saturday, or Sabbath, ought to be kept a fast. To the same purpose the council of Illiberis ordained that a Saturday festival was an error that ought to be reformed, and that men ought to fast on every S.b-

---

\* Can. 16.

bath. But, though this seems to have been the general practice, yet it did not obtain in all places of the West alike. In Italy itself, it was otherwise at Milan, where Saturday was a festival; and it is said in the life of Saint Ambrose, who was bishop of that See, that he constantly dined as well upon Saturday as upon the Lord's-day, and used also upon that day to preach to the people.\*

Dr Charles Hase says:

“The Roman church regarded Saturday as a fast day in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath.”†

Rev. James Cragie Robertson, states that:

“In memory of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion the fourth and sixth days of each week were kept as fasts, by abstaining from food until the hour at which he gave up the Ghost, the ninth hour, or 3 P. M. In the manner of observing the seventh day the Eastern church differed from the Western. The Orientals, influenced by the neighborhood of the Jews, and by the ideas of Jewish converts, regarded it as a continuation of the Mosaic Sabbath, and celebrated it almost in the same manner as the Lord's-day; while their brethren in the west—although not until after the time of Tertullian, extended to it the fast of the preceding day.”‡

Rev. Philip Schaff bears the following testimony.

“The observance of the Sabbath among the Jewish Christians, gradually ceased. Yet the Eastern church to this day marks the seventh day of the week, (excepting only the Easter Sabbath) by omit-

\* P. 83, Oxford, 1840.

† History of the Christian Church, p 67, paragraph 69. New York, 1855.

‡ History of the Church, p. 158, London, 1854.

ing fasting, and by standing in prayer; while the Latin church, in direct opposition to Judaism, made Saturday a fast day. The controversy on this point began as early as the end of the second century. Wednesday, and especially Friday, were devoted to the weekly commemoration of the sufferings and death of the Lord, and observed as days of penance, or watch days, with worship and half fasting, till three o'clock in the afternoon."\*

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

"In the Western churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day. This difference in customs would of course be striking where members of the Oriental church spent their Sabbath-day in the Western church."†

Gieseler bears the following testimony:

"While the Christians of Palestine, who kept the whole Jewish law, celebrated of course all the Jewish festivals, the heathen converts observed only the Sabbath, and, in remembrance of the closing scenes of our Saviour's life, the Passover, though without the Jewish superstitions. Besides these, the Sunday, as the day of our Saviour's resurrection, was devoted to religious worship."‡

If this be carefully studied, two important facts

\* History of the Christian Church, p. 372, New York and Edinburg, 1864.

† History of the Christian religion and Church, during the first three centuries, p. 186, Rose's translation. Nearly the same language is used in his general history, Vol. 1, p. 298, Torrey's translation.

‡ Church History. Apostolic age to A. D. 70, sec. 29.

will appear. 1. There is no indefiniteness in the statement concerning the fact that all Christians kept the Sabbath. 2. With reference to the keeping of the Sunday, Gieseler gives the passages upon which such an idea is founded, thus throwing upon the reader the responsibility of deciding for himself whether the evidence is sufficient to support the claim. It is a significant fact that the learned historian does not commit himself to the popular theory, but leaves each to judge for himself. We ask the reader to refer the question to the New Testament, and to abide by its decision.

Thus appears an unbroken chain of evidence showing that the Sabbath was generally observed by the Christian church as late as the fourth century. The Western church had by this time come to regard it as a *fast*, and its true character had been largely set aside. The Eastern church less corrupted by Romish influence, observed it more nearly in the true Christian spirit, and without extreme Pharisaic rigidity. With such facts within the reach of every careful student of history, it is difficult to understand how so many men can venture to assert that the Sabbath was not observed by Christians after the time of Christ. Bear in mind too that the foregoing evidence is, mainly, concerning the Western branch of the church, which was much more corrupted by the Sunday influences than the Eastern; and that the writers referred to in this chapter all wrote after the rupture between the Jewish and the Pagan elements in the church, at the open-

ing of the second century. Any effort to deny the fact that the Sabbath remained in the *entire* church until the fourth century, and later, is a perversion of history. The only essential modification in the character of its observance was a justifiable laying aside of Pharisaic formalism, and the changing it into a *fast* in the Western church. We shall present hereafter evidence that the Sabbath continued to be observed for a century or two after the changes which were inaugurated by the civil legislation of Constantine, which is to be considered in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER XIII.

# CONSTANTINE AND THE BEGINNING OF LEGISLATION.

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

“He reasoned, as Eusebius reports from his own mouth, in the following manner: ‘My father served the Christians’ God, and uniformly prospered, while the emperors who worshiped the heathen gods, died a miserable death; therefore, that I may enjoy a happy life and reign, I will imitate the example of my father and join myself to the cause of the Christians who are growing daily, while the heathen are



diminishing' This low utilitarian consideration weighed heavily in the mind of an ambitious captain, who looked forward to the highest seat of power within the gift of his age."\*

Dr. Schaff says again:

"He was distinguished by that genuine political wisdom, which, putting itself at the head of the age, clearly saw that idolatry had outlived itself in the Roman Empire, and that Christianity alone could breathe new vigor into it, and furnish it moral support.

"But with the political, he united also a religious motive, not clear and deep indeed, yet honest, and strongly infused with the superstitious disposition to judge a religion by its outward success, and to ascribe a magical virtue to signs and ceremonies. . . . Constantine first adopted Christianity as a superstition, and put it by the side of his heathen superstition, till, finally, in his conviction, the Christian vanquished the Pagan, though without itself developing into a pure and enlightened faith. At first, Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of the Neo-Platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321, he enjoined regular consultations of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; *even later*, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the god of Martyrs, and the heathen goddess of Fortune, and down to the end of his life, he retained the title and dignity of *pontifex maximus*, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. . . . With his every victory over his Pagan rivals, Galerius, Maxentius, and Licinius, his personal leaning to Christianity, and

---

\* Philip Schaff, Church History, Vol. 2, p. 19.

his confidence in the magic power of the cross increased; yet he did not formally renounce heathenism, and did not receive baptism, until, in 337, he was laid upon the bed of death. . . . He was far from being so pure and so venerable as Eusebius, blinded by his favor of the Church, depicts him in his bombastic and almost dishonestly eulogistic biography, with the evident intention of setting him up as a model for all future Christian princes. It must with all regret be conceded, that his progress in the knowledge of Christianity was not a progress in the practice of its virtues. His love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power. The very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age, and the policy of an absolute monarch, can not excuse. After having reached, upon the bloody path of war, the goal of his ambition, the sole possession of the Empire; yea, in the very year in which he summoned the great council of Nicæa, he ordered the execution of his conquered rival and brother-in-law, Licinius, in breach of solemn promise of mercy. (324.) Not satisfied with this, he caused, soon afterward, on political suspicion, the death of the young Licinius, his nephew, a boy of hardly eleven years. But the worst of all is the murder of his eldest son, Crispus, in 326, who had incurred suspicion of political conspiracy, and of adulterous and incestuous purposes toward his step mother, Fausta, but is generally regarded as innocent.

“At all events, Christianity did not produce in Constantine a thorough moral transformation. He was concerned more to advance the outward social position of the Christian religion, than to further its inward mission. He was praised and censured in turn by the Christians and Pagans, the Orthodox and the Arians, as they successively experienced his favor or dislike. . . . When, at last, on his death

bed he submitted to baptism, with the remark. 'Now let us cast away all *duplicity*,' he honestly admitted the conflict of two antagonistic principles which swayed his private character and public life."\*

Uhlhorn says of him:

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

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

"Omnes Judices urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi Agrorum culturæ liber licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditus cælesti provisione concessa."

"Let all judges, and all city people, and all tradesmen, rest upon the *venerable day of the Sun*. But

---

\* Church History, Vol. 2, p. 13.

† Conflict Between Heathenism and Christianity, p. 427.

let those dwelling in the country freely and with full liberty attend to the culture of their fields; since it frequently happens, that no other day is so fit for the sowing of grain, or the planting of vines; hence the favorable time should not be allowed to pass, lest the provisions of heaven be lost.\*

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

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

2. Similar laws concerning many other heathen festivals were common. Joseph Bingham bears the

---

\* Cod. Justin. III. Tit. 12, L. 3.

following testimony, when speaking of the edict under consideration:

“This was the same respect as the old Roman laws had paid to their *ferie*, or festivals, in times of idolatry and superstition. . . . Now, as the old Roman laws exempted the festivals of the heathen from all judicial business, and suspended all processes and pleadings, except in the fore-mentioned cases, so Constantine ordered that the same respect should be paid to the Lord's day, that it should be a day of perfect vacation from all prosecutions, and pleadings, and business of the law, except where any case of great necessity or charity required a juridical process and public transaction.”\*

Bingham states here clearly the fact, that such prohibitions were made by the Roman laws in favor of their festivals, but adds, incorrectly, that Constantine made the same in favor of the Lord's-day; for we have seen that it was not the Lord's day, but the “*venerable day of the Sun*,” which the edict mentions; and it is impossible to suppose that a law, made by a *Christian* prince, in favor of a *Christian* institution, should not in any way mention that institution, or hint that the law was designed to apply to it.

Millman corroborates this idea as follows:

“The earlier laws of Constantine, though in their effect favorable to Christianity, claimed some deference, as it were, to the ancient religion, in the ambiguity of their language, and the cautious terms in which they interfered with Paganism. The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian

---

\* Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 20. chap. 2. sec. 2.

Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration: the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new Paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple, in the sanctity of the first day of the week.”\*

In chapter four of the same book Millman says:

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

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

“That the division of days into *juridici, et feri- ati*, judicial and nonjudicial, did not arise out of the modes of thought peculiar to the Christian world must be known to every classical scholar. Before

---

\* History of Christianity, Book 3, chap. 1.

the age of Augustus, the number of days upon which, out of reverence to the gods to whom they were consecrated, no trials could take place at Rome, had become a resource upon which a wealthy criminal could speculate as a means of evading justice; and Suetonius enumerates among the praiseworthy acts of that emperor, the cutting off from the number, thirty days, in order that crime might not go unpunished nor business be impeded.”\*

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

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

These facts show how the heathen training and belief of Constantine gave birth to the “Sunday edict.”

---

\* Feasts and Fasts, p. 6.

† Feasts and Fasts, p. 86. et. seq.

That he was a heathen is also attested by the fact that the edict of the 7th of March, 321, in favor of Sunday, was followed by another, published the next day, which is so purely heathen, that no doubt can be entertained as to the character of the man who was the author of both edicts.\* The edict of March 8th, commanded that in case of public calamity, like the striking of the imperial palace or public buildings by lightning, the heathen ceremonies for propitiating the gods were to be performed, and the meaning of the calamity should be sought from the *haruspices*. The *haruspices* were soothsayers, who gave their answers from watching the movements of the entrails of slain beasts, and the smoke from burning certain portions. This was a proceeding purely heathen, and no *Christian* prince could have made such a law. There is an evident connection between the two edicts, as we shall see when we remember that Apollo, who was honored as the god of the sun, was the patron deity of these soothsayers. He was also the patron deity of Constantine, and the one to whom he, in his pride, loved to be compared. Thus the Sunday edict, from its associations as well as its language, is shown to be the emanation of a heathen, and not a Christian religion. Remember, too, that at least nine years later than this, Constantine placed his new residence at Byzantium under the protection of the heathen goddess of Fortune; that he *never* gave up the title of high priest

---

\* See Rose's Ind. of Dates, p. 380, Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, etc.



of the heathen religion, that he did not formally embrace Christianity, and submit to baptism until he lay upon his death bed, sixteen years later; and you can not fail to see that whatever he did to favor Christianity, and whatever claims he made to conversion, were the outgrowth of a shrewd policy, rather than of a converted heart. And when the impartial historian can say of him, "The very brightest period of his reign is stained with crimes, which even the spirit of the age, and the policy of an absolute monarch, can not excuse,"\* we can not well claim him as a *Christian* prince.

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

"If it be difficult to determine the extent to which Constantine proceeded in the establishment of Christianity, it is even more perplexing to estimate how far he exerted the imperial authority in the abolition of Paganism. . . . The Pagan writers, who are not scrupulous in their charges against the memory of Constantine, and dwell with bitter resentment on all his overt acts of hostility to the ancient religion, do not accuse him of these direct encroachments

---

\* Schaff.

† See Gibbon, Vol. 3, chap. 28, Decline and Fall of Roman Empire.

on Paganism. Neither Julian nor Zosimus lay this to his charge. Libanius distinctly asserts that the temples were left open and undisturbed during his reign, and that Paganism remained unchanged. Though Constantine advanced many Christians to offices of trust, and no doubt many who were ambitious of such offices conformed to the religion of the emperor, probably most of the high dignities of the State were held by the Pagans. . . . In the capitol there can be but little doubt that sacrifices were offered in the name of the senate and the people of Rome till a much later period."\*

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

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

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

"Many judge of Constantine by too severe a standard, because they regard him as a Christian; but I can not look at him in that light. The religion which he had in his head, must have been a strange jumble indeed. . . . He was a superstitious man, and mixed up his Christian religion with all kinds of absurd and superstitious opinions. When certain oriental writers call him equal to the apostles, they

---

\* Historical Commentaries, Book 4, chap. 4.

† Sunday and the Mosaic Sabbath, p. 4.

do not know what they are saying; and to speak of him as a saint is a profanation of the word.”\*

It is a curious and little known fact, that markets were expressly appointed by Constantine to be held on Sunday. This we learn from an inscription on a Slavonian bath rebuilt by him, published in Gruter's *Inscriptiones Antiquæ totius Orbis Romani*, CLXIV. 2. It is there recorded of the emperor, that “provisione pietatis sue mundinas dies solis perpeti anno constituit;” “by a pious provision he appointed markets to be held on Sunday throughout the year.” His pious object doubtless was to promote the attendance of the country people at churches in towns. “Thus,” says Charles Julius Hare, “Constantine was the author of the practice of holding markets on Sunday, which, in many parts of Europe, prevailed above a thousand years after, though Charlemagne issued a special law (cap. CXL,) against it.”† In “Scotland, this practice was first forbidden on holy days by an Act of James IV., in 1503, and on Sundays in particular by one of James VI., in 1579.”‡

Before dismissing the Constantinian period, it is pertinent to notice Eusebius, the church historian, and the “dishonestly eulogistic,” biographer of Constantine. He was a great partisan, and sought by all means to induce men to favor and honor his patron, the emperor. As a commentator on the

---

\* History of the Eastern Church, p. 292.

† Philological Museum, i., 30.

‡ Robert Cox, Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 359.

Scriptures, his characteristic tendency to make unwarrantable statements is clearly seen. Prof. Moses Stuart made especial effort to reproduce the ideas of Constantine and to show that he taught the "puritan" theory of a transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. The important passages in support of this claim are from Eusebius's Commentary on the 92d Psalm. The Commentary abounds in unsupported statements, of which the following is the key note:

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

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

"But supposing Eusebius to have meant that our Lord, by an express command, put Sunday in the place of Saturday, invested it with all the authority which the Sabbath had possessed, and laid upon his followers the duty of observing it as the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath—supposing Eusebius to say all this, of what value are his opinions to us? The Scripture is our rule, as it was also his:

and if the command is recorded there, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced therefrom, surely we can profit but little from knowing that a bishop in the fourth century found or deduced it, as every intelligent Christian may on the supposition do. If, on the contrary, it is *not* in the Bible, or to be well and necessarily deduced from anything recorded therein, are we bound, or even at liberty, to believe an assertion made for the first time by a writer in the fourth century—a writer, too, that was obviously under a strong temptation to recommend, in every possible way, the Sunday Sabbath of Constantine to the Christians of his time? When Eusebius declares that the Sabbath began with Moses, neither his thorough researches into the usages and antiquities of the Christian church, nor the enlightenment and vigor of his mind, have the smallest effect in inducing Mr. Stuart, or any other Sabbatarian, to disbelieve in a universal, primeval Sabbath law and its recognition by the early Gentile Christians. Are not all men equally entitled to reject his supposed interpretation of Scripture as to the transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week; and also to believe that when he finds in certain Psalm—allusions to and prophecies of the Eucharist, and the morning assemblies of Christians on the Lord's-day, he displays a puerile fancy, rather than that soundness of judgment which an interpreter of Scripture stands greatly in need of?\*

The foregoing testimony relative to the Sunday under Constantine is given thus at length in order to show that it gained supremacy through his *pagan* legislation, and not through Christian influence, nor by the authority of the Word of God. The adulterous union between Christianity and heathenism,

---

\* Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1 p. 364.

thus consummated through civil legislation, brought forth the Papacy. Sunday became one of its petted children. One word describes the course of the "Church" from the time of Constantine along the succeeding centuries until history, full of shame and sadness, hides it under the pall of the dark ages; that word is, *downward*. The leading features of that down-going will be given in the next section.

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

## CHAPTER XIV.

# SUNDAY FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE TO THE CLOSE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

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

ATHANASIUS,

who died 373, A. D., left very little which bears upon the question. He speaks of the first and seventh days as not being "fasts" even in the time of Lent.\* He also refers to the fourth day of the week, as one on which Christians usually assembled in the churches.†

CYRIL,

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

"And fall not into Judaism, nor into the sect of the Samaritans, for henceforth hath Jesus Christ ransomed thee. Abstain from all observance of sabbaths, and from calling an indifferent meat 'common or unclean.' Especially abhor all the assemblies of the wicked heretics; and in every way make

---

\* Festal Epistles, p. 54.    † Historical Tracts, p. 268.

thine own soul safe, by fastings, by prayers, by alms, by reading of the divine oracles.”\*

Again he says:

“ This Holy Spirit, who in union with the Father and Son, has established the New Testament in the church Catholic, has set us free from the grievous burdens of the law—those ordinances, I mean, concerning things common and unclean, and meats, and sabbaths, and new moons, and circumcision, and sprinklings, and sacrifices, which were given for a season, and had the shadow of good things to come, but which, when the truth had come, were rightly abrogated.”†

#### CHRYSOSTOM.

The most important testimony which marks the beginning of the fifth century, is from the “ golden-tongued ” Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, who died 402, A. D. In his commentary on Galatians 2: 17, he says:

“ For though few are now circumcised, yet by fasting and observing the Sabbath with the Jews, they equally exclude themselves from grace. If Christ avails not to those who are already circumcised, much more is peril to be feared where fasting and sabbatizing are observed, and thus two commandments of the law are kept instead of one. . . . Wherefore dost thou keep the Sabbath, and fast with the Jews? Is it that thou fearest the law and abandonment of the letter? But thou wouldst not entertain this fear, didst thou not disparage faith as weak, and by itself powerless to save. A fear to omit the Sabbath plainly shows that you fear the law as still in force; and if the law is needful, it is so as a whole,

\* Lecture 4, sec. 37, p. 51, Oxford, 1839.

† Lecture 17, sec. 29.



not in part, nor in one commandment only; and if as a whole, the righteousness which is by faith, is, little by little, shut out. If thou keep the Sabbath, why not also be circumcised? And if circumcised, why not also offer sacrifices? If the law is observed, it must be observed as a whole, or not at all.\*

In treating of the distinction between what he calls natural and positive laws, he gives utterance to the following:

“How was it, then, when he said, ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ that he did not add, ‘because murder is a wicked thing?’ The reason was that conscience had taught this beforehand; and he speaks thus as to those who know and understand the point. Wherefore when he speaks to us of another commandment, not known to us by the dictate of conscience, he not only prohibits but adds the reason. When, for instance, he gave commandment respecting the Sabbath, ‘On the seventh day thou shalt do no work,’ he subjoined also the reason for this cessation. . . . For what purpose, then, I ask, did he add a reason respecting the Sabbath, but did no such thing in regard to murder? Because this commandment was not one of the leading ones—*τῶν προηγούμενων*. It was not one of those which were accurately defined of our conscience, but a kind of partial and temporary one; and for this reason it was abolished afterwards.”†

In another place, Homily on Matthew, after reviewing the history of the acts of Christ, in healing the sick on the Sabbath, and the act of the disciples in plucking the ears of corn, he notes the arguments

\* Library of the Fathers, Vol. 6, p. 42, Oxford, 1840.

† Homily on the Statutes, Library, etc., pp. 208, 209.

by which the accusing Jews were silenced, and draws the following conclusions:

“ For it was time for them to be trained in all things by the higher rules, and it was unnecessary that his hands should be bound, who was freed from wickedness, winged for all good works; or that men should hereby learn that God made all things; or that they should so be made gentle, who are called to imitate God’s own love to mankind, or that they should make one day a festival who are commanded to keep a feast all their life long. . . . So now, why is any Sabbath required by him who is always keeping the feast, whose conversation is in heaven? Let us keep the feast then continually, and do no evil thing, *for this is a feast*, and let our spiritual things be intense, while our earthly things give place.”\*

In these extracts, the same no-Sabbath theories appear, which vitiated the doctrines of the leading men in the Latin Church during the century preceding the time of Constantine. Not less unscriptural are the following teachings from the pen of the renowned

AUGUSTINE,

Bishop of Hippo, who died 430, A. D., He says:

“ Read the Old Testament, and you will see that so far as precepts are concerned, the very same precepts were given to a people still carnal, which are given to us. For to worship one God, we are commanded. ‘Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain,’ which is the second commandment. This we are commanded too, ‘Observe the Sabbath-day.’ This commandment concerns us still more than it concerned them; because it is com-

---

\* Library, etc., pp. 557, 563

mand'd to be observed spiritually. For the Jews observe the Sabbath in a servile way, spending it in rioting, in drunkenness. How much better would their women be employed at the distaff, than dancing on that day, in the balconies. Let us not say for a moment, my brethren, that these observe the Sabbath. The Christian observes that Sabbath spiritually, abstaining from servile work. For what is from servile work? From sin. How prove we this? Ask the Lord. 'Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.'\* So that on us likewise is enjoined, spiritually, the observance of the Sabbath.†

Augustine brings out the idea suggested above more fully, in his remarks on the Ninety-second Psalm. He says:

“The title of the Psalm, is ‘Psalm or song for the Sabbath-day.’ This day on which I address you is a Sabbath-day, which the Jews honor by an external rest, and by slothful idleness. For they intermit their usual occupations only to indulge in trifling pursuits; and although the Sabbath was appointed by God, they nevertheless spend the day in doing what God has forbidden. Our Sabbath consists in abstaining from every evil work; that of the Jews consists in abstaining from every good work. It would be much better to till the ground than to dance. They abstain from doing good works, and do not abstain from doing others which are puerile. God commands us to observe the Sabbath; but what is the Sabbath which he commands to us? Look, in the first place, where it is observed. It is within us, it is in our heart that our Sabbath is. Some appear externally to be at rest when their conscience is troubled and disturbed. No wicked man can ob-

---

\* John 8: 34.

† Homily on John. Lib., &c., p. 44, Oxford, 1848.

serve this internal Sabbath. His conscience is never in peace. He must necessarily pass his life in continual agitation. The good conscience, on the contrary, is always tranquil; and it is that tranquillity which is the Sabbath of the heart. He who tastes that internal repose expects firmly the promises which God has made to him. If he now suffer afflictions, hope of the future transports him already to heaven, and all the clouds of his sorrow are dispersed, according to the words of St. Paul, 'Rejoice in hope.\*' That joy which we taste in the peace of our hope, is our Sabbath. It is that to which we are exhorted; it is that which is sung in this Psalm. The Christian is there taught to dwell continually in peace, in the Sabbath of his heart; that is to say, never to be troubled, but to be steadfast in repose, in tranquillity, and in the serenity of his conscience. It is for this reason that the ordinary trouble of man is here marked, to enable us by avoiding it to celebrate the Sabbath of the heart."†

In another place,‡ Augustine places the "Sabbath and circumcision and sacrifices" among those precepts of the law which Christians are not allowed to use. In his commentary on the 150th Psalm, he has a mystical and vague exposition of the meaning of the number *one hundred and fifty*, in which the following references occur:

"This number fifteen, I say, signifieth the agreement of the two testaments. For in the former is observed the Sabbath, which signifieth rest, in the latter the Lord's-day, which signifieth resurrection. The Sabbath is the seventh day, but the

---

\* Rom. 12: 12.

† Homily on 92d Psa., Lib. Fathers, Vol. 6, pp. 569-271.

‡ Short Treatise, p. 586, Oxford, 1847.

Lord's-day coming after the seventh must needs be the eighth, and is also to be reckoned the first. For it is called the first day of the week, and so from it are reckoned the second, third, fourth, and so on to the seventh day of the week, which is the Sabbath. But from Lord's-day to Lord's-day is eight days, wherein is declared the revelation of the New Testament, which in the Old was, as it were, veiled under earthly promises.\*

The foregoing are the representative references to the Sabbath in the writings of Augustine. A passage has been quoted from the treatise entitled *De Tempore*, which is sometimes ascribed to Augustine; but the evidences against the authenticity of the work are such as to preclude the conclusion that it came from the pen of Augustine. The passage is to the effect that, "The holy doctors of the church decreed to transfer the glory of the Jewish rest to the Lord's-day." This sentiment corresponds to the Pharisaical Churchism which prevailed during the latter part of the middle ages. Concerning the sermon from which this passage is taken, Doctor Pusey, as quoted by Hessey, remarks: "It is later than the eighth century since it incorporates a passage from Alcuin."† Robert Cox supports, by abundant testimony, the idea that the sermon is falsely ascribed to Augustine.

By these representative quotations, the reader will see that the Sunday had no true sabbatic character in the theories of the church at the close of the fifth

---

\* Lib. &c., p. 449.

† Hessey: Lect. on Sunday, Note 202; and Cox: Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 123.

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

"The *feriæ æstivæ*, or thirty days of harvest, and the *feriæ autumnales*, or thirty days of vintage, three days under the common name of calends of January, one day in memory of the founding of Rome, and another in memory of the founding of Constantinople, and four days in memory of the birth and inauguration of the Emperors, were exempt from judicial pleadings in the courts. All these, together with the fifteen days of Easter, and all Sundays throughout the year, were exempted by a law of Theodosius and Valentian, Junior, about the year 390; and afterward (560) there were added to these, by Justinian, the days of the passion of the apostles; and all public shows and games upon any of them prohibited. Most of these were of long standing

among the Romans, and were retained after the introduction of Christianity.”\*

Heylyn thus sums up the testimony on this point:

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

---

\* Antiquities, Book 20, chap. 1.

yea, and the birthdays of themselves, with those on which each of them had begun his empire. So that, in this regard, the sacred day had no more privilege than the civil, but were all alike, the *Emperor's-day* as much respected as the *Lord's*.\*

In this equality, concerning matters of business, the Sunday, and numerous other festivals, continued to stand, until more than eighty years after. In 469, A. D., the Emperor Leo made a statue prohibiting the obscene shows in the theaters, and the combats with wild beasts, upon the Sunday; more, however, because of the extreme obscenity of the shows, and their interruption of the public services, than of any sacredness of the day.† Even these prohibitions were not confined to the Sunday; for, in the language of Bingham:

“He not only restrained the people from celebrating their games on the Lord's-day, but on all other solemn festivals, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost, obliging both Jews and Gentiles, over all the world, to show respect to those days, by putting a distinction between days of supplication and days of pleasure, and this became the standing law of the Roman Empire.”

Again Heylyn says:

“Thus do we see on what grounds the Lord's-day stands; on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings, that custom countenanced by the authority of the church of God, which tacitly approved the same, and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires. And as the day, so the rest from labor, and the restraint

---

\* History, Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 10.

† See Heylyn, Hist. Sab., part 2, chap. 4, sec. 2; also Bingham, book 20, chap. 5, sec. 4.



from business upon that, received its *greatest strength* from the supreme magistrate, as long as he retained that power, which to him belonged, as after, from the canons and decrees of councils, and the decretals of popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them. . . . The Lord's-day had no such (divine) command that it should be sanctified, but was left plainly to God's people to pitch on this or any other for the public use. And, being taken up amongst them and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercise, yet for three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from labor, nor from worldly business, required upon it. And when it seemed good to Christian princes, the nursing fathers of God's church, to lay restraints upon their people, yet, at first, they were not general, but only thus, that certain men in certain places should lay aside their ordinary and daily works to attend God's service in the church; those whose employments were most toilsome and most repugnant to the true nature of a Sabbath, being allowed to follow and pursue their labors because most necessary to the Commonwealth. And in the following times when the princes and prelates, in their several places, endeavored to restrain them from that also, which formerly they had permitted, and interdicted almost all kinds of bodily labor upon that day, it was not brought about without much struggling and opposition of the people, more than a *thousand years* being passed after Christ's ascension, before the Lord's-day had attained that state in which now it standeth.<sup>7</sup>\*

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

About sixty years later, the transaction of business

---

\* History Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 3 sec. 12.

(*negotiorum intentio*) was forbidden by Theodosius the Great, A. D. 386, who, in the words of canon Robertson, also abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day had been set apart from other secular uses by Constantine. Theodosius the younger, A. D. 425, in legislating on the subject, stated that the honors due to the Emperor were less important than the observance of the Lord's-day, and of certain *other sacred seasons* which he specifies. Leo and Anthemius, A. D. 469, held yet stronger language. If the Emperor's birthday fell on that day, the acknowledgement of it, which was accompanied by games, was to be put off. It does not however appear that the Christians, now greatly increased in number, so much objected to the Emperor that all relaxation on the Lord's day was unlawful, as that these games, being idolatrous, indecent, and cruel, and so unfit for a Christian to attend on any day, were especially unfit to engage his thoughts or attract his attention on the Lord's-day. In particular, the weaker brethren were likely to be led away by them. A few notices as to legal proceedings may conclude this portion of our subject. Constantine qualified his general prohibition of law-business on the Lord's-day, by soon afterwards permitting the acts of conferring liberty and equal rights, (*manumissio*, for instance, or giving freedom to the slave, and *emancipatio*, or setting the son free from the paternal power). This law was followed, under Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 368, by one prohibiting exacting on that day, from any Christian, the payment of any debt. . . . Theodosius the Great,\* confirmed all this, but made his prohibition include not merely the *Dies Solis qui repetitur in se calculo revolvitur*, but such a number of other days as to constitute one hundred and twenty-four judicial holidays in the course of the year."†

---

\* Cod. Theod. ii. 8, 2.

† Lectures on Sunday, p. 83.

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

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

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

"But with all this, in no clearly genuine passage that I can discover in any writer of these two centuries, or in any public document, ecclesiastical or civil, is the fourth commandment referred to as the ground of obligation to observe the Lord's-day. In no passage, too, is there anything like a reference to the Creation words, as the ground of the obligation to observe it, with the exception, perhaps, of that one passage in Chrysostom in which the command for the seventh day is made, *ἀνινιγματῶδῶς* to shadow forth the command for the first. In no passage is there anything like the confusion between 'the seventh day' and 'one day in seven,' of which we have heard so much in England since A. D. 1595. In no passage is there any hint of the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's-day, or of the planting of the Lord's-day on the ruins of the Sabbath, *those fictions of modern times*. If the Sabbath ap-

pears, it appears as a perfectly distinct day. And what is still more to our purpose, looking at the matter as a practical one, though law proceedings are forbidden, and labors for gain (at any rate in towns) are forbidden, and amusements unseemly for a Christian on any day are forbidden, no symptom is as yet discoverable of compulsory restrictions of, or conscientious abstinence from such recreations and necessary duties, (other than trades and professions) as are permissible on other days, so long as they do not interfere with divine worship, and things connected with it, and appropriate to the Lord's-day. . . . In fact, we may at least say, that though to a certain extent formalized, and to a certain extent divested of its unique claims to the Christian regard, the Lord's-day at the end of the fifth century is not transformed into anything like the Sabbath as the Jews had it."\*

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

---

\* Lectures on Sunday, p. 86.

## CHAPTER XV.

# SUNDAY IN THE CHURCH COUNCILS.

Certain writers assert that the early church, through its Councils, set the Sabbath aside, and put the Sunday in its place. The nature of this department, "The Councils," is fairly set forth in the following:

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

meeting regularly in almost every province in Christendom, from Spain and Gaul to Arabia and Mesopotamia, and by extension and further organization, there was soon formed a system of mutually correspondent synods that gave to the church the aspect of a federative republic.”\*

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

---

\* Ency. Brit., Vol. VI., p. 453, 9th ed.

† History Church Councils, Hefele, Vol. 1, p. 145, Edinburg, 1872.

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

“Remember that our fathers have already directed that a layman who is staying in a town, and does not appear at divine service, (*celebrasset conventum*), for three Sundays, shall be excommunicated; and if this is ordered with regard to the laity, no bishop can be allowed to absent himself for a longer time from his church, or leave the people entrusted to him, except from necessity, or for some urgent business.”\*

The penalty of “excommunication” was added to many other acts besides staying from service for three weeks. In the collection of Canons attributed to the “Fourth Synod of Carthage,” which collection was evidently compiled during the sixth century, we find the following decrees:

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

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

In the Fifth “Carthaginian Synod,” (fifth century), canon 5th declares:

“On Sundays and feast days no plays may be performed.”†

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

---

\* Canon 11, Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 145.

† Hefele. Vol. 2, pp. 413, 417, 423.

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

“As some kneel on the Lord’s-day, and on the days of Pentecost, the holy Synod has decided that, for the observance of a general rule, all shall offer their prayers to God standing.”\*

The Synod of Laodicea—343–381 A. D.—furnishes an oft quoted decree as follows:

“Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord’s-day they shall especially honor, and as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.”†

The 16th Canon of the same council shows that this restriction could have applied to only a part of the Sabbath, for it shows that it was a day of public religious service like Sunday. It is as follows:

“On Saturday (Sabbath) the Gospels and other portions of the Scriptures shall be read aloud.”‡

Hefele says of Canon 16:

“Neander remarks that this canon is open to two interpretations. It may mean that on Saturday, as on Sunday, the holy Scriptures shall be read aloud

\* Hefele, Vol. 1, p. 434.

† Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 316.

‡ *Ib. Id.* p. 310.



in the church, and therefore, solemn public service shall be held; and canon 49, is in favor of this interpretation. It was also the custom in many provinces of the ancient church to observe Saturday as the feast of the creation."

Canon 49, reads as follows:

"During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday."

Canon 51, says:

"During Lent no feasts of the Martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy Martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent."

To this canon Hefele adds:

"For the obvious reason that on these days there was full and solemn service."\*

The English translator of Hefele has incorrectly used Saturday for "the Sabbath," in the foregoing paragraphs.

The foregoing extracts constitute the testimony of the councils, local and general, down to the close of the first quarter of the fifth century. They show: (a) That little attention was paid to the Sunday question by the councils, aside from its relation to the contest relative to the time of observing Easter. (b) These extracts show that the Sunday had no pre-eminence in point of sacredness over the Sabbath, or over other festivals. Indeed the order not to rest on the Sabbath indicates that the custom of abstaining from labor on that day still continued in force, and that cessation from labor on Sunday, was not yet an

---

\* Hefele, Vol. 2, p. 320

established custom. These facts relative to what was said by the councils, show that after the time of Constantine the civil law was the stronghold of the Sunday. Its gradual elevation into the place of the Sabbath resulted from the seeds of Paganism from which legislation began, and not from the *religious* experiences of the church.

## CHAPTER XVI.

# THE SABBATH FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE DARK AGES.

We have also valuable testimony showing that the Sabbath survived for some time the new-born opposition which arose with the civil legislation of Constantine and his successors, *i. e.*, after 321 A. D. This too, in the body of the Western, Romanized church; saying nothing here of the dissenters, who, at a later period, withdrew from the Romanized branch, nor of the Eastern wing of the church, which never gave up the Sabbath. Certain writings once accepted as genuine, but now known to be spurious have an historic value, by showing what ideas and practices obtained as late as the sixth century. Prominent among these are

### CONSTITUTIONS OF THE HOLY APOSTLES

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

“According to some authors, they are first quoted in the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople, in 394 A. D., and in those of the Synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon, in 481 and 431 A. D. Some have said that they are mentioned in the *Decretum de libris recipiendis*, issued by Pope Gelasius, (492-496 A. D.) while others have pointed out that the name occurs in those manuscripts only which have the decree of

Hormisdas. (514-523). Perhaps the soundest decision is, that the collection is not mentioned in history until about the end of the 5th century; it is undoubted that it was in existence before the beginning of the sixth, for the Latin translation of the first fifty Canons dates from the year 500 A. D.”\*

Dr. Hessey speaks of the Constitutions as follows:

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

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

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

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

The safest conclusion seems to be this. The Constitutions describe a state of things which came about gradually, between the third and sixth centuries, and are of some value as collateral historic evidence; as such, the references to the Sabbath question are given below. Book I, which is “*Concerning the Laity*,” does not refer to the question. Book II treats of,

\* Vol. 2, p. 170, American Reprint, 9th edition.

† Sunday Lectures, 3d, p. 76.

“ *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.*” In this are the following references to the question under consideration. Chapter 36 treats of the ten commandments as follows:

“ Have before thine eyes the fear of God, and always remember the ten commandments of God,—to love the one, and only Lord God with all thy strength, and to give no heed to idols, or any other beings, as being lifeless gods, or irrational beings or demons. Consider the manifold workmanship of God, which received its beginning through Christ. Thou shalt observe the Sabbath, on account of him who ceased from his work of creation, but ceased not from his work of providence; it is a rest for meditation of the law, not for idleness of the hands.”\*

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

“ Let your judicatures be held on the second day of the week, that if any controversy arise about your sentence, having an interval till the Sabbath, you may be able to set the controversy right, and to reduce those to peace who have the contests one with another, against the Lord’s-day,”†

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 65, 66.

† Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, p. 75.

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

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

Book III, “Concerning Widows;” and Book IV, “Concerning Orphans,” are silent on the Sabbath question. Book V, Sec. 3, is “On Feast Days and Fast Days;” chapter 18 is as follows:

“Do you, therefore, fast on the days of the pass-over, beginning from the second day of the week until the preparation, and the Sabbath, six days,

---

\* Ante-Nicene, Lib. Vol. 17, pp. 87, 88.

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

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

"But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week. But do you either fast the entire five days, or on the fourth day of the week, and on the day of preparation, because on the fourth day the condemnation went out against the Lord. Judas then promising to betray him for money; and you must fast on

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 138, 143.

the day of the preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the cross under Pontius Pilate. But keep the Sabbath and the Lord's-day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of the Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the creator is more honorable by nature and dignity than his own creatures."\*

Chapter 36 gives a form of prayer in which Sabbath and Lord's-day appear as follows:

"Oh Lord Almighty, thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast appointed the Sabbath in memory thereof, because that on that day thou hast made us rest from our works, for the meditation upon thy laws. Thou hast also appointed festivals for the rejoicing of our souls, that we might come into the remembrance of that wisdom which was created by thee; how he submitted to be made of a woman on our account. He appeared in life, and demonstrated himself in his baptism; how he that appeared is both God and man. He suffered for us by thy permission, and died, and rose again by thy power; on which account we solemnly assemble to celebrate the feast of the resurrection on the Lord's-day, and rejoice on account of him who has conquered death, and has brought life and immortality to light." . . . "Thou didst enjoin the observation of the Sabbath, not affording them an occasion of idleness, but an opportunity of piety, for their knowledge of thy power, and the prohibition of evils, having limited them as within a holy circuit for the sake of doctrine, for the rejoicing upon the seventh period. . . . On this ac-

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, p. 186.



count he permitted men every Sabbath to rest, that so no one might be willing to send one word out of his mouth in anger on the day of the Sabbath. For the Sabbath is the ceasing of the creation, the completion of the world, the inquiry after laws, and the grateful praise to God for blessings he has bestowed upon men. All which the Lord's-day excels, and shows the Mediator himself, the Provider, the Law-giver, the cause of the resurrection, the First-born of the whole creation, God the Word, and man, who was born of Mary alone, without a man, who lived holily, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died and rose again from the dead. So that the Lord's-day commands us to offer unto thee O Lord, thanksgiving for all. For this is the grace afforded by thee, which on account of its greatness has obscured all other blessings."\*

Book VIII, chapter 33 presents a law said to have been made by the apostles, Peter and Paul, in the following words:

"I Peter and Paul do make the following Constitution, Let the slaves work five days, but on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day let them have leisure to go to church for instruction in piety. We have said that the Sabbath is on account of creation, and the Lord's-day of the resurrection. Let slaves rest from their work all the great week, and that which follows it for the one in memory of the passion, and the other of the resurrection; and there is need that they should be instructed who it is that suffered and rose again, and who it is permitted him to suffer, and raised him again. Let them rest from their work on the ascension, because it was the conclusion of the dispensation by Christ. Let them rest at Pentecost because of the coming of the Holy Spirit, which was given to those that believed in Christ. Let them rest

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17, pp. 196-7.

on the festival of his birth, because on it the unexpected favor was granted to men, that Jesus Christ, the Logos of God, should be born of the virgin Mary, for the salvation of the world. Let them rest on the day of the Epiphany, because on it a manifestation took place of the divinity of Christ, for the Father bore testimony to him at the baptism, and the Paraclete, in the form of a dove, pointed out to the bystanders him to whom testimony was borne. Let them rest on the days of the Apostles; for they were appointed your teachers [to bring you] to Christ, and made you worthy of the Spirit. Let them rest on the day of the first martyr, Stephen, and of the other holy martyrs who preferred Christ to their own lives."\*

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

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS OF THE SAME APOSTLES. There are eighty-five of these. They treat mainly of the duties of the clergy. The 64th canon says:

"If any one of the clergy be found to fast on the Lord's-day, or on the Sabbath-day, excepting one only, let him be deprived; but if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended."

The 69th canon says:

"If any bishop or presbyter, or deacon, or reader, or singer, does not fast the fast of forty days, or the fourth day of the week, and the day of the prepara-

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 17. pp. 246, 247.

tion, let him be deprived, except he be hindered by weakness of body. But if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended."

#### ANCIENT SYRIAN DOCUMENTS.

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

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

1. "The apostles therefore appointed: Pray ye toward the East, 'because as the lightning which lighteneth from the east and is seen even to the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be, [which was said] that by this we might know and understand that he will appear from the east suddenly."

2. "The apostles further appointed: On the first [day] of the week let there be service, and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the oblation; because on the first day of the week our Lord rose from the

place of the dead, and on the first day of the week he rose upon the world, and on the first day of the week he ascended up to heaven, and on the first day of the week he will appear at last with the angels of heaven."

3. "The apostles further appointed: On the fourth day of the week let there be service; because on that [day] our Lord made the disclosure to them about his trial and his suffering, and his crucifixion, and his death, and his resurrection; and the disciples were on account of this in sorrow."

4. "The apostles further appointed: On the eve [of the Sabbath] at the ninth hour, let there be service, because that which had been spoken on the fourth day of the week about the suffering of the Saviour was brought to pass on the eve [of the Sabbath] the worlds and [all] creatures trembling, and the luminaries in the heavens being darkened."

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*

6. "The apostles further appointed: Celebrate the day of the Epiphany of our Saviour, which is the chief of the festivals of the church, on the sixth day of the latter Canon in the long number of the Greeks."\*

In this way the document proceeds with twenty-seven ordinances on all sorts of subjects. Evidently an ordinance was forged to fit every notion and custom, which needed support. The likeness between many of these ordinances and many of the constitutions, is very marked. It was a similar spirit if not the same hand that gave utterance to them. With such tendencies in the church, such a mixture of Pagan and Christian and Jewish notions, with such dishonesty in forging in the name of Christ and his

---

\* Ante-Nicene Lib., Vol. 20, pp. 38, 39

apostles, with the Church and State united, and hence the church much corrupted, the world was ripe for the Dark Ages that were hurrying on.

There are incidental notices and references scattered over the period between Constantine and the sixth century which show that the Sabbath was a day of regular public worship.

Chrysostom, about the year 388 A. D. in his "Homilies on the Statues," says:

"To-day, and on the former Sabbath it had behooved us to enter on the subject of fasting; nor let any one suppose that what I say would have been unseasonable."\*

Again he says :

"There are many of us now who fast on the same day as the Jews, and keep the Sabbath in the same manner. . . . For though few are now circumcised yet by fasting and observing the Sabbath with the Jews they equally exclude themselves from grace."†

On page 238 of the same volume, Chrysostom earnestly opposes sun worship as a prevalent evil, thus showing that the struggle was still going on, and that the observance still continued among the people in spite of the semi-pagan theories of the leaders, late in the fourth century. Still later Augustine (died 430 A. D.) speaks of public worship on the Sabbath, as follows:

"The title of the Psalm is 'Psalm or Song for the Sabbath-day.' This day on which I address you is a Sabbath-day, which the Jews honor by an external rest, and by slothful indulgence."

---

\* Homily, 15.

† Homilies on Gal. and Eph., Lib. of the Fathers, pp. 15, 42.

This shows that the practice of holding services on the Sabbath still continued in spite of no-Sabbath theories, during the first half of the fifth century. In another place Augustine uses the following language:

“The Sabbath is the seventh day, but the Lord’s-day coming after the seventh must needs be the eighth, and is also reckoned the first. For it is called the first day of the week, and so from it are reckoned the third, fourth and so on to the seventh day of the week, which is the Sabbath.”\*

Considering the facts set forth in this chapter, ignorance alone can excuse men for asserting that the Sabbath was unknown in the early church, or that it was not observed for a long time even after the Western church was Romanized. Indeed, ignorance is not a valid excuse, for if men do not know the facts they have no right to indulge in assertions. No prominent feature of apostolic practice continued in the apostatizing church longer than did Sabbath-keeping.

---

\* Short Treatise, p. 586.

## CHAPTER XVII.

# SUNDAY DURING THE DARK AGES.

Church-appointed festivals and holy days had become so numerous at the opening of the sixth century, that some new influence was demanded to give them importance, and to enforce their observance. This end was sought by claiming an analogy between the God-appointed days under the Jewish dispensation, and the church-appointed days under the gospel. It was assumed that the church, being left to legislate for herself, had power to appoint and enforce in the matter of holy days, as God had done under the Mosaic system. The people had become accustomed to yield, in unquestioning obedience, to the dictation of the church; and hence, a pharisaical churchocracy was the more easily established. Religion was made to consist mainly in outward forms and ceremonies,—the outgrowth of vague, mystical, semi-pagan notions and theories. Sunday, in common with the other festivals, shared in these influences; and thus, a more rigid observance of it began to prevail. Note carefully the fact that there was no claim that the Sunday had taken the place of the Sabbath, by any change or transfer of the fourth

commandment; it was only by analogy, that this pseudo-Sabbathism was introduced. As the darkness of the Middle Ages increased, ecclesiastical formalism grew more rigid and lifeless, and the prevailing ignorance and superstition became more galling and cruel. Dr. Hessey groups the facts together in the following words:

“But a more serious change is at hand. In the centuries ranging from the sixth to the fifteenth, we find civil rulers and councils, and ecclesiastical writers by degrees altering their tone. Holy days are multiplied more and more. Then, as the church has established so many that it is impossible to observe them all, and as her authority, from being exercised so often and in a manner so difficult to be complied with, begins to be thought lightly of, holy days must be distinguished, and some sanction, which shall vividly reach the conscience, must be found for days of special obligation. The Old Testament has been already referred to for the analogy of many of her festivals. The step from analogy to identification is not a startling or a violent one. Thus, a gradual identification of the Lord’s-day with the Sabbath sets in. This naturally leads to the fourth commandment. The fourth commandment once thought of, vexatious restrictions follow, thwarting men in their necessary employments or enjoyments by an application of its terms either strictly literal or most ingeniously refined. Councils condescend to notice whether oxen may or may not be yoked on the Lord’s-day; and not unfrequently contradict each other. The second Council of Macon, A. D. 585, enjoins ‘that no one should allow himself on the Lord’s-day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns and praise of God. For this is the day of perpetual rest:’ this is shadowed out to us by the



seventh day in the law and the prophets.' It then goes on to threaten punishments for profanation of the holy day, either by pleading causes or by other works. 'Offenders will displease God,' and besides will draw upon themselves the 'implacable anger of the clergy.' Lawyers will lose their privilege of pleading causes. Clerks or monks will be shut out for six months from the society of their brethren. '*Rusticus aut servus gravioribus justium ictibus verberabitur.*' Still, even in this Council, there is a recognition of the true origin of the Lord's-day. 'Keep the Lord's day, whereon we were born anew and freed from all sins.'

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

"A few more instances, taken almost at random, may conclude this part of our subject. At the end of the eighth century, we find Alcuin asserting that the observation of the former Sabbath had been transferred very fitly to the Lord's-day, by the custom and consent of Christian people. . . . In England again, A. D. 1201, in the time of King John, Eustace, Abbot of Flay, preaches the observance of the Lord's-day with a strictness eminently Judaical, and descending to the most ordinary occupations. He professes to confirm his doctrine by a letter, purporting to be from our Saviour, and miraculously found on the altar of St. Simeon at Golgotha. Various apocryphal judgments overtook persons transgressing, in the slightest degree, the commands set forth in this document. It had said that from the

ninth hour of the Sabbath (Saturday) to sunrise on Monday, no work was to be done; and it is curious to find that the instances of punishment seem to cluster about the profanation of the later hours of Saturday. At length, the church, almost as a rule, though still asserting that the Lord's-day and all other holy days were of ecclesiastical institution (not indeed in the high sense of that word, for they are not *de Jure Divino*, but *de Jure Humano Canonico*), had erected a complete Judaic superstructure upon an ecclesiastical foundation. . . . The most perfect development, however, of this ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism is displayed by Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, in the fourteenth century, in his Commentary on the twelfth chapter of Exodus. . . . 'If a musician (says Tostatus) wait upon a gentleman to recreate his mind with music, and they are agreed upon certain wages, or he be only hired for a present time, he sins in case he play or sing to him on holy days (including the Lord's-day); but not, if his reward be doubtful or depend only on the bounty of the parties who enjoy his music.' 'A cook that, on the holy days, is hired to make a feast or to dress a dinner, commits a mortal sin;' but not, 'if he be hired by the month or year. Meat may be dressed upon the Lord's-day or the other holy days, but to wash dishes on those days, is unlawful,—that must be deferred to another day. A man that travels on holy days to any special shrine or saint, commits no sin; but he commits sin if he returns home on those days. Artificers which work on these days for their own profit only, are in mortal sin, unless the work be very small (*quia modicum non facit solemnitatem dissolvi*), because a small thing dishonoreth not the festival.' But I forbear to proceed with this catalogue of puerilities."\*

Heylyn treats very fully of that which Dr. Hessey

---

\* Hessey. Lectures on Sunday, Lect. 3. p. 87. seq.

has thus outlined. In part second of his *History of the Sabbath*, we learn that the Council of Macon, under Gunthran, king of Burgundy, although very strict in its prohibitions, still acknowledges that:

“The Lord does not exact it of us, that we should celebrate this day in corporeal abstinence or rest from labor, who only looks that we do yield obedience to his holy will, by which, contemning earthly things, he may conduct us to the heavens of his infinite mercy.” . . . “Yet notwithstanding these restraints from work and labor, the church did never resolve it that any work was in itself unlawful on the Lord’s-day, though to advance God’s public service it was thought good that men should be restrained from some kinds of work, that so they might better attend their prayers and follow their devotions.”\*

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

“Yet all this while, we find not any one who did observe it as a *Sabbath*, or which taught others so to do; not any who affirmed that *any manner of work* was unlawful on it, further than as it was prohibited by the Prince or Prelate, that so the people might assemble with greater comfort; not any one who preached or published that any pastime, sport, or recreations of an honest name, such as were lawful on the other days, were not fit for this.” . . . “I note it only for the close, that it was near *nine hundred* years from our Saviour’s birth, if not quite so much, before restraint from husbandry had been first thought of in the East; and probably being thus restrained, did find no more obedience there than it had done before in the Western part.”†

Heylyn goes on to show that much of the rigidity

---

\* Chapter 4, sec. 7.

† Chapter 4, sec. 12.

concerning Sunday observance, existed only in *theories* and laws. In confirmation of which, he cites the following:

“Nor were these reservations and exceptions only in point of business, and nothing found in point of practice; but there are many instances, especially of the greatest persons, and most public actions left upon record, to let us know what liberty they assumed unto themselves as well on this day, as on the rest. And such only shall I instance as being most exemplary, and therefore conducing most to my present purpose. And, first, we read of a great battle fought on Palm Sunday, Anno 718, between Charles Martel, Grand Master of the household of the King of France, and Hilpericus the King himself, wherein the victory fell to Charles. . . . Upon the Sunday before Lent, Anno 835, Ludovick the Emperor, surnamed Pius, or the godly, together with his prelates and others, which had been present with him at the assembly held at Thionville, went on his journey unto Metz, nor do we find that it did derogate at all from his name and piety. Upon the Sunday after Whitsuntide, Anno 844, Ludowic, son unto Lotharius the Emperor, made his solemn entrance into Rome, the Roman citizens attending him with their flags and ensigns, the pope and clergy staying his coming in St. Peter’s Church, there to entertain him. Upon a Sunday, Anno 1014, Henry the Emperor, environed with twelve of the Roman Senators, came to St. Peter’s Church, and there was crowned, together with his wife by the pope then being. On Easter day, Conrad the Emperor was solemnly inaugurated by Pope John,—Canute King of England, and Rodolph King of the Burgundians, being then both present; and the next Sunday after, began his journey towards Germany. . . . On Passion Sunday, Anno 1148, Lewis the King of France, afterwards canonized for a saint, made his first entry into Jeru-

salem with his army. . . . What should I speak of councils on this day assembled, as that of Charles, Tours, Anno 1146, for the recovery of the Holy Land; and of on Trinity Sunday, as we call it now, Anno 1164, against Octavian the pseudo-pope; that of Ferrara, upon Passion Sunday, Anno 1177, against Frederick the Emperor; or that of Paris, Anno 1226, summoned by Stephen, then Bishop there, on the fourth Sunday in Lent, for the condemning of certain dangerous and erroneous positions then on foot. I have the rather instanced in these particulars, partly because they happened about these times, when Prince and Prélate were more and more intent on laying restraints upon their people, for the mere honor of this day, and partly because, being all of them public actions, and such as move not forward but by divers wheels, they did require a greater number of people to attend them.”\*

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

“Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anno 858, thus reckoneth up the festivals of especial note; viz., seven days before Easter, and seven after Christmas, the feasts of the apostles, and the Lord’s-day; and, then, he adds that on those days they suffer neither public shows nor courts of justice. Emanuel Comnenus, next Emperor of Constantinople, Anno 1174: ‘We do ordain,’ saith he, ‘that these days following be exempt from labor;’ viz., the nativity of the Virgin Mary (and so he reckoneth all the rest in

---

\* Hist. of Sab., part 5, chap. 2, sec. 9.

those parts observed), together with all Sundays in the year; and that in them there be no access to the seats of judgment. . . . Now, lest the feast of Whitsuntide might not have some respect as well as Easter, it was determined in the council held at Engelheim, Anno 948, that Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Whitsunweek, should no less solemnly be observed than the Sunday was.”\*

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

“ Under Clodoveus [Clovis], king of France, the bishops met in the first Council of Orleans (A. D. 507), where they obliged themselves and their successors to be always at the church on the Lord’s-day, except in case of sickness or some great infirmity. And because they, with some other of the clergy in those days, took cognizance of judicial matters, therefore by a Council at Arragon, about the year 518, in the reign of Theodoric, king of the Goths, it was decreed, that ‘ No bishop or other person in holy orders should examine or pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Lord’s-day.’”†

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

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

---

\* Chapter 4, sec. 12.

† Dialogues on the Lord’s-day, pp. 263, 264.

‡ Hengstenberg, On the Lord’s-day, p. 58.

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

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

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

“ If a servant do any work on Sunday by his master’s order, he shall be free, and the master shall pay thirty shillings. But if he went to work on his own head, he shall either be beaten with stripes, or shall ransom himself with a price. A freeman, if he

---

\* Dialogues on the Lord’s-day, p. 267.

works on this day, shall lose his freedom or pay sixty shillings; if he be a priest, double." \*

In A. D. 747, under Egbert, king of Kent, by a council of the clergy,

"It was ordered that the Lord's-day be celebrated with due veneration, and wholly devoted to the worship of God. And that all abbots and priests, on this most holy day, remain in their respective monasteries and churches, and there do their duty according to their places." †

Forty years later, Egbert, archbishop of York, to show positively what was to be done on Sunday, and what the laws designed by prohibiting ordinary work to be done on such days, made this canon:

"Let nothing else be done on the Lord's-day, but to attend on God in hymns, and psalms, and spiritual songs. Whoever marries on Sunday, let him do penance for seven days." ‡

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

At a provincial council held in Paris, A. D. 829, the prelates complained that people disregarded the canons relative to Sunday, and asserted that this was

\* Morer, Dialogues on the Lord's-day, p. 283,

† Morer, Dialogues, etc., p. 254.

‡ Ibid, p. 284.



the reason why God had sent some very remarkable and terrible judgments upon men:

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

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

“It was ordered more precisely than in former times, that no man should henceforth, dare to make any markets on the Lord’s-day; no, not for things that were to eat, neither to do any kind of work which belonged to husbandry. Which canon, being made at Rome, confirmed at Compiègne, and afterwards incorporated, as it was, into the body of the canon law, became to be admitted, without further question, in most parts of Christendom; especially when the popes had attained their height, and brought all Christian princes to be at their devotion. For then the people, who before had most opposed it, might have justly said, ‘Behold, two kings stood not before him, how then shall we stand?’ Out of which consternation all men presently obeyed, trades-

---

\* Morer, Dialogues, etc., p. 271; also, Heylyn, His. of Sab. part. 2, chap. 8, sec. 7.

men of all sorts being brought to lay by their labors; and amongst those, the miller, who, though his work was easiest, and least of all required his presence.”\*

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

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

Once begun, the work of excessive legislation found ready acceptance. These laws were added to, in one form or another, under Athelstan, A. D. 928; and again, in 943, under the order of Otho, archbishop of Canterbury. In A. D. 967, Edgar “commanded that the festival should be kept from three o’clock in the afternoon on Saturday, until the dawn of day on Monday.” And under Ethelred, A. D. 1009, the demand for strict observance was renewed. In Norway the same tendency prevailed. Heylyn ‡ relates the story of pious king Olaus, in the year 1028, who, in absent mindedness, having whittled a stick on Sunday, and being told that he had thereby trespassed upon the sanctity of Sunday, gathered the

---

\* Morer, *Dialogues. etc.*, p. 272; Heylyn, *Hist. Sab.*, part 2, chap. 5, sec. 7.

† *Dialogues. etc.*, pp. 284, 285.

‡ *Hist. of Sab.*, part 2, chap. 5, sec. 2.

chips, and set fire to them in his hand, that he might punish himself for breaking God's commandment. But the crowning act of impious nonsense remains to be noticed. In the year A. D. 1200, one Eustace, an abbot, came from Normandy to preach in England, who also performed many miracles. He inveighed against the desecration of Sunday, but was evidently met by the reply that there was no commandment from God for its observance. Returning to the continent, he remained for a time; and in 1201, came back to England, armed with a document which was most befitting to his purposes. It is worth the room it takes in our pages, as a curiosity, although it offers a sad commentary upon the honesty of the times which could produce such a forgery, and upon the credulity of the people who could accept it. The following account of the transaction is from a contemporary author:

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

Archbishop, and they opened the scroll, and received the holy epistle from God; and when they had taken the same, they found this writing therein:

“ I am the Lord, who commanded you to observe the holy day of the Lord, and ye have not kept it; and have not repented of your sins, as I have said in my gospel, “ Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.” Whereas, I caused to be preached unto you repentance and amendment of life, you did not believe me, I have sent against you the Pagans, who have shed your blood on the earth; and yet you have not believed; and, because you did not keep the Lord’s-day holy, for a few days you suffered hunger, but soon I gave you fullness, and after that you did still worse again. Once more, it is my will that no one, from the ninth hour on Saturday until sunrise on Monday, shall do any work, except that which is good.

“ And if any person shall do so, he shall, with penance, make amends for the same. And if you do not pay obedience to this command, verily, I say unto you, and I swear unto you, by my seat, and by my throne, and by the cherubim who watch my holy seat, that I will give you my commands by no other epistle; but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and hot water, in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men.

“ This do I say unto you: for the Lord’s holy day, you shall die the death, and for the other festivals of my saints which you have not kept, I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels; and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away to the tombs of the dead, and to hide yourselves for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from before your eyes, and will send darkness upon you, that, not seeing, you may slay one another, and that I may re-

move from you my face, and may not show mercy upon you. For I will burn the bodies and the hearts of you, and of all those who do not keep as holy the day of the Lord.

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

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

This farce was carried out in a befitting manner by pretended miracles, which attended disobedience to this “ heavenly ” mandate. These seem to cluster

---

\* Roger de Hoveden, *Annals*, Vol. 2, pp. 526-528 Bohn’s Edition.

around the later hours of the Sabbath, rather than the hours of Sunday. These are recounted as follows:

“ On Saturday, a certain carpenter of Beverly, who, after the ninth hour of the day, was, contrary to the wholesome advice of his wife, making a wooden wedge, fell to the earth, being struck with paralysis. A woman also, a weaver, who, after the ninth hour on Saturday, in her anxiety to finish a part of the web, persisted in so doing, fell to the ground, struck with paralysis, and lost her voice. At Rafterton also, a vill belonging to Master Roger Arundel, a man made for himself a loaf and baked it under the ashes, after the ninth hour on Saturday, and ate thereof, and put part of it by till the morning; but when he broke it on the Lord's-day, blood started forth therefrom; and he who saw it bore witness, and his testimony is true.

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

“ Also in Lincolnshire, a women had prepared some dough, and, taking it to the oven after the ninth hour on Saturday, she placed it in the oven, which was then at a very great heat; but when she took it out she found it raw, on which she again put it into the oven, which was very hot; and both on the next day and on Monday, when she supposed that she should find the loaves baked, she found raw dough.

“ In the same country also, when a certain woman had prepared her dough, intending to carry it to the oven, her husband said to her, ‘ It is Saturday, and it is now past the ninth hour, put it aside until

Monday; ' on which the woman, obeying her husband, did as he commanded; and so, having covered over the dough with a linen cloth, on coming the next day to look at the dough, to see whether it had not, in rising, through the yeast that was in it, gone over the sides of the vessel, she found there the loaves ready made by the divine will, and well baked, without any fire of the material of this world. This was a change wrought by the right hand of him on high." \*

One more specimen of this blasphemous nonsense must suffice. It is from another contemporary work. The pretended miracle is as follows:

" About this time, a certain woman of the county of Norfolk, despite the warnings of this man of God (*i. e.*, Eustace), went one day to wash clothes after three o'clock on Saturday; and while she was busily at work, a man of venerable appearance, unknown to her, approached her, and reproachingly inquired the reason of her rashness in thus daring, after the prohibition of the man of God, to wash clothes after three o'clock; and thus by unlawful work, profane the holy Sabbath-day. He, moreover, added that unless she at once desisted from her work she would, without doubt, incur the anger of God, and the vengeance of heaven. But she, in answer to his rebuke, pleaded urgent poverty, and said that she had till then dragged on a wretched life by toil of that kind; and that if she should desist from her accustomed labor, she doubted her ability to procure the means of subsistence. After a while the man vanished suddenly from her presence, and she renewed her labor of washing the clothes, and drying them in the sun, with more energy than before. But for all this, the vengeance of God was not wanting: for,

---

\* Hoveden, Vol. 2, pp. 529, 530.

on the spot, a kind of small pig, of a black color, suddenly adhered to the woman's left breast, and could not by any effort be torn away; but, by continual sucking, drew blood, and, in a short time, almost consumed all the bodily strength of the woman. At length, being reduced to the greatest necessity, she was compelled, for a long time, to beg her bread from door to door, until, in the sight of many who wondered at the vengeance of God, she terminated her wretched life by a miserable death." \*

In such foolish forgeries, such impious nonsense, did the Sunday Sabbathism of the Dark Ages culminate. Two or three years later, in 1203, this same "Roll from heaven" was produced at a council held in Scotland, under Pope Innocent III, and King William, in order to further the sacred observance of Saints' days and Sundays in that kingdom. It is difficult to believe that such a state of things could have existed among our ancestors, six hundred years ago. But the facts are so well vouched for by the contemporary historians above quoted, and by all the representative writers on the Sunday question at the present time, that there is no chance to doubt them, though we might wish that the sad truth were only a fraudulent joke of some irresponsible scribbler. In addition to the authorities already quoted, the curious reader, who wishes to pursue the case further, will find the "Roll" and the pretended judgments referred to by the following writers:—Binnius, *Councils*, Vol. 3, pp. 1448, 1449; Sir David Dalrymple,

---

\* Roger de Hoveden, *Chronicles, or Flowers of History*; formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris, Vol. 2, pp. 188-192, London, 1849



*Historical Memorials*, pp. 7, 8, Edition 1769; Heylyn. *History of the Sabbath*; Hessey, *On Sunday*; Gilfillan. *Sunday*; Cox, *Sabbath Literature*; J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*; and other modern writers. The same "Roll," in a slightly modified form, figures in the history of the Sabbath question among the Armenians.

Many pages more might be filled with similar theories, decrees, and laws, which found expression between the close of the fifth century and the Reformation. But the case does not demand it. To quote more, would only reiterate what has been already given. We, therefore, proceed to sum up the case: From the opening of the sixth century forward, there was increasing formality and much Phariseeism in the matter of holy days. Their appointment and the manner of their observance was placed on no other ground than church authority, the "custom and consent" of Christian people. The Old Testament was appealed to, not as direct authority, but on analogical grounds. The reasons given for the observance of the Sunday are vague and varied. Sometimes, the Sabbath was said to foreshadow the Sunday; sometimes, circumcision was made to do a like duty. By some, the reason for its appointment was found in the fact that it was the first day of creation; by others, that it was the day of the Saviour's resurrection. This last is the general reason; but some or all of the others are usually associated with it, to strengthen it. There is more or less talk, in a loose way, concerning the example of the apostles and the

early church. But this argument is used with equal freedom in support of many other holy days, and of practices which all agree are wholly without such authority. Such were the better and more sensible reasons. The more senseless and superstitious ones, as we have seen, were brought in to do what the others failed to accomplish. The whole picture is one eminently in accord with the Dark Ages.

The Sunday had no prominence over many other church festivals, except that which came naturally from the fact, that it occurred oftener. Its observance, in keeping with the general character of the religion of the times, consisted in an outward formalism, without pure spiritual life. Stringent restrictions were promulgated, which the people could not and did not observe. There was no power in this pseudo-Sabbathism to elevate the people, to draw them toward God, or to nourish true spiritual life. These long centuries of increasing darkness, all present the same sad spectacle of a sinking church, trying to lift itself by itself, and sinking deeper at every struggle. How much the few saw through the ritualism and darkness, we can not tell; but the masses, blinded by false theories, groped painfully and slowly downward.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

# THE SABBATH IN THE WESTERN CHURCH DURING THE DARK AGES:

Anti-Christ, in the form of the Papacy, never succeeded in driving the Sabbath wholly from its dominions. There is much that bears on this subject, besides the evidence already given, showing that, as the Romanized church gradually expelled the Sabbath from the "Orthodox" body, those who were loyal to the law of God and the practices of the apostolic church stood firm, regardless of excommunication and persecution.

Dissenters who kept the Sabbath, existed under different names and forms of organization, from the time of the first Pope to the Reformation. They were either the descendents of those who fled from the heathen persecutions previous to the time of Constantine, or else those who, when he began to rule the church and force false practices upon it, refused submission, and sought seclusion, and freedom to obey God, in the wilderness in and around the Alps. In their earlier history they were known as Nazarenes, Cerinthians, and Hypsistarii, and later, as Vaudois, Cathari, Toulousians, Albigenes, Petro-

brusians. Passagii, and Waldenses. We shall speak of them in general, under this latter name. They believed the Romish church to be the "Anti-Christ" spoken of in the New Testament. Their doctrines were comparatively pure and Scriptural, and their lives were holy, in contrast with the ecclesiastical corruption which surrounded them. The reigning church hated and followed them with its persecutions. In consequence of this unscrupulous opposition, it is difficult to learn all the facts concerning them, since the only available accounts have come to us through the hands of their enemies, garbled and distorted. Before the age of printing, their books were few; and from time to time these were destroyed by their persecutors, so that we have only fragments from their own writers. At the beginning of the twelfth century they had grown in strength and numbers to such an extent as to call forth earnest opposition and bloody persecution from the Papal power. This and the increasing facilities for preserving history have given them a prominent place in the annals of the church, and its reforms since that time. Their enemies have made many unreasonable and false charges concerning their doctrines and practices, but all agree that they rejected the doctrine of "church authority," and appealed to the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice. They condemned the usurpations, the innovations, the pomp and formality, the worldliness and immorality of the Romish hierarchy. If their close adherence to God's Word sometimes led them to adopt ex-

treme views, it is not wonderful. Even their bitter enemies have not denied that which all accord to them, viz.: moral excellence and holiness of life far in advance of their times and surroundings.

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

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

“As scarcely any fragment of their history remains, all we know of them is from the accounts of their enemies, which were always uttered in a style of censure and complaint; and without which we should not have known that millions of them ever existed. It was the settled policy of Rome to obliterate every vestige of opposition to her decrees and doctrines, everything heretical, whether persons or

writings, by which the faithful would be liable to be contaminated and led astray. In conformity to this their fixed determination, all books and records of their opposers were hunted up and committed to the flames. Before the art of printing was discovered, in the fifteenth century, all books were made with a pen; the copies, of course, were so few that their concealment was much more difficult than it would be now, and if a few of them escaped the vigilance of the inquisitors, they would be soon worn out and gone. None of them could be admitted and preserved in the public libraries of the Catholics from the ravages of time, and the hordes of barbarians, with which all parts of Europe were at different times overwhelmed." \*

Again Mr. Benedict speaks as follows:

"We have already observed from Claudius Seyssel, the popish archbishop, that one Leo was charged with originating the Waldensian heresy in the valleys, in the days of Constantine the Great. When those severe measures emanated from the Emperor Honorius against re-baptizers, the Baptists left the seat of opulence and power, and sought retreats in the country, and in the valleys of Piedmont; which last place, in particular, became their retreat from imperial oppression." †

Dean Waddington bears testimony as follows:

"Rainer Sacho, a Dominican, says of the Waldenses: 'There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: first, it is the most ancient; some say it is as old as Sylvester, others, as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated; there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Third, while other sects are

---

\* History of the Baptists, p. 50.

† *Ib.*, p. 23.

profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing concerning God which is not good.' \*\*

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

"These ancient Christians date their origin from the beginning of the fourth century, when one Leo, at the great revolution in religion under Constantine the Great, opposed the innovations of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome. Nay, Rieger goes further still, taking them for the remains of the people of the valleys, who, when the Apostle Paul, as is said, made a journey over the Alps into Spain, were converted to Christ." †

Jortin bears the following testimony:

"In the seventh century, Christianity was preached in China by the Nestorians and the Valdenses who abhorred the papal usurpations, and are supposed to have settled themselves in the valleys of the Piedmont." †

President Edwards says:

"Some of the popish writers themselves own that that people never submitted to the Church of Rome. One of the popish writers speaking of the Waldenses, says: The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest in the world. It is supposed that this people first betook themselves to this desert, secret place among

---

\* Church History, chap. 22, sec. 1.

† Latrobe's Trans., p. 16, London, 1780.

‡ Eccl. Hist., Vol. 2, sec. 38.

the mountains to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions, which were before Constantine the Great, and thus the woman fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent. Rev. 12: 6-14. And the people being settled there, their posterity continued there from age to age afterward; and being, as it were, by natural walls as well as God's grace, separated from the rest of the world, never partook of the overflowing corruption" . . . "Theodore Belvedere, a popish monk, says that the heresy had always been in the valleys. In the preface to the French Bible the translators say that they (the Valdenses) have always had the full enjoyment of the heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched with the same by the apostles, having preserved, in fair manuscripts the entire Bible in their native tongue from generation to generation." \*

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

"Even in the twelfth century their numbers abounded in the neighborhood of Cologne in Flanders, the south of France, Savoy, and Milan. They were increased, says Egbert, to great multitudes throughout all countries, and although they seem not to have attracted attention in any remarkable degree previous to this period, yet, as it is obvious they could not have sprung up in a day, it is not an unfair inference that they must have long existed as a

---

\* History of Redemption, pp. 293. 294.



people wholly distinct from the Catholic church, though, amidst the political squabbles of the clergy, it was their good fortune to be entirely overlooked." . . . "Toward the middle of the twelfth century, a small society of the Puritans, as they were called by some, or Waldenses as they are termed by others, or Paulicians, as they are denominated by our old monkish historian, William of Newburg, made their appearance in England. This latter writer speaking of them, says: 'They came originally from Gascoyne, where, being as numerous as the sand of the sea, they sorely infested France, Italy, Spain and England.'"\*

Benedict says:

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

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

"They can say a great part of the Old and New

\* Hist. of the Waldenses, Vol. 1, chap. 4, sec. 3, London, 1816.

† Hist. of the Baptists, p. 31.

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

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

---

\* Ecc. Hist. of the Ancient Piedmont Church, pp. 216, 217, 209, London, 1690.

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

"They admit of nothing but the Bible. They choose their own priests and bishops; deny no man marriage, perform no offices for the dead, and have but very few holy days and ceremonies."\*

These are the same people to whom Erasmus refers, representing them as extremely strict in observing the Sabbath. Robert Cox, in his "Sabbath Literature," quotes from Erasmus and comments as follows:

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

"Hospinian of Zurich, in his treatise *De Festis Judæorum et Ethnicorum*, Cap. iii, (Tiguri.—1592.) replies to the arguments of these Sabbatarians."‡

The story concerning their extreme strictness on the Sabbath is doubtless a mistake. But inasmuch as they accepted the Bible as their only guide, it is

\* History of the Reformation, etc., p. 53, London, 1689.

† De Amabili Ecclesiæ Concordia, Op. tom., V, p. 506; Lugd. Bat., 1704.

‡ Vol. 2, pp. 201, 202.

not wonderful that they refused to place the "Dies Dominicus before the Sabbath," since the Bible gives no authority for such a course. Doctor Hessey refers to these same Sabbatarians as the origin of the present Seventh-day Baptists. A voluminous work by Alexander Ross, speaking of these people at the beginning of the Reformation, says:

"Some only will observe the Lord's-day; some only the Sabbath; some both, and some neither."\*

In his history of the Waldenses, Jones gives their "confession of faith," article tenth of which is as follows:

"Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God; such as the festival days and vigils of the saints, and what is called holy water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things, but above all, the Masses."†

In section four of the same chapter, Jones quotes from book first, chapter five, of Perrin's History of the Vaudois, as follows:

"Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than the Christians. They never swear but by compulsion, and rarely take the name of God in vain. They fulfill their promises with punctuality, and living for the most part in poverty, they profess to preserve the apostolic life and doctrine. They also profess it to be their desire to overcome only by the simplicity of faith, by purity of conscience, and by integrity of life; not by philosophical niceties, and theological subtleties." And he very candidly ad-

\* A View of All Religions in the World, etc., p. 237, London, 1653.

† Chapter 5, sec. 3.

mits that, "In their lives and morals they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves with all their might to observe the commandments of God. Lielenstenius, a Dominitian, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says: 'I say that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love, but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shown in 'my Treatise.' " . . . "Louis XII., king of France, being informed by the enemies of the Waldenses, inhabiting a part of the province of Provence, that several heinous crimes were laid to their account, sent the Master of Requests, and a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, who was confessor to his majesty, to make inquiry into this matter. On their return, they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found there no images, nor signs of ornaments belonging to the Mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish church; much less could they discover any traces of the crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary, *they kept the Sabbath-day*, observed the ordinance of baptism, according to the Primitive church, and instructed their children in the articles of Christian faith, and the commandments of God."

Eccolampadius, Luther, Beza, Bullinger, De-Vignaux, Chassagnon, Milton, and others among modern writers unite in bearing testimony to their uprightness and faithful adherence to the Word of God. Their observance of the Sabbath is also further attested as follows. Jones says:

"Because they would not observe saints' day they were *falsely supposed* to neglect the Sabbath also, and called *Inzabbatuti*, or Insabbathists."\*

Benedict has the following:

---

\* Hist. Waldenses, chap. 5, sec. 1.

“We find that the Waldenses were sometimes called *Insabbathos*, that is regardless of Sabbaths. Mr. Milner supposes this name was given to them because they observed not the Romish festivals and rested from their ordinary occupations only on Sundays. A Sabbatarian would suppose that it was because they met for worship on the seventh day, and did not regard the first day sabbath.”\*

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

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

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

“Keep Saturday holy, nor esteem Saturday fasts

---

\* Hist. Baptists, Vol. 2, p. 412. Ed. 1831.

† Vol. 1, pp. 216, 220, Edinburg, 1833.

lawful. But on Easter, even, they have solemn services on Saturdays, eat flesh, and feast it bravely, like the Jews."\*

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

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

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

“ The account of their practicing circumcision is undoubtedly a slanderous story, forged by their enemies, and probably arose in this way: Because they observed the seventh day, they were called, by way of derision, Jews, as the Sabbatarians are frequently at this day; and if they were Jews, they either did, or ought to, circumcise their followers. This was probably the reasoning of their enemies. But that they actually practiced the bloody rite is altogether improbable.” ‡

---

\* Vol. 2, p. 1269, London, 1625.

† Eecl. Hist., Vol. 2, p. 127, London, 1810.

‡ Hist. Baptists, Vol. 2, pp. 412-418, Ed. 1813.

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

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

The various and slanderous charges of corruption and religious excesses which certain Romish writers have made against the Waldenses, are truthfully and fairly disposed of by Mr. W. S. Gully, in a work entitled, "Valdenses," etc.:

"We may, therefore, consider that all the licentious tales which have been told at the expense of Valdo and his disciples, were the inventions of after times. That individuals among them may have broached some extravagant and fanatical dogmas is not improbable, but we have no contemporary evidence in proof of their having departed from the strictest rules of moral and religious purity, or of their having been guilty of any other than the unpardonable offense of disobeying a spiritual authority which had become as tyrannical in the exercise of its powers as it was remiss in the discharge of the sacred trusts committed to it. 'The worst thing that can be said of them,' said the inquisitor Reiner, whose busi-

---

\* P. S. London, 1635.



ness it was to accuse and hunt them down, 'is that they detest the Romish Church.' \*\*

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

---

\* P. 57, Edinburg edition.

## CHAPTER XIX.

# THE SABBATH IN THE EASTERN CHURCH.

Having followed the Sabbath and the Sunday down to the close of the Dark Ages, in the Western, Romanized church, it is pertinent to turn attention to the Eastern church, which is even yet a *terra incognita* to many readers.

In the changes of the first four centuries after Christ, the Eastern church, which was really the Mother Church, and the home of primitive Christianity,\* was left unaffected by the influences which started the strong current of empire westward by way of Rome. The Eastern world grew quiet rather than active, and passed into a sort of general and gradual petrification of thought, which its isolation from the westward currents served to perpetuate. † No general revival of thought and theology, in the Eastern church, has yet taken place. Mohammedanism overwhelmed large portions of the field, perverting, and preventing reform. In the 16th century Papacy made some strong inroads, and by the fires and dungeons of the Inquisition, and the bland-

---

\* See Stanley, Eastern Church, Lect. 1, p. 87, seq.

† See Life and Times of St. Gregory. p. 28 and p. 49, of London Edition, 1850.

ishments of its emissaries, turned many into its ranks. Protestant missions began at different points about the opening of the present century, but have not yet gone far enough to create any general awakening. For this reason little interest has been felt in the Eastern church, and many have deemed that *all* of church history, is involved in the Western branch, out of which our own ecclesiastical currents have come. But the truth is that a very large factor of church history is the Eastern current, and especially so in regard to the earliest ideas and practices, those of the Apostolic Period. Dean Stanley notices this feature of the case as follows:

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

“ But the Oriental church has claims to be considered, over and above its magnitude and its ob-

scurity. By whatever name we call it—'Eastern,' 'Greek,' or 'Orthodox,'—it carries us back, more than any other existing Christian institution, to the earliest scenes and times of the Christian religion. Even though the annals of the Oriental Patriarchates, are, for the most part, as regards the personal history of their occupants, a series of unmeaning names, the recollections awakened by the seats of their power are of the most august kind. Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, are centers of local interest, which none can see or study without emotion. And the churches which have sprung up in those regions, retain the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out everywhere else.\*

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

#### THE ABYSSYNIAN CHURCH.

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

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

---

\* Hist. Eastern Church, pp. 88, 89. New York, 1862.

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

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

“The flame of discord might easily have been extinguished, by the death of the Vicroy and that of the *Abuna*, had not the Emperor, regarding his late

---

\* Journal of three years' residence in Abyssinia, p. 55, New York, 1850.

success as a decisive victory, issued a decree forbidding the people longer to celebrate the Jewish Sabbath, which, *from time immemorial*, they had been accustomed to hallow with the same strictness and solemnity as the Lord's-day." \*

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

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

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

---

\* Journal, etc., p. 93.

† Journal, etc., p. 83.

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

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

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

“ After the amusement of some unequal combats between the Jesuits and his illiterate priests, the Emperor declared himself a proselyte to the Synod of Chalcedon, presuming that his clergy and people would embrace, without delay, the religion of their prince. The liberty of choice was succeeded by a law, which imposed, under pain of death, the belief of the two natures of Christ; the Abyssinians were enjoined to work and to play on the Sabbath; and

---

\* Gobat, Abyssinia, p. 97.

Segved, in the face of Europe and Africa, renounced his connection with the Alexandrian church."\*

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

"The Abyssinians do hold the Scriptures to be the perfect rule of Christian faith; insomuch that they deny it to be in the power of a general council to oblige the people to believe anything as articles of faith without an express warrant from them." †

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

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

"We are bound by the Institutions of the Apostles to observe two days, to wit: the Sabbath and the Lord's day, on which it is not lawful for us to do any work, no, not the least. On the Sabbath-day, because God, after he had finished the creation of the world, rested thereon; which day, as God would have it called the *Holy of Holies*, so the not celebrating thereof with *great honor and devotion* seems to

---

\* Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 4, chap. 47, p. 565. Harper's edition, 1883.

† Church History of Ethiopia, by Michael Geddes. p. 31, London, 1696.

‡ Ibid, pp. 34, 35.



be plainly contrary to God's will and precept, who will suffer heaven and earth to pass away sooner than his word; and that especially, since Christ came not to dissolve the law, but to fulfill it. It is *not*, therefore, *in imitation of the Jews*, but *in obedience to Christ and his holy apostles*, that we observe that day, the favor that was showed herein to the Jews, being transferred to us, Christians; so that, excepting Lent, we eat flesh every Saturday in the year. But in the kingdoms of Barnagaus, Tigre and Mahon, the Christians, according to ancient custom, do eat flesh on all Saturdays and Sundays, even in Lent. We do observe the Lord's-day after the manner of all other Christians in memory of Christ's resurrection." \*

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

"The church of Abyssinia, founded in the fourth century, by the church of Alexandria, furnishes the one example of a nation, savage, yet Christian, showing us, on the one hand, the force of the Christian faith in maintaining its superiority at all against such immense disadvantages, and, on the other hand, the utmost amount of superstition with which a Christian church can be overlaid without perishing altogether. One lengthened communication it has hitherto received from the West—the mission of the Jesuits. With this exception, it has been left almost entirely to itself. Whatever there is of Jewish, or of old Egyptian, ritual preserved in the Coptic church is carried to excess in the Abyssinian. The likeness

---

\* Church History of Ethiopia, pp. 34, 25.

of the sacred ark, called the ark of Zion, is the center of Abyssinian devotion. To it gifts and prayers are offered. On it the sanctity of the whole church depends. Circumcision is not only practiced, as in the Coptic church, but is regarded as of equal necessity with baptism. There alone the Jewish Sabbath is still observed, as well as the Christian Sunday. They (with the exception of a small sect of the Seventh-day Baptists) are the only true Sabbatharians in Christendom."\*

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

The time may not be distant when this branch of the church will spring to new life and become, under

---

\* P. 96, New York, 1862.

† Journal, etc., p. 459.

God, instrumental in converting the nations around it to him, and to his Sabbath.

#### THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

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

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

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

"There are at least fourteen great feast-days in the course of the year, on which all ordinary labor

---

\* Hist. Eastern Church, p. 92.

is suspended, and the day is observed more strictly than the Sabbath."\*

J. W. Mossie, † as quoted by Andrews, thus describes them:

“The creed which these representatives of an ancient line of Christians cherished was not in conformity with Papal decrees, and has with difficulty been squared with the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Episcopacy. Separated from the world for one thousand years, they were naturally ignorant of many novelties introduced by the councils and decrees of the Lateran; and their conformity with the faith and practices of the first ages, laid them open to the unpardonable guilt of heresy and schism, as estimated by the church of Rome. ‘We are Christians, and not idolators,’ was their expressive reply, when required to do homage to the image of the Virgin Mary.” . . . “La Croze states them at fifteen hundred churches, and as many towns and villages. They refused to recognize the pope, and declared they had never heard of him; they asserted the purity and primitive truth of their faith, since they came, and their bishops had for thirteen hundred years been sent from, the place where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians.” . . . “Remote from the busy haunts of commerce, or the populous seats of manufacturing industry, they may be regarded as the Eastern Piedmontes, the Vallois of Hindoostan, the witnesses prophesying in sack cloth through revolving centuries, though indeed their bodies lay as dead in the streets of the city they had once peopled.” ‡

Yeates informs us that Saturday “amongst them

---

\* *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, pp. 561, 562. Phila., 1852.

† *Continental India*. Vol. 2, pp. 116, 117, 120.

‡ *History of the Sabbath*.

is a festival day agreeable to the ancient practice of the church.”\*

But the following testimony from the pen of Rev. Claudius Buchanan, presents the case still more clearly. He says:

“Next to the Jews, the Armenians will form the most generally useful body of Christian missionaries. They are found in every principal city of Asia; they are the general merchants of the East, and are in a state of constant motion from Canton to Constantinople. Their general character is that of a wealthy, industrious, and enterprising people. They are settled in all the principal places of India, where they arrived many centuries before the English. Wherever they colonize, they build churches, and observe the solemnities of the Christian religion in a decorous manner.” . . . “The history of the Armenian church is very interesting. Of all the Christians in Central Asia, they have preserved themselves most free from Mohammedan and Papal corruptions. The Pope assailed for a time with great violence, but with little effect. The churches in lesser Armenia indeed consented to a union, which did not long continue; but those in Persian Armenia maintained their independence, and they retain their ancient Scriptures, doctrines, and worship to this day.” . . . “The Bible was translated into the Armenian language in the fifth century, under very auspicious circumstances, the history of which has come down to us. It has been allowed, by competent judges of the language, to be a most faithful translation. La Croze calls it the ‘Queen of Versions.’ This Bible has ever remained in the possession of the Armenian people, and many illustrious instances of genuine and enlightened piety occur in their history.” . . .

---

\* East India Church History. p. 134—quoted by Andrews, Sab. Hist. p. 314.

“ The Armenians in Hindoostan are our own subjects. They acknowledge our government in India, as they do that of Sophi in Persia, and they are entitled to our regard. They have preserved the Bible in its purity, and their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. *Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship throughout our empire on the seventh day;* and they have as many spires pointing to heaven among the Hindoos as ourselves. Are such a people then entitled to no acknowledgement on our part, as fellow Christians? Are they forever to be ranked by us with Jews, Mohammedans, and Hindoos? ” \*

#### NESTORIAN OR CHALDEAN CHRISTIANS.

Stanley states that:

“ The Chaldean Christians, called by their opponents, Nestorians, are the most remote of these old ‘ Separatists.’ Only the first two councils, those of Nicaea and Constantinople, have weight with them. The third—of Ephesus—already presents the stumbling block of the decree which condemned Nestorius. Living in the fastnesses of Kurdistan, they represent the persecuted remnant of the ancient church of Central Asia. They trace their descent from the earliest of all Christian missions—the mission of Thaddæus to Abgarus.” . . . “ In their earlier days they sent forth missions on a scale exceeding those of any Western church, except the See of Rome in the sixth and sixteenth centuries, and for the time re-

---

\* *Researches in Asia*, pp. 206, et seq.

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

deeming the Eastern church from the usual reproach of its negligence in propagating the gospel. Their chief assumed the splendid title of Patriarch of Babylon, and their missionaries traversed the whole of Asia, as far eastward as China, and as far southward as Ceylon."\*

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

"These eight festivals of our Lord we observe, and we have many holy days and the Sabbath-day, on which we do not labor." . . . "The Sabbath day we reckon far—far above the others." . . . "The worship of the Sabbath does not differ materially from that of other days, except that an extra service for preaching the gospel is now extensively introduced under the influence of the missionaries." . . . "Incense is burned in the churches of the Nestorians on the Sabbath and on feast-days." †

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

"The Sabbath, he says, is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes, which I have seen among no other Christians in the East. I have repeatedly been told by Nestorians of the plain, that their brethren in the mountains would immediately kill a man for traveling or laboring on the Sabbath; and there is abundant reason to believe that this was formerly done, though it has ceased since the people have become acquainted with the practice of Christendom on this subject. While in the mountains, I made repeated inquiries concerning the observance of that remarkable statute of the Jews, which required that 'whosoever doeth any work on the Sab-

---

\* Hist. Eastern Church, p. 91.

† Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 573.

bath-day he shall surely be put to death;’ and I was everywhere told that this statute had formerly been literally executed. Nor does there appear to be any motive for deception, since the practice is now disapproved by all. There are said to be Nestorians now in Tiyary who will not kindle a fire on the Sabbath to cook their food; but their cold Winters oblige them to do it for necessary warmth.”\*

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

Rev. Justin Perkins gives the following from an

---

\* Lectures on Sunday, p. 309.



order of church service among the Nestorian Christians of the present day:

“1. Alternate prayers for each day in two weeks.”

“2. Prayers for every day in the year except the Sabbath-day and festivals.”

“3. Prayers for the Lord's-day and festivals.”

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

Mr. Perkins also reports the existence of a “Romish Legend of the Epistle on the Sabbath,” which custom demanded should be read every Sabbath, and which severely denounced Sabbath-breaking. He also states that reciting prayers constitutes a very considerable part of the daily church service of the Nestorians. The gospels are also read, particularly on the Sabbath, and on festivals. \*

Neale, writing concerning the church calendar of the Armenians, says:

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

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

---

\* A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians, p. 15. Andover, 1843.

“There is in truth no great difficulty in the Armenian fasts; at the same time there are great difficulties in the calendar arising from the Saturday commemorations, *fixed as such*, and the translation of festivals from a fast to a following Saturday.”\*

Another modern author testifies as follows:

“It must not be forgotten that throughout the East, Saturday is looked on as a second Sunday. The Armenians keep Saturday as a day in honor of Almighty God the Creator of all things, and Sunday in commemoration of the new creation, brought about by the resurrection of our blessed Lord, Jesus Christ.”†

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

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

\* History of the Holy Eastern Church, Vol. 2, pp. 731, 795.

† The Armenian Church, by E. F. K. Fortescue, p. 53, London, 1872.

observance of the Sabbath as a Christian institution, by the early church.

#### CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.

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

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

"The Syrian Christians inhabit the interior of Travancore and Malabar, in the south of India, and have been settled there from the early ages of Christianity. The first notices of this ancient people in recent times are to be found in the Portuguese histories. When Vasco de Gama arrived at Cochin, on the coast of Malabar, in the year 1503, he saw the sceptre of the Christian king; for the Syrian Christians had formerly regal power in Malay—ala. The name or title of their last king was Beliarte; and he dying without issue, the dominion devolved on the king of Cochin and Diamper.

"When the Portuguese arrived, they were agreeably surprised to find upwards of a hundred Christian churches on the coast of Malabar. But when they became acquainted with the purity and simplicity of their worship, they were offended. 'These churches,' said the Portuguese, 'belong to the pope.' 'Who is the pope?' said the natives, 'we never heard of him.' The European priests were yet more alarmed when they found that these Hindoo Christians maintained the order and discipline of a regular

church under Episcopal jurisdiction; and that for 1,300 years past they had enjoyed a succession of bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. 'We,' said they, 'are of the true faith, whatever you from the west may be: for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians.'

\* \* \* \* \*

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

"All must confess that it was (is) Christ's church in the midst of a heathen land. The church of England would be happy to promote its welfare, to revive its spirit, and to use it as a means of future good in the midst of her own empire.

"I took occasion to observe that there were some rites and practices in the Syrian church, which our church might consider objectionable or nugatory." \*

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

"Amongst the crimes cognizable in the Inquisition

---

\* pp. 85, 99, 103, Armstrong, Boston, 1811.

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

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

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

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

---

† P. 83.

‡ P. 56.

accusers, and those who have been with thee at these assemblies." \*

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

#### SABBATH-KEEPING IN CHINA.

One other field remains to be noticed before we take leave of the Eastern church,—China. Enough has been recovered from its ancient records to show that the primeval Sabbath was known in Chinese traditions, and that Sabbath-keeping Christianity existed there, in common with the rest of the Eastern church. The *Chinese Repository*, for March, 1849, page 156, of Vol. 1, published at Canton, contains an extract from a sermon by a native preacher, relative to the Sabbath in the "Book of Changes:" the date of this book is supposed to be contemporaneous with the time of Noah. The preacher said:

"The Scriptures say that in six days God made heaven, earth, the sea, and all things therein, and rested on the seventh; therefore we hallow the seventh day as a sacred time, as is required in the commandment. 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it

---

\* P. 58; Dellon's Account of the Inquisition at Goa, translated from the French, Paris, 1684. — Hull, England, 1812, pages as above.

holy,' etc. Thus we see that the Sabbath began at the time of the creation, and was instituted by the Lord of all nations; at that time there was only one man who was the ancestor of all people, and thus became the chief of all; and this day was set apart that through the first father of all nations it might be handed down. Proper, therefore, it is for all lands to know it, for all people to observe it. But now there are people in many countries entirely ignorant of the name of the Sabbath. This is the cause: mens hearts are continually treacherous, and the heart of rectitude is ever small, so that the longer the world exists, the more it forgets the commands of God. If we trace the matter up it will be found that there is no country which did not know the Sabbath, and even the Chinese speak of it. The diagram *Fuh*, in the 'Book of Changes,' says: 'this rule goes and returns; in seven days it comes again.'" . . . "The Chinese use the phrase, 'Heaven and Earth,' to indicate the Supreme Ruler, and he instituted the Sabbath with no other reason than to benefit the bodies and souls of men, as the Scriptures say: 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Do we not again see in this the love of God for man! Truly these words are trustworthy. In respect of the expression: 'The ancient kings ordered that on that day the gate of the great road should be shut, and the traders not permitted to pass, nor the princes to go and examine their states,' it is plainly to be seen that in the time of the ancient kings, on the day of the Sabbath, all classes kept at rest, and observed it."

This interpretation of their ancient books agrees with Humboldt's testimony, relative to the week, he says:

"It (the week) is in use among the Chinese, who seem also aborigines of the elevated plain of Tartary.

but who have long had intimate communication with Hindostan and Thibet."\*

The existence of the Eastern or Nestorian type of Christianity, in China, during the earlier centuries, is well attested; as is also the fact, that it was a Sabbath-keeping Christianity. Gieseler says:

"The Nestorians not only maintained themselves in Persia, where they enjoyed the exclusive favor of the king, but spread their doctrines on all sides, carrying them into Arabia and India, and it is said, in the year 636, even as far as China."†

The evidences of this occupancy of China by the Nestorian Christians is fully attested by the following "Nestorian Inscription:"

"In 1665, Chinese workmen engaged in digging a foundation for a house, outside the walls of the city of Si Gnau-Fou, the capital of the province of Chen-si, found buried in the earth a large monumental stone, resembling those which the Chinese are in the habit of raising to preserve to posterity the remembrance of remarkable events and illustrious men. It was a dark-colored, marble tablet, ten feet high and five broad, and bearing on one side an inscription in ancient Chinese, and also some other characters quite unknown in China. The discovery excited much attention among the Mandarins and the population of the country. The stone was publicly exhibited, and visited by crowds of curious persons: and amongst others, some Jesuit missionaries, who were at that time scattered about China in various missions, went to examine it. Several exact tracings of the stone were sent to Europe by the Jesuits, who saw it. The library of their house at Rome had one of the first,

---

\* Researches, Vol. 1. p. 285.

† Church History, Second Period, chap. 6.



and it attracted numerous visitors; subsequently another authentic copy of the dimensions of the tablet was sent to Paris, and deposited at the library of Reu Richelieu, where it may still be seen in the gallery of manuscripts. At the news of this curious discovery, the government of Peking sent to demand a copy of the inscription, and the Emperor gave orders that the original should be placed in a celebrated pagoda, about one fourth of a league from Si-Gnau-Fou, where doubtless it may still be found.\*

“This monument, discovered by chance, amidst rubbish, in the environs of an ancient capital of the Chinese Empire, excited a great sensation; for on examining the stone, and endeavoring to interpret the inscriptions, it was with surprise discovered that the Christian religion had had numerous apostles in China at the beginning of the seventh century, and that it had for a long time flourished there. The strange characters proved to be those called *estrangellos*, which were in use among the ancient inhabitants of Syria, and will be found in some Syriac manuscripts of earlier date than the eighth century.”

The inscription gives a very fair compendium of Christian doctrines, from the Nestorian stand-point. It would occupy ten or fifteen pages of this book, hence we give only certain portions, which bear on the theme in hand:

4. “Our ministers allow their beards to grow, to show that they are devoted to their neighbors. The tonsure that they wear at the top of their heads indicates that they have renounced worldly desires. In giving liberty to slaves we become a link between the powerful and the weak. We do not accumulate riches, and we share with the poor that which we

---

\* During our residence at Peking, several Chinese friends assured us that they had seen the inscription in the above mentioned pagoda.

possess. Fasting strengthens the intellectual powers, abstinence and moderation preserve health. We worship seven times a day, and by our prayers we aid the living and the dead. On *the seventh day* we offer sacrifice, after having purified our hearts and received absolution for our sins. This religion, so perfect and so excellent, is difficult to name, but it enlightens the darkness by its brilliant precepts. It is called the Luminous Religion ”

5. “ Learning alone, without sanctity, has no grandeur. Sanctity, without learning, makes no progress. When learning and sanctity proceed harmoniously, the universe is adorned and resplendent.”

21. “ This stone was raised in the second year of the Kein-Tchoung, of the great dynasty of Thang (A. D. 781), on the seventh day of the moon of the great increase. At this time the devout Ning-Chou, lord of the doctrine, governed the luminous multitude in the Eastern country.” \*

The history of the finding of this monument may also be found in, “ China and the Chinese,” by Henry Charles Sirr, an English Barrister, Vol. 2, chap. 10, p. 187, seq. See also, “ Ten Great Religion’s.” by James Freeman Clarke, p. 71, seq.

#### THE GREAT CHINESE INSURRECTION AND THE SABBATH.

An Epoch in modern Chinese history is of special interest as connected with the Sabbath.

The Ti-Ping, *i. e.*, *Universal Peace*, Revolution, in China, was one of the most wonderful developments of the power of the Bible over heathenism during

---

\* Christianity in China, Taratary and Thibet, by M. L'Abbe Huc. Vol 1, chap. 2, p. 45, seq., London, 1857.

this century of marvelous results in the work of foreign missions.

In 1833, a young man, son of a peasant, received a tract, composed of extracts from the Bible, from a tract distributor, in the streets of Canton. He glanced at it carelessly and laid it aside. Soon after, being sick, he saw in a vision a man who said to him, "I am the Creator of all things, go and do my work." A few years later, when war broke out between England and China, this young man, Hung-sen-tseuen, deeming it a national disaster on account of the sins of the people, re-read his Christian books, and was converted to Christianity thereby. From the Bible he drew his system of theology as follows: God is our Creator and supreme Father, Christ is our elder brother and heavenly teacher, Idolatry ought to be abolished, and virtue and righteousness ought to be practiced according to the Decalogue and the teachings of the New Testament. Hung-sen-tseuen sought baptism at the hands of an American missionary in Canton, but was refused, it is said, through false charges. He then taught his followers to baptize themselves. Many flocked to him, and the movement became a Chinese Puritan Reformation. The Ti-Pings were called "God worshipers." At this time there was universal unrest among Chinamen against the ruling Tartar dynasty, and a party of insurgents fled to the Ti-Pings for protection, and became associated with them. Thus the movement assumed a political character about 1850. It was Cromwellian. The soldiers knelt in prayer on the

eve of battle, and rose from their knees to fight. The entire Bible was printed and circulated among the people. The Lord's Prayer and the ten commandments were printed on cards and taught to the children in every household. Opium, whisky, tobacco, prostitution and similar evils were prohibited. Learning their religion from the Bible, they knew nothing of the modern theories concerning the change or abrogation of the Sabbath, and hence accepted it as a part of Christianity. One of their religious publications was made up of the ten commandments, with remarks and a hymn, one stanza to each command. From that we extract as follows:

“ THE FOURTH COMMAND.”

*“ On the seventh day, the day of worship, you should praise the great God for his goodness.”*

*“ Remark.* In the beginning, the great God made heaven and earth, land and sea, men and things, in six days; and having finished his work on the seventh day, he called it the day of rest (or Sabbath); therefore all the men of the world who enjoy the blessings of the great God, should, on every seventh day especially, reverence and worship the great God and praise him for his goodness.”

The hymn says:

“ All the happiness enjoyed in the world comes  
from heaven;  
It is also reasonable that men give thanks and sing;  
At the daily morning and evening meal there should  
be thanksgiving:

But on the seventh day the worship should be more intense."\*

Rev. N. Wardner, D. D., who was a missionary in Shanghai during the Ti-Ping movement, writes as follows:

"But the question naturally arises: How came they to adopt the *seventh* day of the week instead of the *first*, as their Sabbath, since all their instruction from Christians was by those who taught that the *first* day is the Sabbath? This was a mystery to all who learned of that fact. But when they took Nan-King, and Europeans had opportunity to visit them, they were told that it was first, because the Bible taught it, and second, because their ancestors observed it as a day of worship.

In 1847, the writer formed the acquaintance of the Rev. Dr. Gutzlaff, a German missionary, then located at Hong-Kong, who informed him that he had recently seen an essay written by a very scholarly Chinaman, in which he proved conclusively, by a large array of quotations from ancient Chinese history, that they once kept the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath."

These facts unite to show that the Christianity of the different branches of the Eastern church was a Sabbath-keeping Christianity, until it became Romanized. In this it was like that in the West previous to its Romanization. Whatever place Sunday might have gained as a resurrection festival, and the counterpart of the Wednesday and Friday fasts, it never could have taken the place of the Sabbath, had

---

\* History of the Ti—spelled both Tae and Ti—Ping Revolution, by Lin-Le; Vol. 2, Appendix A., p. 824, London, 1866. Also. History Ti-Ping, etc., by Commander Lindsey Brine. R. N., p. 368, London, 1862.

not Pagan philosophy ostracized the Sabbath in theory, and pagan-born civil law gradually foisted the Sunday into its place, urged on by an unwarrantable anti-Jewish prejudice.

## CHAPTER XX.

# SUNDAY IN THE GERMAN REFORMATION.

Reforms center around one representative idea. Great reforms usually begin at the point where great evils begin to die, by the law of reaction. Each stage of the reformation must come in its own order. Error grows tyrannical with age. It imposes bitter experiences, before its victims rise up in determined rebellion. The Lutheran movement began when the burden of "Church authority," became intolerable. Fainting humanity longed to come to God for rest and salvation, without the false intervention of church and priest and pope. The blasphemous system of "Indulgences" was the lowest point possible, in the Papal apostasy. Here Luther made the attack. Thus, salvation through faith, without the intervention of the church, or the sanction of its authority, became the central idea, in the first stage of the reformatory movement. Mere protestation in words had failed. New ground had to be assumed, through courageous struggle. Under such circumstances, all outside issues were forgotten, and the battle raged around the question of man's right

to read God's Word, and to believe in Christ, without ecclesiastical intervention.

Aside from these general principles of reform, there were special reasons why the Sabbath question did not find a prominent place in the earlier stage of the Reformation. The theory which had been held so long, that the Sabbath was Jewish only, was accepted by the Continental Reformers with little questioning. The flagrant evils which had come in with the Romish doctrine of Church-appointed holy days led to its rejection, and nothing was left but the no-Sabbath platform. Thus, prejudice against Judaism and hatred for the Papacy set the Sabbath question aside. Keeping this fact in view, the reader will not wonder at what follows. We aim to give "Sunday authorities," rather than our own conclusions; and so begin the testimony by a quotation from Doctor Hessey. Speaking of Luther's "Larger Catechism," he says:

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

It then goes on to speak thus:

"This precept, so far as its outward and carnal meaning is concerned, does not apply to us Christians. The Sabbath is an outward thing, like other ordinances of the Old Testament which were bound to certain modes and persons and times and places, but are now all of them made free by Christ. But still, in order that we may gather for simple people some Christian meaning from this precept, understand what God requires of us therein, in the follow-



ing manner. We celebrate festivals, not for the sake of intelligent and instructed Christians (for these have no need of them), but first, even for the sake of the body. Nature herself teaches the lesson that the working classes, servants and maids, are to be considered; they have spent the whole week in laborious employment, and require a day on which they may take breath from their work and refresh themselves and restore their exhausted frames by repose. The second reason, and indeed the chief one, is this: that on such day of rest (*an dien solchem Ruhetage—die Sabbati*), leisure and time may be obtained for divine worship (a duty for which, otherwise, no opportunity could be found); so that we may come together to hear and handle the Word of God, and further, that we may glorify God with hymns and psalms, with songs and prayers.

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

The following, from other sources, coincides fully with that just quoted:

---

\* Sunday, Lecture 6, p. 167.

“ As for the Sabbath or Sunday, there is no necessity for its observance; and if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because nature likewise teaches us to give ourselves, from time to time, a day’s rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the Word of God preached.” \*

Again Luther says:

“ The gospel regardeth neither Sabbath nor holidays, because they endured but for a time, and were ordained for the sake of preaching, to the end that God’s Word might be tended and taught ” †

And again:

“ Keep the Sabbath holy, for its use both to body and soul; but if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day’s sake; if anywhere anyone sets up its observance upon a *Jewish* foundation, then I order you to work on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to ride on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on the Christian spirit of liberty,” ‡

And again:

“ According to Luther the Mosaic law was imposed on the Jews alone, and even upon them ceased to be obligatory at the coming of Christ. The ten commandments, says he: ‘ do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt. If he says no, then say: How then does Moses concern me, since he speaks to the people that have been brought out of Egypt? In the New Testament Moses comes

---

\* Michelet’s Life of Luther, Hazlitt’s Translation, p. 271, London, 1846.

† Luther’s Table Talk, Bell’s Translation, chap. 31, p. 357. London, 1652.

‡ Quoted in Christian Sects in the Nineteenth Century, p. 20, London, 1846.

to an end, and his laws lose their force. He must bow in the presence of Christ. We must stop the mouths of the factious spirits who say: Thus says Moses. Then do you reply: Moses does not concern us. If I accept Moses in one commandment, I must accept the whole Moses. In that case I should be obliged to be circumcised, and to wash my clothes in a Jewish manner, and to eat and drink and dress, and do everything of this kind, in the manner in which the Jews are commanded to do them in the law. Therefore we will not obey Moses, or accept him. Moses died and his government terminated when Christ came." \*

Again Luther says:

"The words of the Scripture prove clearly to us, that the ten commandments do not affect us; for God has not brought us out of Egypt, but only the Jews. We are willing to take Moses as a teacher, but not as our law-giver, except when he agrees with the New Testament and with the law of nature." . . . "No single point in Moses binds us." . . . "Leave Moses and his people alone. I listen to the word which concerns me. We have the gospel." †

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

"Concerning ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, we teach that those may be kept and performed which can be attended to without sin, and which

\* Luther on the Ten Commandments, quoted by Hengstenberg, *On the Lord's-day*, p. 62.

† Instructions to Christians. How to make use of Moses. quoted by Hengstenberg, p. 61. This treatise may be found in the Latin of Luther's Works 1:1, 68. Jena. 1603. See Cox. Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, pp. 383, 384.

promote peace and good order in the church, such as certain holy days, festivals, etc. Concerning matters of this kind, however, caution should be observed, lest the consciences of men be burdened, as though such observances were necessary to salvation." †

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

"Likewise the authors of traditions act contrary to the command of God, when they place sin in meats, days and such like things; and burden the church with the bondage of the law; as if there ought to be among Christians, for the meriting of righteousness, a worship of God like unto that of which we read in Leviticus, the ordering whereof God committed, as they say, to the apostles and bishops. And the pontiffs appear to be deceived by the example of Moses's law; hence those burdens, that certain meats defile and pollute the conscience, and that it is deadly sin to do any manner of work on the *holy days and on Sunday*, or to leave unsaid the *Horæ Septa*; that fastings deserve remission of sins, and that they are necessary to the righteousness of the New Testament; that sin, in a case reserved, cannot be forgiven without the authority of the reserver, where, indeed, the canons themselves speak only of the reservation of the canonical penalty, and not of the reservation of sin. From whence, and of whom, have the bishops the power and authority to impose these traditions upon the church, to wound consciences? For St. Peter forbids the yoke to be laid upon the disciples' necks.\* And St. Paul to the Corinthians says, that

\* Unaltered Augsburg Confession, Art. 15, New York, 1850.

\* Acts 15.

the power was given them to improve, and not to destroy. Why then do they multiply sin by such precepts? We have clear texts of Divine Writ, forbidding the institution of such precepts, thinking thereby to merit grace, or as if the same were necessary to salvation." . . . "For it is necessary that the doctrine of Christian liberty be kept still in the churches, which is, that the bondage of the law is not necessary to justification, as it is written,† 'Be not again entangled in the yoke of bondage.' The pre-eminence of the gospel must still be retained, which declares that we obtain remission of sins and justification freely by faith in Christ, and not for certain observations or rites devised by men.

"What shall we think, then, of the Lord's-day, and church ordinances and ceremonies? To this our learned men respond, that it is lawful for bishops or pastors to make ordinances that things be done orderly in the church; not that we should purchase by them remission of sins, or that we can satisfy for sins, or that consciences are bound to judge them necessary, or to think that they sin who, without offending others, break them. So Paul ordains, that in the congregation women should cover their heads, and that interpreters and teachers be heard in order in the church. It is convenient that the churches should keep such ordinances for the sake of charity and tranquility, that so one should not offend another, that all things may be done in the churches in order, and without tumult; but yet, so that the conscience be not charged, as to think that they are necessary to salvation, or to judge that they sin who, without hurting others, break them; as that no one should say that a woman sins who goeth abroad bareheaded, offending none.

"Even such is the observation of the Lord's-day,

---

† Gal. 5: 1.

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

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

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

---

\* As above, p. 176.

## CHAPTER XXI.

# SUNDAY IN THE SWISS REFORMATION.

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

“The Sabbath, in so far forth as it is ceremonial, is abolished; and, therefore, now we are not tied or bound to any certain times.”\*

Heylyn corroborates the above as follows:

“Zwingle avoweth it to be lawful, on the Lord's day, after the end of divine service, for any man to follow and pursue his labors, as commonly we do, saith he, in time of harvest.”†

Dr. Hessey quotes Zwingle as follows:

“Now hear, my Valentinus, how the Sabbath is

---

\* On the Sabbath, p. 277, London, 1630.

† Hist. of the Sab., Part 2. chap. 6, sec. 9.

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

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

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

#### CALVIN.

John Calvin stands in history as the representative man in the reformatory movement in Switzerland and France. His views relative to the Sabbath question are fully expressed in his writings, from which we extract the following:

---

\* Sunday, p. 352. Note, 387.  
 † Works, Vol. 4, p. 515.



“Sec. 28. The end of this precept is, that, being dead to our own affections and works, we should meditate on the kingdom of God, and be exercised in that meditation in the observance of his institutions.”

“Sec. 32. Assemblies of the church are enjoined in the divine word, and the necessity of them is sufficiently known, even from the experience of life. Unless there be stated days appointed for them, how can they be held? According to the apostle, ‘All things are to be done decently, and in order, among us. But, so far is it from being possible to preserve order and decorum without this regulation, that if it were abolished, the church would be in imminent danger of immediate convulsion and ruin.’ . . . ‘But why, it may be asked, do we not rather assemble on every day, that so *all distinction* of days may be removed? *I sincerely wish this were practiced*, and truly, spiritual wisdom would be well worthy of some portion of time being daily allotted to it.’”

“Sec. 33. I am obliged to be rather more diffuse on this point because, in the present age, some unquiet spirits have been raising noisy contentions respecting the Lord’s-day. They complain that Christians are tinctured with Judaism, because they retain any observance of days. But I reply, that the Lord’s-day is not observed by us upon the principles of Judaism; because in this respect the difference between us and the Jews is very great. For we celebrate it, not with scrupulous rigor, as a ceremony which we conceive to be a figure of some spiritual mystery, but only use it as a remedy necessary to the preservation of order in the church.”

“Sec. 34. However, the ancients have, not without sufficient reason, substituted what we call the Lord’s-day in the room of the Sabbath. For since the resurrection of the Lord is the end and consummation of the true rest, which was adumbrated by the ancient Sabbath, the same day which put an end

to the shadows admonishes Christians not to adhere to a shadowy ceremony. Yet I do not lay so much stress on the septenary number that I would oblige the church to an invariable adherence to it; nor will I condemn those churches which have other solemn days for their assemblies, provided they keep at a distance from superstition. And this will be the case if they be only designed for the observance of discipline and well regulated order. Let us sum up the whole in the following manner: As the truth was delivered to the Jews under a figure, so it is given to us without any shadows; first, in order that, during our whole life we should meditate on a perpetual rest from our works, that the Lord may operate within us by his Spirit; secondly, that every man, whenever he has leisure should diligently exercise himself in private, in pious reflections on the works of God, and also that we should at the same time observe the legitimate order of the church, appointed for the hearing of the word, for the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayer. Thirdly, that we should not unkindly oppress those who are subject to us. Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who in past ages have inflicted the church with a Jewish notion, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part of this commandment, which, according to them, is the appointment; of the seventh day has been abrogated but that the moral part of it, that is, the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day, for, on this principle, the same mysterious signification would still be attributed to particular days, which formerly obtained among the Jews. . . . But the principal thing to be remembered is the general doctrine, that lest religion decay or languish among us, sacred assemblies ought diligently to be held, and that we ought to use those ex-

ternal means which are adapted to support the worship of God." \*

Calvin is quoted by Cox as follows:

"When certain days are represented as holy in themselves, when one day is distinguished from another on religious grounds, when holy days are reckoned a part of divine worship, then days are improperly observed. The Jewish Sabbath, new moons and other festivals were earnestly pressed by the false apostles, because they had been appointed by the law. When we, in the present age, make a distinction of days, we do not represent them as necessary, and thus lay a snare for the conscience. We do not reckon one day to be more holy than another; we do not make days to be the same thing with religion and the worship of God, but merely attend to the preservation of order and harmony. The observance of days among us is a free service and devoid of all superstition." †

In Calvin's sermons on the Book of Deuteronomy, sermon 34, we have the following:

"Yea, and we have to mark also, that it is not enough for us to think upon God and his works upon the Lord's-day every man by himself, but that we must meet together upon some certain day to make open confession of our faith. Indeed, this ought to be done every day, as I have said afore. But yet, in respect of men's rawness, and by reason of their slothfulness, it is necessary to have one special day dedicated wholly thereunto. It is true that we be not bound to the seventh day, neither do we (indeed) keep the same day that was appointed to the Jews, for that was Saturday. But to the intent to show

---

\* Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. 1, Book 2, chap. 8.

† Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 404. See also, Calvin's Com. on Gal. 4: 10, Pringle's Trans., Edinburg, 1854.

the liberty of Christians, the day was changed because Jesus Christ in his resurrection did set us free from the bondage of the law, and canceled the obligation thereof. That was the cause why the day was shifted. But yet we must observe the same order of having some day in the week, be it one or be it two, for that is left to the free choice of Christians." \*

Again he says:

"But some one will say, We still keep up some observance of days. I answer that we do not by any means observe days as though there was any sacredness in holy days, or as though it were not lawful to labor upon them, but respect is paid to order and government, not to days." †

Hopkins bears the following testimony:

"Calvin took low ground upon this subject, speaking of the Sabbath as 'abrogated,' to be used by Christians only as a remedy necessary for the preservation of order in the church, for hearing the Word, for breaking the mystic bread, for public prayers, and to let servants and laborers rest. The pernicious influence of his views still infects the Continental church." . . . "It was the custom with the Protestant churches on the Continent—thanks in part to Calvin—for the people, after divine service, to refresh themselves with bowling, walking abroad, and other innocent recreations." ‡

But lest some one should charge us with not fully representing Calvin, we add his comments upon those specific portions of the New Testament, which are claimed in support of the "Puritan" theory of a

\* Cox Sab. Lit. Vol. 1, p. 408.

† Com. on Col. 2:13, Edinburg, 1857.

‡ Hist. of the Puritans, Vol. 3, p. 586, Boston, 1859.

“change of day,” and of Sunday as sacred on New Testament authority. In commenting on the time of Christ’s resurrection, and the harmony of the evangelists on that point,\* he says nothing of the “change of day,” or the commemorating of the day because of the resurrection. In his comments on John 20, he makes no claim that “after eight days,” was the next Sunday. On Acts 2 : 1, in treating of Pentecost, he makes no claim that it fell on the first day of the week. On Acts 20 : 7, the meeting at Troas, he speaks with definiteness, but in a way which shows that he found in it no support for Sunday observance. He says:

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

“For to what end is there mention of the Sabbath, save only that he may note the opportunity and choice of time? Also it is a likely matter that Paul waited for the Sabbath, that the day before his departure he might the more easily gather all the disciples into one place. Therefore, I think thus, that they had appointed a solemn day for the celebrating of the holy supper of the Lord among themselves, which might be *commodus* for them all.” †

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

---

\* Matt. 28, Mark 16, and Luke 24.

† Commentaries, Latin Edition of 1667. Acts 20: 7

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

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

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

" At Geneva a tradition exists that when John Knox visited Calvin on a Sunday, he found his aus-

---

\* Rev, 1: 10.

† Calvin's Commentaries, 1 Cor. 16.

tere coadjutor bowling on a green. At this day, and at that place, a Calvinist preacher, after his Sunday sermons, will take his seat at the card table."\*

Such were the views of the great lights in the Continental Reformation, Luther and Calvin. The lesser lights, their coadjutors, followed in the same paths. Bullinger and Beza, upon whom Calvin's mantle fell, were true to the teachings of their predecessor. In his commentary upon Rev. 1: 10, Bullinger asserts that "Christian churches entertained the Lord's-day, not upon any commandment from God, but upon their free choice." In his sermons he discusses the question at length. In that discussion he says:

"Now, as there ought to be an appointed place, so likewise there must be a prescribed time, for the outward exercise of religion, and so consequently, an holy rest. They of the primitive church, therefore, did change the Sabbath-day, lest, peradventure they should have seemed to have imitated the Jews, and still to have retained their order and ceremonies, and made their assemblies and holy restings to be on the first day of sabbaths, which John calleth Sunday (?) or the Lord's-day, because of the Lord's glorious resurrection upon that day. And although we do not, in any part of the Apostles' writings, find any mention made that this Sunday was commanded us to be kept holy; yet for because in this fourth precept of the first table we are commanded to have a care of religion and the exercising of outward godliness, it would be against all godliness and Christian

---

\* Bampton Lectures, p. 366, note 449. As authority for this tradition, and the accompanying statement, Hessey gives Disraeli—Charles the First, Vol. 2, p. 16; also Strypes Life of Bp. Aylmer c. xi.

charity, if we should deny to sanctify the Sunday, especially, since the outward worship of God cannot consist without an appointed time and space of holy rest.

“ I suppose, also, that we ought to think the same of those few feasts and holy days, which we keep holy to Christ our Lord, in memory of his nativity, or incarnation, of his circumcision, of his passion, of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord into heaven, and of his sending of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples. For Christian liberty is not a licentious power and dissolving of godly, ecclesiastical ordinances, which advance and set forward the glory of God and love of our neighbor. But for because the Lord will have holy days to be kept and solemnized to himself alone, I do not therefore like of the festival days that are held in honor of any creatures. This glory and worship is due to God alone. Paul saith, ‘ I would not that any man should judge you in part of an holy day, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come.’ And again, ‘ Ye observe days and months and years and times; I fear lest I have labored in you in vain.’ And therefore we at this day, that are in the church of Christ, have nothing to do with the Jewish observation; we have only to wish and endeavor to have the Christian observation and exercise of Christian religion to be freely kept and observed.” \*

Beza speaks as follows:

“ Concerning the fourth commandment, I suppose it is agreed upon among Christians, that the same is abrogated, so far as it was ceremonial, but not in such a manner as that the Lord’s-day ought to be observed according to the manner of the Jewish Sabbath, etc.; that Christians upon that day should ab-

---

\* Sermons Second Decade, pp. 259, 260, 261.



stain from their daily labors, except only such time of the day as was appointed for public assemblies. This was neither commanded in the Apostles' days, nor yet observed, until Christian Emperors enjoined the same to the end that people might not be abstracted from holy meditations. Neither in those days was the same precisely or strictly observed."\*

Heylyn speaks of Beza's views in these words:

"Beza his (Calvin's) scholar and Achatés' sings the self-same song, that howsoever the assemblies of the Lord's-day were of apostolic and divine tradition, yet so that there was no cessation from work required, as was observed among the Jews. For that, saith he, had not so much abolished Judaism, as put it off and changed it to another day. And he then adds that this cessation was first brought in by Constantine and afterwards confirmed with more and more restraints, by the following Emperors, by means of which it came to pass, that that which was at first done for a good intent, viz., that men being free from their worldly business, might wholly give themselves to hearing of the Word of God, degenerated at last into downright Judaism [In Apocal. 1; 10]."+

Heylyn goes on, speaking of others, as follows:

"So for the Lutheran churches, Chemnitz charges the Romanists with superstition, because they taught the people that the holy days, considered only in themselves, had a native sanctity. And howsoever for his part, he thinks it requisite that men should be restrained from all such works as may be any hindrance to the sanctifying of the day, yet he accounts it but a part of the Jewish leaven so scrupulously to prohibit such external actions as are no hindrances to God's public worship, and man's Sabbath

\* Homily 30, on the Songs of Solomon.

† History Sabbath, part 2d, chap. 6, sec. 5.

duties. Bucer goes further yet, and doth not only call it a superstition, but an apostasy from Christ, to think that working on the Lord's-day, in itself considered, is a sinful thing. He adds that he 'did very well approve of the Lord's-day meetings, if men were once dispossessed of the opinions that the day was necessary to be kept, that it was holier in itself than the other days, and that to work upon that day was in itself sinful.' Lastly, the churches of the Switzers profess, in their confession—c. 24—that, in the keeping of the Lord's-day, they give not the least hint to any Jewish superstitions, 'for neither,' as they said, 'do we conceive one day to be more holy than another, or think that rest from labor, in itself considered, is any way pleasing unto God.' . . .

"Bucer resolves the point more clearly, and saith, 'The Lord's-day, by the common consent of Christian people, was dedicated unto public rest, and the assemblies of the church.' And Peter Martyr, upon a question being asked, why the old seventh day was not kept in the Christian church, makes answer, 'that upon that day, and on all the rest, we ought to rest from our own works, the works of sin.' That this was rather chosen than that, for God's public service, 'that,' saith he, 'Christ left totally unto the liberty of the church, to do therein what should seem most expedient, and that the church did very well, in that she did prefer the memory of the resurrection before the memory of creation.' . . . "Gaulter speaking more generally (says) that 'the Christians first assembled on the Sabbath-day, as being then most famous and so most in use. But when the churches were augmented, the next day after the Sabbath was designed to those holy uses."\*

#### IN FRANCE.

The character of the reformatory movement in

---

\* Hist. Sab., part 2, chap. 6, sec. 7.

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

## SUMMARY.

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

“And so it was in reference to the Lord’s-day. With one blow, as it were, and with one consent, the Continental Reformers rejected the legal or Jewish title which had been set upon it, the more than Jewish ceremonies and restrictions by which, in theory at least, it had been encumbered; the army of holy days, of obligation by which it had been surrounded. But they did more. They left no sanction for the day itself, which could commend itself powerfully to men’s consciences. They did not perceive that, through the Apostles, it was of the Lord’s founding. They swept away, together with the *upper works*, which *were not the Lord’s*, the *under works*, which *were the Lord’s*. And when they discovered that men, that human nature, in fact, could not do without it, they adopted the day indeed, but

with this reservation, expressed or implied, 'The Lord's-day is to be placed in the category of ordinances, which, being matters of indifference, any particular or National Church hath power to ordain, change, or abolish; or, which was worse still, they made it a purely civil institution, dependent, if not for its origin, at least for its continuance, upon the secular power.' \*

On page 172, Hesse concludes in these words:

"We are now, I think, in a condition to sum up the views of the Continental Reformers of the sixteenth century on the subject before us. Sabbatarians, indeed, those eminent men were not. They are utterly opposed to the literal application of the fourth commandment to the circumstances of Christians. They scarcely touch upon that commandment, except to show that the Sabbath has passed away." . . . "They feel it necessary to defend their practice on grounds, sometimes perhaps of apostolic example, (with the proviso, however, that such example is to be taken only for what it is worth,) but generally, of antiquity, of the church's will, of the church's wisdom, of considerations of expediency, of regard to the weaker brethren, and sometimes on lower grounds still. And neither the day itself, nor the interval at which it recurs, is of obligation. Our Lord's resurrection is made a decent excuse for the day, rather than the original reason, or one of the original reasons for its institution. We miss also in their writings that close connection of the Lord's-day with the Lord's Supper, which was prominently brought forward in early times." . . . "And it seems to me more than probable that the want of a deeper sanction for the observance of the Lord's-day than their teachers supplied, led the members both of the Protestant and of the Reformed communions into a

---

\* Sunday Lect. 6, p. 165, et seq.

practical disregard of it, closely resembling that of the communion which they had indignantly disclaimed."

Heylyn sums up the case in a similar strain:

"Thus have we proved by the doctrine of the Protestants, of what side soever, and those of greatest credit in their several churches, eighteen by name, and all the Lutherans in general of the same opinion, that the Lord's-day is of no other institution than the authority of the church." . . . "Nay, by the doctrine of the Helvetian churches, if I conceive their meaning rightly, every particular church may designate what day they please to religious meetings, and every day may be a Lord's-day or a Sabbath."\*

The fact is thus placed beyond question, that the "Continental" reformers taught unmodified no-Sabbathism, on the broad ground of Christian liberty. The present flood of no-Sabbathism, which is pouring into America from the Continent of Europe, is the logical fruitage of the theories which were thus early taught. The correctness of these theories must be tested, in part at least, by their present fruitage thus seen. But according to the philosophy of history, we may not condemn the continent of Europe for its present no Sabbathism. It was a no-Sabbath tree which the reformers planted there.

Robert Cox makes the same conclusions in a criticism upon a passage from the papers of the "Sabbath Alliance," in which he states that Luther, Cal-

---

\* Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 6, sec. 8.

vin, Melancthon, Beza, Bucer, Zwingle and others taught "expressly or in effect that the Sabbath was an exclusively Jewish institution, and was never meant for this more advanced age." \*

---

\* Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties. p. 484

## CHAPTER XXII.

# SUNDAY IN THE ENGLISH RE- FORMATION.

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

"They made as quick advances, perhaps, in restoring religion toward its primitive simplicity as the circumstances of the time would admit; and it is evident that they designed to go farther, and not make this the last standard of the Reformation. Indeed, Queen Elizabeth thought her brother had gone too far, by stripping religion of too many ornaments,

and, therefore, when she came to the crown, she was hardly persuaded to restore it to the condition in which he left it. King James I., King Charles I., Archbishop Laud, and all their admirers, instead of removing farther from the superstitious pomps of the Church of Rome, have been for returning back to them, and have appealed to the settlement of Queen Elizabeth as the purest standard."\*

The editor of Neale's work, John A. Choules, M. A., adds a note to the above, as follows:

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

With this glance at the general situation, the reader is prepared to examine the matter in hand more in detail. We shall first note the opinions of representative men, and then the enactments concerning the Sunday and its observance.

#### TYNDALE.

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

"And as for the Sabbath, a great matter, we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into the Monday, or any other day, as we see need; or may make every tenth day holy day, only if we see a cause why. We may make two every week, if it were expedient and one not enough to teach the people. Neither was there any cause to change it from the

\* History of the Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 55, New York, 1855.



Saturday, than to put a difference between us and the Jews, and lest we should become servants to the day after their superstition. Neither needed we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught without it.\*

## JOHN FRYTH.

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

“Our forefathers who were in the beginning of the church, did abrogate the Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an ensample of Christian liberty, and that they might know that neither the keeping of the Sabbath, nor of any other day is necessary according to Paul: ‘Ye observe days, times and months.’ ‘I am afraid of you, that I have labored in vain toward you.’ Howbeit, because it was necessary that a day should be reserved, in which the people should come together to hear the Word of God, they ordained, instead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next day following, which is Sunday. And, although they might have kept the Saturday with the Jew, as a thing indifferent, yet they did much better to overset the day, to be a perpetual memory that we are free, and not bound to any day, but may do all lawful works to the pleasure of God and the profit of our neighbor. We are in manner as superstitious in the Sunday as they were in the Saturday; yea, and we are much madder. For the Jews have the Word of God for their Saturday, sith it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemn. And we have not the Word of God for us, but rather against us; for we keep not the seventh day as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God’s law. But Paul biddeth that no man judge us, as concerning

---

\* Works of the English Reformers, William Tyndale and John Fryth, Vol. 2, p. 101, London, 1831.

holy days, meats, and such other exterior things: yea, and in no ways will he that we observe them, counting them more holy than other days. For they were instituted that the people should come together to hear God's Word, receive the sacraments, and give God thanks; that done, they may return unto their houses and do their business as well as any other day. He that thinketh that a man sinneth which worketh on the holy day, if he be weak or ignorant, ought better to instruct and so to leave his hold; but if he be obstinate and persevere in his sentence, he is not of God but of the devil, for he maketh sin in such as God leaveth free. According to this ensample I would that our ceremonies were altered; because (as I have said) the people seek health in them, and what villainy more can they do to Christ's blood."\*

## CRANMER.

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

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

---

\* Declaration of Baptism, p. 96.

† Catechism, p. 40, Oxford, 1829; also Cox Sab. Lit. and Hessey, Sunday Lectures.

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

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

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

Jerome also, to the Galatians IV., according to the same, saith, ‘Lest the congregation of the people without good order, should diminish the faith in Christ, therefore certain days were appointed, wherein we should come together; not that that day is holier than the others in which we come together, but that whatsoever day we assemble in, there might arise greater joy by the sight of one of us to another.’ \*

Concerning civil enactments Heylyn speaks as follows, after quoting the opinions of Tyndale, Fryth and others:

“Now that which was affirmed by them in their particulars, was not long afterwards made good by the general body of this church and state, the king, the lords spiritual and temporal, and all the commons

\* Confutation of Unwritten Verities, Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 60, 61. Cambridge, 1846.

met in Parliament, *anno*, fifth and sixth of King Edward VI., where, to the honor of Almighty God, it was thus enacted: ' Forasmuch as men be not at all times so mindful to laud and praise God, so ready to resort to hear God's Holy Word, and to come to the holy communion as their bounded duty doth require; therefore, to call men to remembrance of their duty, and to help their infirmity, it hath been wholesomely provided that there should be some certain times and days appointed, wherein the Christians should cease from all kinds of labor, and apply themselves only and wholly unto the aforesaid holy works, properly pertaining to true religion, which works, as they may well be called God's service, so the times especially appointed for the same, are called holy days. Not for the matter of the nature either of the time or day—for so all days and times are of like holiness—but for the nature and condition of such holy works, whereunto such times and days are sanctified and hallowed; that is to say, separated from all profane uses, and dedicated, not unto any saint or creature but, only unto God and his true worship. Neither is it to be thought that there is any certain time, or definite number of days prescribed in the holy Scriptures, but the appointment both of the time and also of the number of days, is left by the authority of God's Word unto the liberty of Christ's church, to be determined and assigned orderly in every country by the discretion of the rulers and ministers thereof, as they shall judge most expedient, to the true setting forth of God's glory, and the edification of their people.'

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

“ Be it therefore enacted, etc., that all the days here-

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

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

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

purpose of the church, the Sunday was no otherwise esteemed of than any other holy day.' \*

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

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

"All the Queen's faithful and loving subjects shall henceforth celebrate and keep their holy day according to God's holy will and pleasure, that is, in hearing the Word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offenses unto God and amendment of the same, in reconciling of themselves charitably to their neighbors, where displeasure hath been, in oft-times receiving the com-

---

\* Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 2.

munion of the body and blood of Christ, in visiting the poor and sick, using all soberness and godly conversation. Yet, notwithstanding, all Parsons, Vicars and Curates shall teach and declaim to their parishioners, that they may with a safe and quiet conscience, after their common prayer, in time of harvest, labor upon the holy and festival days, and save that which God hath sent; and if for any scrupulosity or grudge of conscience, men should abstain from working on these days, that then they should grievously offend God.

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

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

therefore by this statute, and the common prayer book, we are bound to keep more Sabbath, than the Lord's-day Sabbath, or else none at all." \*

Doctor Hessey speaks of the reign of Elizabeth, as follows :

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

During the latter years of the reign of Elizabeth, when, according to Mr. Hessey, "The desecration of Sunday which prevailed seems to have been most appalling," ‡ she refused to sanction a law for its better observance, which had been carried through Parliament by the Puritan influence. In this she only carried out the doctrine of the church, and of the reigning power whereby the Sunday was held as a

\* Heylyn Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 4.

† Sunday etc., sec. 7, p. 201

‡ Ibid., pp. 206, 207.



holiday only, and not as a Sabbath. Neale speaks of these times, and this refusal on the part of the Queen, in the following words :

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

In another place Neale adds :

“ While the bishops were thus harrassing honest and conscientious ministers for scrupling the ceremonies of the church, practical religion was at a very low ebb. The fashionable vices of the times were profane swearing, drunkenness, reveling, gaming, and profanation of the Lord’s-day : yet there was no discipline for these offenders, nor do I find any such cited into the spiritual courts, or shut up in prisons.

---

\* History of the Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 176.

If men came to the parish churches and approved of the habits and ceremonies, other offenses were overlooked, and the court was easy. At Paris Gardens, in Southwark, there were public sports on the Lord's-day, for the entertainment of great numbers of people who resorted thither. But on the thirteenth of January, being Sunday, it happened that one of the scaffolds, being crowded with people, fell down, by which accident some were killed, and a great many wounded. This was thought to be a judgment from heaven: for the Lord Mayor, in the account he gives of it to the treasurer, says, 'that it gives great occasion to acknowledge the hand of God for such abuse of the Sabbath-day, and moveth me in conscience to give order for redress of such contempt of God's service:' adding, that for this purpose he had treated with some justices of the peace in Surrey, who expressed a very good zeal, but alleged want of commission, which he referred to the consideration of his lordship. But the court paid no regard to such remonstrances, and the Queen had her ends in encouraging the sports, pastimes and revelings of the people on Sundays and holy days."\*

Such were the doctrines of the Reformed English Church, and such their fruits at the opening of the seventeenth century. In 1603, James I. of Scotland, came into possession of the scepter. A stricter observance of the Sunday had obtained to some extent among those of the Puritan party who accepted the doctrines concerning the Sabbath which had just then been published by Nicholas Bound. These efforts made by the Puritans caused no little complaint, which led to a declaration by the King, commonly called the "Book of Sports," which was pub-

---

\* *Id.*, p. 154

lished in 1618. In this he declares that for the good of his people it is his pleasure that lawful recreations should be allowed, and therefore :

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

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

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

---

\* Heylyn’s Hist. Sab., Part 2, chap. 8, sec. 10.

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

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

" I would I knew where to find you ; to-day you are with the Romanists, to-morrow with us ; our adversaries think you ours ; and we, theirs. Your conscience finds with both, and neither : how long will you halt in this indifference ?"

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

---

\* Hist. Puritans, Vol. 1, p. 279.

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

The publication of the foregoing widened the breach between the Puritans and the government. Many clergymen were deposed for refusing to read these declarations from their pulpits and much trouble and persecution came upon all dissenters. These agitations, and the ripening of other turbulent elements, culminated in civil war in 1642. The government soon came into the hands of the Puritan

---

\* Id. Vol. 1, p. 312.

party, and hence the civil history of the Sunday from 1646 to 1660 belongs to the next chapter. The execution of the King in 1649, the establishment of the Cromwellian Protectorate in 1653, the death of Cromwell in 1658, the military interregnum, and the restoration of Charles II. in 1660, are the prominent points in this turbulent period. The restoration of Charles and the re-establishment of the church of England were followed by a period of great moral and social debauchery. The King gave himself up to a life of avowed lewdness, and great dissoluteness prevailed among the baser sort of those who adhered to the throne and to the State religion. In 1661, the "Savoy Conference" was called. This was an effort to harmonize the Puritan party with the State-religion party. This it failed to do. Concerning the Sunday at that time and since, Dr. Hessey speaks as follows :

"The Savoy Conference, as we have said, refused to make any alterations in our authorized documents so far as Sunday was concerned. Since that time, the church of England has not formally meddled with the subject. Meanwhile, Sunday has gone through considerable vicissitudes. What it was in the licentious reign of Charles the II. may be surmised from the mournful picture, given by Evelyn, of the Sunday preceding the death of that king. Puritanism had indeed died out in reference to the Lord's-day; but I confess that the state of things which succeeded was worse than Puritanism. In the middle of the eighteenth century, there was a reaction. Methodism rose up. This is not the place to discuss either the justifiableness of that movement, or the influence which it has had upon the

church of England. But I may venture to quote a passage from Earl Stanhope which illustrates very clearly its bearings upon the immediate subject. 'It is,' says he, 'certainly one of the ill effects of Methodism that it has tended to narrow the circle of innocent enjoyments.' Then, after mentioning some instances, he adds: 'Of one clergyman, Mr. Grimshaw, who joined the Methodists, and is much extolled by them, it is related by his panegyrist. "He endeavored to suppress the generally prevailing custom in country places during the summer, of walking in the fields on the Lord's-day, between the services, or in the evening in companies. He not only bore his testimony against it from the pulpit, but reconnoitered the fields in person, to detect and reprove delinquents."' How different was the saying of good old Bishop Hacket, 'Serve God and be cheerful.'"\*

The church of England has not spoken authoritatively upon the Sabbath question since the above extract from Hessey's work was written, and hence it is not needful to trace the question further. The civil enactments, which are carefully noted in the foregoing pages, constitute the real authority concerning the Sunday and its observance in England. The use of the ten commandments in the liturgy of the English church can not be interpreted as favoring the idea of the Sabbath—Saturday—as may be seen from the discussions and interpretations at the time they were first placed in the liturgy (1552), which interpretations are sustained by modern churchmen. †

---

\* Sunday, Sect. 8, p. 218.

† See Cox Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 139; Heylyn Hist. Sab., Part 2, Chap. 8, Sec. 3, and Hessey, Sunday Lect. 5, p. 149.

The "Book of Homilies," published in 1562, in the homily on the "Place and Time of Prayer," presents the claim of analogy between the Sabbath and the Sunday. This was done to conciliate the Puritan element, which was then beginning to separate from the church; but the homily—which is not authoritative—teaches nothing different from what is shown in the foregoing extracts, concerning the origin of Sunday observance, or the authority upon which it is based.\* Hence the case, as regards the church of England, may be stated, briefly, thus:

The English church has always taught that the civil and religious authorities, the state and the church, have power to ordain and regulate the observance of Sunday. In her purest days, the Sunday is placed on a footing with the other church holidays. After the separation between the church and the Puritan party, the enactments in favor of Sunday were less strict, and the practical observance of it was looser until the time of Cromwell. When the church party was restored, after the civil war, there was no improvement in theory, and none in practice, except here and there where the Puritan element affected the people in spite of the teachings and laws of the ruling power. If there has been any temporary or local effort for a more sabbatic observance of Sunday since the middle of the eighteenth century, it has been made by "Dissenters," and not by the church. The history of the English church

---

\* See Cox Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 412, and Morer, Dialogues on the Lord's-day, p. 299.



must, therefore, go in to form a part of the history of that ecclesiastical no-Sabbathism, which was developed with the papacy, and beyond which the English church was not carried by her efforts at reformation. In further support of this thought, it is befitting to close this chapter with the following, from high authority :

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

Certain writers, notably Mr. Gilfillan, have labored to set aside the facts relative to the no-Sabbathism of the English church and of the Reformers in general. In the matter of civil enactments Mr. Gilfillan makes reference to a summary of Sunday legislation in England, prepared by Rev. John Baylee, in which a few enactments favorable to Sunday are mentioned as follows :

---

\* Hallam's Constitutional History of England. Works. Vol. 4, p. 227, N. Y., 1847.

“The late clerical secretary of the Society for Promoting the due Observance of the Lord’s-Day has thus summed up the Sabbath laws enacted in England from the year 1604: ‘In the reign of James I., trading in boots and shoes on the Lord’s-day is prohibited by law. And by an act passed in the first year of the reign of Charles I., it was found necessary *to restrain by a law* assemblages of persons from various parishes on the Lord’s-day. And in the second year of the same king *traveling of carriages is prohibited*. We can easily conceive how inconsistent with such legislation must have appeared to his subjects the re-issuing, on the part of the king, of the Book of Sports of his father, which virtually encouraged what the act of the first year of his reign pronounced unlawful. The act of the 29th Ch. II. C. 7, is a very important one, still in force, and needing only some amendments, chiefly as regards an increase in the amount of the penalties, to render it efficient. It *prohibits the following of ordinary callings*, and enjoins upon all, publicly and privately to exercise themselves in the duties of piety and true religion. The Act 21, Geo. III. C. 40, has proved a highly beneficial law, in *preventing places of amusement being opened for payment of money* on the Lord’s-day. The Act, though stringent and efficient for its purposes, is evaded with impunity in London, persons being admitted to public gardens by means of refreshment tickets purchased on the ordinary days of the week. In the reign of George IV., and subsequently at different times, Acts were passed *regulating inns, taverns, &c.* on the Lord’s-day. It is to be hoped the day is not far distant when the law will require them to be closed wholly on the Lord’s-day, with such exceptions as charity may require: for it is now an established fact, that crime increases in the same degree in which public-houses are allowed to be open on the Lord’s-day. The Act 3 and 4, of William IV., is deserving of special notice. *It en-*

*ables the election of officers of corporations, formerly required to be held on the Lord's-day, to be held on Saturday or Monday.* It is the Act of the late Sir Andrew Agnew, and was passed in 1833. The bill was drawn up by Mr. George Rockfort Clarke; the preamble of it is important, for it *asserts it to be the duty of the Legislature to remove as much as possible impediments to the due observance of the Lord's-day.* Imperfect as our legislation is on the subject of the Lord's-day, yet it has proved a mighty barrier to keep out the tide of profanation of the day with which the love of gain and of pleasure, more than of God, would otherwise have inundated us. It has also proved highly protective to society in general, in securing to a population, the most active, industrious and hard-worked in Europe, the privilege of one day in seven for religious instruction and rest.' '\*

The foregoing is the best possible showing that can be made concerning the existing Sunday laws in England. That such enactments are and have been practically in-operative and void is seen in the facts concerning the present and past practices of the people. On this point we shall speak further when we make a general summary of the present state of the Sunday question in the Christian Church, in which we shall be obliged to array Mr. Gilfillan against himself. Mr. Gilfillan also makes a great effort to prove that the Reformers, Continental and English, were not no-Sabbathists, by referring to or quoting their sayings concerning the divine origin of the Sabbath—Saturday—and the perpetuity of the Ten Commandments. His apparent success in supporting such inferences comes only, if at all,

---

\* Sabbath, p. 436, seq. N. Y. edition

from not acknowledging that when they thus speak it is only of the *general spirit* of the law, and not of its letter. The most that can in any instance be made to appear is a tendency in some cases to adopt a sort of theory of "Analogy" between the Old Testament and the New, after the manner of the Romish writers of the Middle Ages. The very full statements quoted in this chapter from unquestioned authority, must be shown to be false before the Continental and the English Reformers can be taken from the list of no-Sabbathists.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

# PURITANISM AND THE SUNDAY IN ENGLAND

The more radical and devoted ones, who led in the work of reformation under Edward VI., were so restrained by the conservative influences during the reign of Elizabeth, that they grew restive and evinced a strong tendency to separate from the Established Church. The restrictions which were imposed by the "Acts of Conformity" increased these tendencies, until they culminated in open separation about the middle of the sixteenth century. At first the Puritans plead for a better observance of the Sunday as a part of the general work of civil and religious reform. As they continued to seek for higher life and greater purity, the Sabbath question grew in importance. This was not fortuitous. Men never come into closer relations with God without feeling the sacredness of the claims which his law imposes; and no part of that law stands out more prominently than the fourth commandment, when the heart seeks to bring highest honors to him who is at once Father and Redeemer. As these men threw off the shackles of church authority, and stood face to face with God, recognizing him as their only law-giver, they

were driven toward higher ground concerning the Sabbath question.

Since the Puritans had no control in civil affairs until the time of the revolution under Cromwell, their doctrinal teachings are the only source of information previous to that period. The key note of the Puritan theory concerning the Sabbath and Sunday was struck by Nicholas Bownde (or Bound), in a book entitled, "*The Doctrine of the Sabbath, plainly laid forth and soundly proven.*" This was first published in 1695. The reader will readily discover the strength or weakness, the consistency or inconsistency of the theory, from the following copious extracts which are made from a copy of the first edition. After a preliminary discussion, Mr. Bownde opens the case in these words :

"First of all, therefore, it appeareth in the story of Genesis, that it was from the beginning, and that *the seventh day was sanctified at the first, as soon as it was made*, insomuch that Adam and his posterity, if they had continued in their first righteous estate, should have kept that day holy above the rest, seeing the Lord sanctified it for their sakes: and though it be so indeed that they should have been occupied in some honest calling and work upon the six days (according as it is said to Adam, that the Lord put the man into the garden of Eden, that he might dress it and keep it), yet notwithstanding, upon the seventh day they should have ceased from all worldly labor, and given themselves to the meditation of God's glorious works, and have been occupied in some more immediate parts of his service, according to the former commandment. And that we might understand indeed, that the law of sanctifying the Sabbath is so ancient, the prophet Moses, in Genesis,

doth of purpose use the same words which the Lord (God himself doth in pronouncing it (as is set down in Exodus), namely, that he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, and that in it God rested from all his work which he had made; to teach us assuredly that this commandment of the Sabbath was no more then first given when it was pronounced from heaven by the Lord than any other of the moral precepts: nay, that it hath as much antiquity as the seventh day hath being: for so soon as the day was, so soon was it sanctified, that we might know, that as it came in with the first man, so it must not go out but with the last man, and as it was in the beginning of the world, so it must continue to the ending of the same, and as the first seventh day was sanctified so must the last be, and as God bestowed this blessing upon it in the most perfect estate of man, so must it be reserved with it till he be restored to his perfection again." \*

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

"And that this Sabbath-day, which hath that commendation of antiquity and consent which we have heard, ought to stand still in its proper force, and that it appertaineth to us Christians now, most evidently appeareth by the authority and credit which it receiveth from the gospel and New Testament also, in which it is so highly commended unto us (that I might not in this place speak of the other

---

\* The Doctrine, etc., p. 5. seq.

manifold testimonies that it hath in the Old). And by name we may see how our Savior Christ, and all his apostles established it by their practice; for they, upon the Sabbath, ordinarily enter into the synagogues and preach unto the people, doing such things upon these days as appertain to sanctifying of them according to the commandment." \*

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

"Now, as we have hitherto seen, that there ought to be a Sabbath-day, so it remaineth that we should hear upon what day this Sabbath should be kept, and which is that very day that is sanctified for that purpose. For I do know that it is not agreed upon among them that do truly hold that there ought to be a Sabbath, which is that very day on which the Sabbath should always be. Herein the Lord hath been merciful unto his church, and succored the infirmities of man in this behalf, and decided the endless contention that might have been about this

---

\* Id., p. 9.



matter, in that he hath told us that it is the *seventh* day which he hath sanctified for that purpose. For it is in express words said, in Genesis, that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. And in Exodus, 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;' and afterwards the same words be repeated by Moses in Deuteronomy. Wherefore it must needs be upon that day, and upon none other: for the Lord himself sanctified that day, and appointed it for that purpose, and none but it; and therefore it is truly said, by that great saint, Augustine, 'This is found of the Sabbath alone,—God sanctified the seventh day,' insomuch, that a man being in conscience persuaded that he should keep holy unto the Lord some one day or other, should ignorantly choose out some other day, neglecting the seventh, to sanctify it by resting from his labors, and wholly applying himself to God's service, he could not look for that blessing from God, which, no doubt, the church of God doth find at his hand, upon that day, by virtue of his special promise; for he blessed that day and sanctified it. And as Peter Martyr alledgeth it out of Rabbi Agnon, 'This blessing doth light upon those who observe and sanctify the same Sabbath which God appointed; and we do not read that he bestowed that blessing upon any other day which we know he did upon the seventh. So that the substance of this law is natural, as Master Junius saith, and to be observed of all men alike, namely, that every seventh day should be holy unto God.' And so it is true not only that of every seven days, as Peter Martyr saith, 'one must be reserved unto God,' and, a little after, 'it is perpetual that one day in the week should be reserved for the service of God,' but that this must be upon the seventh. In setting down which, I do not so far forget myself, but that I remember that some, whom with all humility I do reverence in the Lord, and give thanks unto him for their labors, that (I say) are otherwise

minded, and do not think the church is necessarily tied to the number of seven in observing the day. Yet I do not see (be it far from me that I should obstinately contend with any) where the Lord hath given any authority to his church, ordinarily and perpetually, to sanctify any day except that which he hath sanctified himself. For I hold this, with other learned men, as a principle of divinity, that it belongeth only to God to sanctify the day as it belongeth to him to sanctify any other thing to his own worship." . . . "Therefore we must needs acknowledge it to be the singular wisdom and mercy of God towards his church, thus by sanctifying the seventh day, to end the strife. For, as we see in God's service, when men go away from his Word, there is no end of devising that which he alloweth not; and they fall upon everything, saving upon that they should; so in appointing the day if we be not ruled by the Word, we shall find by experience that every day will seem more convenient to us than that, at leastwise we shall seem to have as good reason to keep any other as the seventh."\*

Continuing the subject he presses the point that God sanctified the day because in it he had rested, and that the Jews were not at liberty to change even "the number of that day," and that they only properly worshiped God and proved their love for him when they kept holy his day. Again he draws his conclusion in these words :

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

After thus surveying the field, it is difficult to

---

\* Id., p. 30, et seq.

understand how Mr. Bownde could be so blinded to the legitimate deductions from his own arguments, as to talk of a change of day. But so strong were his prejudices against what he calls Judaism that he clings to the Sunday, supporting his claim with the following broken reed :

“ But now concerning this very special seventh day which we now keep in the time of the gospel, that is well known, that it is *not* the *same* it was from the beginning, which *God* himself did *sanctify*, and whereof he speaketh in this commandment, for it was the day going before *ours*, which in Latin retaineth its ancient name, and is called the Sabbath, which we also grant, but so that we confess it must always remain, never to be changed any more, and that all men must keep holy *this* seventh day, which was unto them not the seventh, but the *first* day of week, as it is so called many times in the New Testament, and so it still standeth in force, that we are bound unto the seventh day, though not unto *that* very *seventh*. Concerning the time, and persons by whom, and when the day was changed, it appeareth in the New Testament, that it was done in the time of the apostles, and by the apostles themselves, and that together with the day, the name was changed, and was in the beginning called the *first day of the week*, afterward's the *Lord's-day*.”

Mr. Bownde quotes only *two* passages of Scripture in support of the above claim, Acts 20: 7, and 2 Cor. 16: 2. In direct opposition to his previous proposition, that the Word of God alone is authority, he devotes several pages to quotations and remarks concerning the “ Doctors and Fathers ” in the church, seeking to show that the early Christians changed the observance from the Sabbath to the Sunday.

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

Such were the theories of the Puritans concerning the Sunday. It now remains to trace its history in civil legislation, and in practical life. The visible separation between these radical reformers and the Established Church began about 1560,<sup>7</sup> when they were derisively called Puritans. During the remainder of the reign of Elizabeth and the reign of her successor, James I., they had but little direct

political influence. But as all reforms find their first welcome among the common people, Puritanic ideas and practices gained steadily among the masses. The spirit of liberty was demanding release from the civil and ecclesiastical usurpations and oppressions which marked the beginning of the reign of Charles I. His Queen was an open friend of the Papists, while he claimed to be the supporter of the orthodox church, as founded by Elizabeth. Laud and his co-workers were the King's advisers, and were at the head of the church party. Against these were arrayed the whole Puritan party, and many others who could not fellowship the papistic tendency of the Court. In the Parliament, this included the body of the "House of Commons," and a party in the "House of Lords." But the "Bench of Bishops," who were *ex officio* members of the House of Lords, for a long time thwarted all efforts for change or reform.

About 1640 the open struggle commenced by the passage of a reformatory bill in the House of Commons, one provision of which was for a stricter observance of Sunday. It was defeated in the House of Lords; but the discussion and agitation did much to arouse the people, and to disturb the security of the throne and the church party. This would probably have ended for the time in discussion except that, upon the heel of the failure of the bill, there came the insurrection of the Papists, and the massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, on the 23d of October, 1642. Strong suspicions were entertained that the

Court, especially the Queen, was a party to the plot, and fears were aroused that a similar fate awaited the English non-conformists. The failure of the efforts of Parliament, and of the Irish Protestants, to obtain relief for the sufferers, and punishment for the offenders, at the hands of the Court, only widened the breach between the two parties in the government, and showed the complicity of the Court with the barbarous butchery of the Irish. This led to a rapid separation. The Bishops were soon driven from the House of Lords. The King fled to York, followed by his party. The Parliament having tried in vain to obtain his co-operation to avert the dangers to the kingdom, took the power into its own hands. The Queen fled to Holland, from whence, with her son-in-law, the Duke of Orange, she forwarded supplies to the King. Each party possessed itself of as much territory and military strength as possible, and the King, marching against London, was met at "Edgehill, near Keinton, in Warwickshire" by the Parliament forces under the Earl of Essex, and the first battle took place on the 23d of October, 1643, just one year from the breaking out of the Irish insurrection.

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

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

(b.) The calamity of civil war with all its horrors

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

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

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

---

\* History Puritans, Vol. 1. p. 424.

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

“ The Parliament’s affairs being low, and their counsels divided, they not only applied to heaven by extraordinary fastings and prayers, but went on vigorously with their intended reformation. They began with the Sabbath, and on March 22d, 1642-3, sent to the Lord Mayor of the city of London, to desire him to put in execution the statutes for the due observance of the Lord’s-day. His lordship, accordingly, issued his precept the very next day to the aldermen, requiring them to give strict charge to the church wardens and constables within their several wards, that from henceforth they do not permit or suffer any person or persons, in time of divine service, or at any time on the Lord’s-day, to be tippling in any tavern, inn, tobacco shop, ale house or other victualing house whatsoever; nor suffer any fruiter, or herb-women to stand with fruit, herbs or other victuals or wares in any streets, lanes or alleys, or any other ways to put things for sale at any time of that day, or in the evening of it; or any milk-woman to cry milk; nor to suffer any persons to unlade any vessels of fruit or other goods, and carry them on shore; or to use any unlawful exercises or pastimes; and to give express charge to all inn keepers, taverns, cook shops, ale houses, etc., within their wards, not to entertain any guests to tiddle, eat, drink or take tobacco in their houses on the Lord’s-day, except inn-keepers, who may receive their ordinary guests, or travelers who come for the dispatch of their necessary business; and if any persons offend in the premises, they are to be brought before the Lord Mayor or one of his Majesty’s justices of the peace



to be punished as the law directs. This order had a very considerable influence upon the city, which began to wear a different face of religion to what it had formerly done. May 5th the book tolerating sports upon the Lord's-day was ordered to be burned by the common hangman in Cheapside and other usual places; and all persons having any copies in their hands were required to deliver them to one of the sheriffs of London to be burned."\*

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

"Next to the Lord's-day, they had a particular regard to their monthly fast. April 24th, all constables, or their deputies, were ordered to repair to every house within their respective liberties, the day before every public fast, and charge all persons strictly to observe it according to the said ordinance. And upon the day of the public fast, they were enjoined to walk through their said liberties, to search for persons who, either by following the work of their calling, or sitting in taverns, victualing or ale houses, or in any other ways, should not duly observe the same, and to return their names to the Committee for examination, that they might be proceeded against for contempt. The fast was observed the last Wednesday in every month, the public devotions continuing with little or no intermission from nine in the morning till four in the afternoon, and (as has been already observed) with uncommon strictness and rigor."†

---

\* Id., Vol. 1, p. 454.

† Ibid.

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

"Religion was the fashion of the age. The Assembly was often turned into a house of prayer, and hardly a week passed without solemn fasting and humiliation in several of the churches of London and Westminster. The laws against profaneness were carefully executed, and because the former ordinances for the observation of the Lord's-day had proved ineffectual, it was ordained, April 6th, that all persons should apply themselves to the exercise of piety and religion on the Lord's-day; that no wares, fruits, herbs, or goods of any sort, be exposed for sale, or cried about the streets, upon penalty of forfeiting the goods. That no person without cause shall travel, or carry a burden, or do any worldly labor, upon penalty of ten shillings for the traveler, and five shillings for every burden, and for every offense in doing any worldly labor. That no person shall, on the Lord's-day, use or be present at, any wrestling, shooting, fowling, ringing of bells for pleasure, markets, wakes, church-ales, dancing, games, or sports whatsoever, upon penalty of five shillings to every one above fourteen years of age. And if children are found offending in the premises, their parents or guardians to forfeit twelve pence for every offense. That all May poles be pulled down, and none others erected. That if the several fines

above mentioned can not be levied, the offending party shall be set in the stocks for the space of three hours. That the King's declaration concerning lawful sports on the Lord's-day be called in, suppressed and burned.

“This ordinance shall not extend to prohibit dressing meat in private families, or selling victuals in a moderate way in inns or victualing houses, for the use of such as can not otherwise be provided for; nor to the crying of milk before nine in the morning, or after four in the afternoon.” \*

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

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

“Though several ordinances had been made heretofore for the strict observation of the Lord's-day, the present House of Commons thought fit to enforce them by another, dated April 9th, 1650, in which they ordain, ‘that all goods cried, or put to sale on the Lord's-day, or other days of humiliation and thanksgiving appointed by authority, shall be seized. No wagoner or drover shall travel on the Lord's-day, on penalty of ten shillings for every offense. No persons shall travel in boats, coaches, or on horses, except to church, on penalty of ten shillings. The like penalty for being in a tavern. And where distress is not to be made, the offender is to be put in the stocks six hours. All peace officers are required to

---

\* *Ib.* Vol. 1, p. 499.

make diligent search for discovering offenders ; and in case of neglect, the justice of peace is fined five pounds, and every constable twenty shillings."\*

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

“ As new inroads were made upon the ordinances for observation of the Sabbath, the Parliament took care to amend them. This year they ordained that ‘ the Sabbath should be deemed to extend from twelve of the clock on Saturday night to twelve of the clock on Lord’s-day night,’ and within that compass of time they prohibited all kinds of business and diversions, except works of necessity and mercy. No election of magistrates is to be on the Lord’s-day; no holding of courts or return of writs, but if according to their charters they fall upon the Lord’s day, they are to be deferred to Monday. That all persons not having a reasonable excuse, to be allowed by a justice of the peace, shall resort to some church or chapel where the true worship of God is performed, or to some meeting place of Christians not differing in matters of faith from the public profession of the nation, on a penalty of two shillings and six pence for every offense. It is further ordered, that no minister shall be molested or disturbed in the discharge of his office on the Lord’s-day, or any other day when he is performing his duty, or in going and coming from the place of public worship. Nor shall any willful dis-

---

\* Neale, Hist. Puritans, Vol. 2, p. 118.

turbance be given to the congregation, on penalty of five pounds, or being sent to the workhouse six months, provided the information be within one month after the offense is committed. This ordinance is to be read in every chapel in this nation annually, the first Lord's-day in every March."\*

Soon after this came the "Restoration," under Charles II., and Puritanism, as a controlling power in the government, passes out of sight. Whatever may be said concerning the course of the Puritan party as a political power, it is evident that the moral character of the people was much improved during its supremacy. Rigid and intolerant, it nevertheless possessed much more of true religion and vital piety than the formalists did who preceded and followed it. Many of the corrupt elements in church and state which could not be reformed were exiled. But with the restoration under Charles II., these came swarming back, and in turn harrassed and drove out the Puritans. Mr. Neale sums up the case in these words :

" And here was an end of those distracted times which our historians have loaded with all the infamy and reproach that the wit of man could invent. The Puritan ministers have been decried as ignorant mechanics, canting preachers, enemies to learning, and no better than robbers. The Universities were said to be reduced to a mere Munster, and that if the Goths and Vandals, and even the Turks had overrun the nation, they could not have done more to introduce barbarism, disloyalty and ignorance; and yet in these times, and by the men who then filled the university chairs were educated the most learned

---

\* Id., Vol. 2, p. 166.

divines and eloquent preachers of the last age, as the Stillingfleets, Tillotsons, Bulls, Barrows, Whitbys and others, who retained a high veneration for their learned tutors after they were rejected and displaced. The religious part of the common people has been stigmatized with the character of hypocrites; their looks, their dress and behavior have been represented in the most odious colors; and yet, one may venture to challenge these declaimers to produce any period of time since the Reformation wherein there was less open profaneness and impiety and more of the spirit, as well as the appearance of religion. Perhaps there was too much rigor and preciseness in indifferent matters: but the lusts of men were laid under a visible restraint, and though the legal constitution was unhappily broken, and men were governed by false politics, yet better laws were never made against vice, or more vigorously executed.

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

“But when the legal constitution was restored, there returned with it a torrent of debauchery and wickedness. The times which followed the Restora-

tion were the reverse of those which preceded it; for the laws which had been enacted against vice for the last twenty years, being declared null, and the magistrates changed, men set no bounds to their licentiousness. A proclamation, indeed, was published against those loose and riotous cavaliers, whose loyalty consisted in drinking healths, and railing at those who would not revel with them. But, in reality, the King was at the head of these disorders, being devoted to his pleasures, and having given himself up to an avowed course of lewdness. His bishops and chaplains said that he usually came from his mistresses' apartments to church, even on sacrament days. There were two play-houses erected in the neighborhood of the court. Women actresses were introduced into the theaters, which had not been known until that time; the most lewd and obscene plays were brought on the stage, and the more obscene, the King was better pleased, who graced every new play with his royal presence. Nothing was to be seen at court but feasting, hard drinking, reveling and amorous intrigues, which engendered the most enormous vices. From court, the contagion spread like wild-fire among the people, insomuch that men threw off the very profession of virtue and piety, under color of drinking the King's health. All kinds of old cavalier riotings and debauchery revived. The appearance of religion, which remained with some, furnished matters of ridicule to libertines and scoffers. Some who had been concerned in the former changes thought they could not redeem their credit better than by deriding all religion, and telling or making stories to render their former party ridiculous. To appear serious, or to make conscience either of words or actions, was the way to be accounted a schismatic, a fanatic, or a sectarian, though, if there was any real religion during the course of this reign, it was chiefly among those people. They who did not applaud the new ceremonies were marked out as Pres-

byterians, and every Presbyterian was a rebel. The old clergy, who had been sequestered for scandal, having taken possession of their livings, were intoxicated with their new felicity, and threw off all the restraints of their order. Every week, says Mr. Baxter,\* produced reports of one or other clergyman, who was taken up by the watch, drunk, at night, and mobbed in the streets. Some were taken with lewd women; and one was reported to be drunk in the pulpit. Such was the general dissoluteness of manners which attended the deluge of joy, which overflowed the nation upon his majesty's restoration." †

For twenty-five years (until 1683) did this profligate libertine, surrounded by a court like himself, carry on his ruinous rule. Sunday observance shared largely in the general decline, especially since it had been maintained before in a great degree by the civil power. Popery, secretly favored by the King, grew strong. The Puritan or Parliament party, now known under the general name of Nonconformists, was divided into Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, etc., all of whom were most bitterly persecuted. Among these, the Quakers, holding within their number many educated and influential men, though extremely strict in other respects, ignored all ideas of a Sabbath, or any obligation to observe days. ‡ Thus between the reigning dissoluteness, and the revival of the earlier doctrine of

---

\* Life, part 2, p. 288.

† Id., Vol. 2, p. 208.

‡ For their views, see Dymond's essays on the Principles of Morality, essay 2, chap. 1. and the Doctrines of Friends, by Elisha Bates, chap. 13.



“no sacred time,” the strict observance of Sunday was largely ignored.

It was not until the fifth year of the reign of George I. (1719) that a complete recognition of the Non conformists, and a general toleration of dissenters was obtained. There was little or no improvement in the observance of Sunday until the middle of the eighteenth century. The church of England retains her old standards concerning Sunday. The English Dissenters are now much less rigid in their observance of it than the Puritans were. The church of Ireland has always been too nearly allied to the church of England on this point to need any separate notice here. The church of Scotland has been, and yet is more Puritanic concerning Sunday. The following, from the pen of Doctor Hessey, will sufficiently illustrate its most rigid features :

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

along the streets, and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold upon both young and old whom they find out of their houses or out of the church.'

'My fourth instance shall be taken from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6, A. D., 1658: 'The said day, Alexander Cairnie, in Tillochie was delaitit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep up his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit that it was of necessitie for saving of the beasts lyfe in tyme of storme; was rebuked for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke.'\*

Since those years, the continental no-Sabbathism has crept into Scotland somewhat largely, and for some time past a war has been going on between it and the Puritan element, concerning "Sunday trains," and the like. The general tendency seems to be to the more liberal views.

More will be said on the present state of the question in a succeeding chapter.

---

\* Sunday, Lect. 7, p. 216.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

# THE SABBATH IN EUROPE SINCE THE REFORMATION.

The history of the Sabbath during the early years of the Reformation is necessarily meager. The descendants of the Waldenses in Bohemia, Holland, and other parts of Northern Europe, seem to have formed the material for Sabbath-keeping churches which came to light when the rays of Reformation began to illumine the long continued night of Papal apostasy. These Sabbath-keepers were Baptists, and hence were classed with the despised "Anabaptists," who were made still more odious by the fanaticism of a few at Munster during the early part of the sixteenth century. Most writers have, therefore, passed over the history of these years by saying of Sabbath observance, that it was "revived by some sectaries among the Anabaptists," or words to this effect. When Sabbath-keepers were persons of prominence, more definite notice is taken of them. Enough can be gathered, however, to show that Sabbath-keepers were not uncommon on the continent of Europe, from the opening of the sixteenth century forward. An old German historian, John Sleidan, speaking of a sect in Bohemia called "Picards," says :

“ They admit of nothing but the Bible. They choose their own priests and bishops; deny no man marriage, perform no offices for the dead and have but very few holy days and ceremonies.”\*

These are the same people to whom Erasmus refers, representing them as extremely strict in observing the Sabbath. Robert Cox in his “Sabbath Literature,” makes them the progenitors of the Seventh-day Baptists. He says:

“ With reference to the origin of this sect, (Seventh-day Baptists,) I find a passage in Erasmus, that at the early period of the Reformation when he wrote there were Sabbatarians in Bohemia, who not only kept the seventh day, but were said to be so scrupulous in resting on it, that if anything went into their eyes they would not remove it till the morrow.” †

The passage from Erasmus is as follows:

‘ Nunc audimus apud Bohemos exoriri novum Judæorum genus Sabbatarios appellant, qui tanta superstitione servant Sabbatum, ut si quid eo die inciderit in oculum, nolint eximere; quasi non sufficiat eis pro Sabbato Dies Dominicus qui Apostolis etiam erat sacer, aut quasi Christus non satis expresserit quantum tribuedum sit Sabbati.’ ‡

Hospinian of Zurich in his treatise *De Festis Judæorum et Ethnicorum*, Cap. iii, (Tiguri.—1593,) replies to the arguments of these Sabbatarians. The story concerning their extreme strictness on the Sabbath is doubtless a forgery. But inasmuch as they accepted the Bible as their only guide, it is not wonderful that they refused to place the “Dies Dominicus be-

---

\* History of the Reformation, etc., p. 53, London, 1689; also, French edition of 1787. Vol. 1, p. 117. † Vol. 2, pp. 201, 202.

‡ De Amabili Ecclesiæ Concordia, Op. tom. V, p. 506; Lugd. Bat. 1704.

fore the Sabbath," since the Bible gives no authority for such a course. Doctor Hessey\* refers to these same Sabbatarians as the origin of the present Seventh-day Baptists. A voluminous work by Alexander Ross, speaking of these people at the beginning of the Reformation, says :

"Some only will observe the Lord's-day ; some only the Sabbath ; some both, and some neither." †

Bishop White, speaking of Sabbath observance bears this testimony :

"The same likewise being revived in Luther's time by Carlstadius and Sternebergius, and by some sectaries among the Anabaptists, hath both then and ever since been censured as Jewish and Heretical." ‡

Ross, § above quoted, bears concurrent testimony to the Sabbatarianism of Sterneberg. Carlstadt it will be remembered was an intimate friend of Luther, between whom and himself a separation was initiated because of Carlstadt's extreme radicalism in his plans of reformation.

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

\* Lectures on Sunday, p. 374.—Note.

† A View of all Religions in the World, etc., p. 237.—London, 1653.

‡ Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 8.

§ View of all Religions, p. 235.

|| Sabbath, p. 60.

Chambers' Cyclopedia refers to the Bohemian Sabbath-keepers, and others as follows :

" Accordingly, in the reign of Elizabeth, it occurred to many conscientious and independent thinkers, (as it had previously done to some Protestants in Bohemia,) that the Fourth Commandment required of them, the observance, not of the first, but of the specified *seventh* day of the week, and a strict bodily rest, as a service then due to God. They became numerous enough to make a considerable figure for more than a century in England, under the title of 'Sabbatarians'—a word now exchanged for the less ambiguous appellation of 'Seventh-day Baptists.' . . . " They have nearly disappeared in England, though in the seventeenth century so numerous and active as to have called forth replies from Bishop White, Warner, Baxter, Bunyan, Wallis and others." \*

Thus it is seen that there were Protestant Sabbath-keeping Baptists in Bohemia, Holland and England, as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century. This link unites the past with the present, and gives an unbroken chain of Sabbath-keepers from the days of Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, to the present hour. The church has never been without witnesses for the truth concerning God's holy day.

The complete development and organization of the Seventh-day Baptists in England, is easily traced. In these pages this will be done first, by noting the authors and martyrs, among them whose names appear in history, and second by giving a brief history of their organized churches.

Among the first who taught the truth relative to

---

\* Article, Sabbath, Vol. 8—London, 1836.

the Sabbath, and suffered for it, was John Trask—spelled also Trasque and Thraske—Ephriam Paggitt, in his "Church Herisiography," devotes more than fifty pages to the history of Trask, his wife, and his followers. From this it appears that he first began to observe the Sunday according to the law of the fourth commandment. One of his comrades, Lackson, (Hessey says Jackson,) carrying the question on to its legitimate results, taught that the day mentioned in the law must be observed. Trask accepted this and many more with him. Paggitt mentions William Hillyard, Christopher Sands, Mrs. Mary Chester, who was afterwards imprisoned, Rev. Mr. Wright and his wife. He also mentions in the same connection, "One Mr. Hebden, a prisoner in the new prison, that lay there for holding Saturday Sabbath." Mrs. Chester was kept in prison for some time, but was finally released upon her apparent conversion to the church. But her tendency to the truth was too strong, and "twelve months after she was set at liberty, she relapsed into her former errors." Paggitt charges Trask and his followers with Judaical opinions concerning Christ; but the charge seems to have grown out of the fact that they observed the Sabbath, and no "official" charge of this kind is made against them on their trials.

Mrs. Trask, before her imprisonment kept a private school for children, having one assistant teacher who was also a Sabbath-keeper. Attention was drawn to her Sabbatarian principles, from the fact that she would not teach upon the Sabbath, and on

the trial she was condemned to imprisonment.\* Concerning which Paggitt speaks as follows :

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

Trask was brought before the infamous “ Star Chamber ” in 1618, and tried upon the following charges, which appear in the speech of Bishop Andrews against him. ‡ The Bishop states that his fault consisted in trying to make “ Christian men, the people of God, His Majesty’s subjects, little better than

\* See Paggitt, p. 209. † p. 196. This was written in 1661, forty years after the trial of Trask, and about the time of Brabourne.  
‡ See Paggitt, p. 199.



Jews. This he doth in two points, and when he takes it in his head, he may do it in two and two, and two more."

These are the specifications :

" One is, Christians are bound to abstain from those meats which the Jews were forbidden in Leviticus.

" The other, that they are bound to observe the Jewish Sabbath."

Bishop Andrews labors, in a lengthy speech, to prove both these positions heretical. There is no argument of importance adduced in the speech. It does however contain that somewhat noted passage, "*Dominicum Servasti,*" etc., which leaves no shadow of doubt that he was the author of it, and shows also that he gives no authority for it. This trial resulted in the following sentence, which was executed upon Trask :

" Set upon the Pillory in Westminster, and from thence to be whipped to the fleet, there to remain prisoner."

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

" A Treatise of Liberty from Judaism, or an Acknowledgement of True Christian Liberty. Indited and Published by John Trask, of late Stumbling, now Happily Running in the Race of Christianity."\*

Thus did the hand of persecution suppress the first prominent development of Sabbath truth in England. The suppression was, however, neither complete nor

---

\* See Heylyn Hist. Sab., part 2, chap. 8, sec. 10; Cox Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 153, etc.

of long duration. Eight years later Theophilus Brabourne, of Norfolk published his first book, entitled,

“ A Discourse upon the Sabbath-day : Wherein are handled these particulars ensuing : 1. That the Lord’s-day is not the Sabbath-day by Divine institution. 2. An exposition of the 4th Commandment, so far forth as may give light unto the ensuing Discourse ; and particularly here it is shown at what time the Sabbath-day should begin and end, for the satisfaction of those who are doubtful on this point. 3. That the Seventh-day Sabbath is not abolished. 4. That the Seventh-day Sabbath is now still in force. 5. The author’s exhortation and reasons that nevertheless, there be no Rent from our Church as touching practice.—1682, 18mo. pp. 238.”\*

Cox says :

“ Brabourne is a much abler writer than Trask, and may be regarded as the founder in England of the sect at first known as Sabbatarians, but now calling themselves Seventh-day Baptists.” . . . “ Towards the conclusion of the treatise, he thus appeals to the prudence of his readers : ‘ And now let me propound unto your choice these two days, the Sabbath-day on Saturday, or the Lord’s-day on Sunday ; and keep whether of the twain you shall in conscience find the more safe. If you keep the Lord’s-day, but profane the Sabbath day, you walk in great danger and peril (to say the least) of transgressing one of God’s eternal and inviolable laws, the Fourth Commandment ; but on the other side, if you keep the Sabbath-day, though you profane the Lord’s-day, you are out of

---

\* Cox Sab. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 157.

all gunshot and danger, for so you transgress no law at all, since Christ nor his apostles did ever leave any law for it.' \* †

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

"A defense of the most ancient and sacred Ordinance of God's, the Sabbath-day." . . . "Undertaken against all Anti-Sabbatarians, both of Protestants, Papists, Antinomians and Anabaptists; and by name and especially against these ten Ministers: M. Greenwood, M. Hutchinson, M. Furnace, M. Benton, M. Gallard, M. Yates, M. Chappel, M. Stinnet, M. Johnson, and M. Warde." †

We have not space, nor is it necessary to quote from the book to show the strength and soundness of the work, and its necessary influence on the public mind. Through this book the name of Brabourne has become inseparably connected with the true Sabbatarianism of those times. The character and influence of the work is also shown in the fact that Bishop Francis White, by order of the King, prepared an answer to it, entitled, "A Treatise on the Sabbath-day, Containing a Defense of the Orthodoxal Doctrine of the Church of England, against Sabbatarian Novelty."—London, 1635. In his dedication to Archbishop Laud, White speaks of Brabourne as follows :

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 220.

† *Sabbath Literature*, Vol. 1, p. 162.

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

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

Bishop White was well qualified to write and produced a work which, except the “ History of the Sabbath ” by Peter Heylyn, was stronger than any of the books put forth by the churchmen of those times. Brabourne was summoned before the “ High Commission, whose well-tempered severity herein so

---

\* Introduction, near the close.

prevailed upon him that, submitting himself to a private conference, and perceiving the unsoundness of his principles, he became a convert, conforming himself quietly to the Church of England." \*

This "quiet conformity to the Church of England," on the part of Brabourne was evidently only a temporary wavering, for he "wrote afterwards, and a composition of his against Cawdrey, which came out in 1654, gives no evidence of the sincerity of his retraction." †

It is evident that he was for the moment overborne, rather than permanently changed, since his "preface" contained a candid and calm discussion of the causes which impelled him to write and of the consequences which might follow. On this very point he says :

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

---

\* See Fuller's Church History, Book 10, century XVII, section 32; also, Brook's Lives of Puritans, Vol. 2, p. 362, and White, p. 305.

† Hessey Lectures on Sunday, pp. 373-4, note 479.

hope could I then conceive that God would open his gate of mercy to me, who, while I lived, would not open my mouth for him?"\*

This "Introduction," comprising an address to the king, to the prelates, and to the reader, is far from being the language of a mere enthusiast. If his strength failed and his bewildered judgment wavered for a moment under the pressure which was brought to bear upon him, it is not wonderful, nor more than many good and true men have done under similar circumstances. There is still further evidence that he "soon relapsed into his former errors," for Mr. Cox† notices another book from his pen in reply to two books against the Sabbath, one by Ives and the other by Warner. This last work by Brabourne was an 8mo book, published, at London, in 1659. It thus appears that he published four books in favor of the Sabbath.

Next upon the list stands the name of James Ockford, a follower of Brabourne, who issued a work in 1642, entitled "The Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment." Something concerning its character and history may be gleaned from a work in favor of of Sunday by Cawdrey and Palmer, published in 1652. In part third, section thirty-three is found the following:

"But before we conclude this chapter, we shall take a brief survey of what a later Sabbatarian hath written, being, it seems, unsatisfied (as well he might)

---

\*This "Introduction" is not paged. This passage is from his address to the reader.

†Sabbath Literature, Vol. 2, p. 6.

with all that hath been said by the Bishop,\* and others in his way, in answer to the Sabbatarian arguments. One James Ockford (as we hinted above) hath revived the quarrel, and makes use of his adversaries' weapons to beat themselves withal. There hath been a sharp confutation of his book by fire, it being commanded to be burnt, as perhaps it well deserved. Yet lest he should complain of harsh dealing, no answer being given him, for his satisfaction, though all his arguments are already confuted in this present discourse, we shall give him a brief account of our judgment concerning his whole book—we think to a full satisfaction." †

Cawdrey and Palmer were members of the "Assembly of Divines," and wrote from the Puritan stand point. Their review of Ockford's book, and the book itself show that his arguments were well sustained. About ten years later, Edward Fisher published a book in favor of the Sabbath, entitled "A Christian Caveat," etc. This work passed through at least five editions. Cox speaks of it as "A pithy, clever treatise directed against the opinions held by the Puritans, of whom he affirms that, because they are neither able to produce direct Scripture nor solid reason for what they say, they labor to support their conceits by fallacies, falsities, and wresting of God's Holy Word, as upon scanning, their proofs will be manifest to the meanest capacity." ‡

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

---

\* Referring to Bishop White's answer to Brabourne.

† p. 416.

‡ Sabbath Literature, Vol. 1, p. 237.

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

By a Lover of Peace with Truth, Edward Stennet.

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

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

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

“Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all Thy Commandments.” Ps. 119 : 6.  
London, 1658.

This work has been republished by the American Sabbath Tract Society, from the preface to whose edition we extract the following notice concerning the author.

“The friends of the Sabbath will doubtless receive this little volume as a valuable relic of the past—as a word from one of the tried and faithful friends of the truth, one who not only loved the day of God’s weekly rest, but greatly delighted in the promise of a future and glorious Sabbathism with the people of God. Edward Stennet, the author, was the first of a series of Sabbatarian ministers of that name, who for four generations continued to be among the foremost of the Dissenters in England, and whose praise is still in all the churches. He was an able and devoted minister, but dissenting from the Established Church, he was deprived of the means of support ; and, his family being large, he applied himself to the study of medicine, by the practice of which he was enabled to give his sons a liberal education. He



suffered much of the persecution which the Dissenters were exposed to at that time, and more especially for his faithful adherence to the cause of the Sabbath. For this truth, he experienced tribulation, not only from those in power, by whom he was kept a long time in prison, but also much distress from unfriendly dissenting brethren, who strove to destroy his influence, and ruin his cause. He wrote several treatises upon the cause of the Sabbath besides this, but they are very rare, and perhaps cannot be found in a perfect state of preservation. It would be well, no doubt, to revive all of them, and, if practicable, republish them in the same form as this, that they might be bound together, and placed as they deserve to be, in every Sabbath-keeper's library. They all breathe the genuine spirit of Christianity, and in their day were greatly conducive to the prosperity of the Sabbath-keeping churches."

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

Next comes a book by William Sellers, published in 1671, the title of which runs as follows :

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

Next in order is the name of an author whose

works were prominently associated with the history of the Seventh-day Baptists in England during the last half of the seventeenth century, Francis Bampfield. He wrote at least two works upon the Sabbath, besides others of a scientific and literary character. The first work on the Sabbath is entitled,

“The Judgment of Mr. Francis Bampfield, late Minister of Sherbourne in Dorsetshire, for the Observation of the Jewish or Seventh-day Sabbath; with his Reasons and Scripture for the same. Sent in a letter to Mr. Ben of Dorchester. Together with Mr. Ben’s sober Answer to the Same, and a Vindication of the Christian Sabbath against the Jewish. Published for the satisfaction of divers friends in the West of England. London, 1672, 12mo, pp. 86.

His Second work bears the following title :

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

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

“He was descended from an ancient and honorable family in Devonshire, and being designed for the ministry from his birth, was educated accordingly; his own inclination concurring with the design of his pious parents. When he left the university

(where he continued seven or eight years) he was ordained a Deacon of the Church of England by Bp. Hall; afterwards Presbyter by Bp. Skinner, and was soon after preferred to a living in Dorsetshire, of about one hundred pounds per annum, where he took great pains to instruct his people, and promote true religion among them. Having an annuity of eighty pounds a year settled upon him for life, he spent all the income of his place in acts of charity among his parishioners, in giving them Bibles and other good books, setting the poor to work, and relieving the necessities of those that were disabled; not suffering a beggar, knowingly, to be in his parish. While he was here, he began to see that in many ways the Church of England needed reformation, in regard to doctrine, worship and discipline; and therefore, as became a faithful minister, he heartily set about it, making the laws of Christ his only rule. But herein he met great opposition and trouble.\*

When the Act of Uniformity was passed, in 1662, being unable to conform to its requirements, Mr. Bampfield gave up his place, and though he was strictly loyal in all the political troubles of those times, he nevertheless suffered much on account of his non-conformity. "Soon after his ejection he was imprisoned for worshiping God in his own family." Not a little injustice and cruelty was shown him in these minor imprisonments. But he was doomed to much greater trials and sufferings, for we learn from Calamy that,

"Mr. Bampfield afterward suffered eight years imprisonment in Dorchester jail, which he bore with great courage and patience, being filled with the

---

\* Non-Conformists Memorial, Vol. 2, p. 149, seq.

comfort of the Holy Ghost. He also preached in the prison, almost every day, and gathered a church there. Upon his discharge in 1675, he went about preaching the Gospel in several counties. But he was soon taken up again for it in Wiltshire, and imprisoned at Salisbury; where, on account of a fine, he continued eighteen weeks. During this time he wrote a letter which was printed, giving an account of his imprisonment, and the joy he had in his sufferings for Christ. Upon his release he came to London, where he preached privately several years with great success, and gathered a people; who, being baptized by immersion (Mr. Bampffield having become a Baptist), formed themselves into a church, and met at Pinner's Hall, which, being so public, soon exposed them to the rage of their persecutors."

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

On the 24th of the same month, he met his congregation again at Pinner's Hall, and was again pulled out of the pulpit, and led through the streets with his Bible in his hand, and great multitudes after him; some reproaching him, and others speaking in his favor; one of whom said, 'See how he walks with his Bible in his hand, like one of the old martyrs.' Being brought to the sessions where the Lord Mayor attended, he and three more were sent to prison. The next day they were brought to the bar, and being examined were remitted to Newgate. On March 17, 1683, he and some others, who were committed for not taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, were brought to the Old Bailey, indicted, tried, and by the jury (directed by the Judge) brought in guilty. On March 28, being brought again to the sessions to receive their sentence, the recorder, after odiously aggravating their offence, and reflecting on scrupulous consciences, read their sentence, which was: 'That they were out of the protection of the King's Majesty; that all their goods and chattels were forfeited, and they were to remain in jail during their lives, or during the King's pleasure.' Upon this Mr. Bampfield would have spoken, but there was a great cry—'Away with them, we will not hear them, etc.,' and so they were thrust away; when Mr. Bampfield said 'The righteous Lord loveth righteousness; the Lord be judge in this case.' They were then returned to Newgate, where Mr. Bampfield (who was of a tender constitution) soon after died in consequence of the hardships he suffered, much lamented by his fellow prisoners, as well as by his friends in general. Notwithstanding his peculiar sentiments, all who knew him acknowledged that he was a man of serious piety, and deserved a different treatment from what he met with from an unkind world. He was one of the most celebrated preachers in the West of England, and extremely admired by his hearers,

till he fell into the Sabbatarian notion, of which he was a zealous asserter." \*

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

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

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

This work was answered by John Wallis, D. D., Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford, which elicited a second book in reply by Mr. Bampfield, entitled,

"A Reply to Dr. Wallis, his Discourse concerning the Christian Sabbath."—London, 1683.

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

Passing into the next century another book comes before the public in 1724, from the pen of George Carlow, entitled, "Truth defended, or Observations on Mr. Ward's expository discourses from the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th verses of the 20th chapter of Exo-

---

\* p. 151, Vol. 2d. Found also in Vol. 1, p. 468, seq., London edition, 1775.

cus, concerning the Sabbath." This work was reprinted in America, at Stonington, Conn., in 1802 and again by the American Sabbath Tract Society, in New York. The following historic notice of the author is taken from the American edition of 1847.

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

A pastor of the "Mill Yard Seventh-day Baptist Church" in London, Robert Cornthwaite published

five books upon the Sabbath question. The first was published about 1733, and the last in 1740. These are their titles in order:

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

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

3. "The Seventh-day Sabbath farther vindicated, or a Defense of some Reflections on Dr. Wright's Treatise on the Religious observation of the Lord's-day, according to the express words of the Fourth Commandment; as, also, of the Seventh-day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, against the exceptions of Mr. Caleb Flemming."\* London, 1736.

4. "A Second Defense of some Reflections on Dr. Wright's Treatise on the Religious observation of the Lord's-day, etc., against the exceptions of Mr. Caleb Flemming, in which his explication of Gen. 2: 2, 3, is considered, and shown to be as inconsistent as the Doctor's Explication of the Fourth Commandment; and the Seventh-day Sabbath is proved to oblige all Christians on Protestant principles." London, about 1737.

5. "An Essay on the Sabbath, or a modest attempt towards a plain, Scriptural resolution of the following questions. 1. Whether the Seventh-day Sabbath was given to Adam in Paradise. 2. Whether the same now obliges Christians, occasioned by the following

---

\* An Unitarian minister whose work was published the same year.



pieces lately wrote upon the subject, viz : Mr. Hallett's Discourse on the Lord's-day; Mr. Jephson's Discourse concerning the Religious Observation of the Lord's-day, etc. Mr. Chubb's Dissertation concerning the Time of Keeping a Sabbath. Mr. Killingworth's Appendix to his Supplement to the sermons preached at Salter's Hall, against Popery; Mr. Dobels Seventh-day Sabbath not obligatory on Christians, and his Appendix; and Dr. Watts' Holiness of Times, Places and People. In which everything judged material, offered by any of these gentlemen on the negative side of either of the above mentioned questions, is impartially considered." London, 1740.

Robert Cox\* quotes largely from this work, and says .

“ Mr. Cornthwaite is one of the ablest defenders of the positions taken up by Seventh-day Baptists.

It will be seen by the titles that Mr. Cornthwaite's books were mostly controversial. They were widely circulated, and the replies to them were written by some of the most eminent men of those times. Notices of other Sabbatarian authors will be found in the next chapter, in connection with the history of churches.

#### ORGANIZATION OF SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST CHURCHES IN ENGLAND.

The Seventh-day Baptists were the most radical reformers, and the most fearless dissenters that took part in the English Reformation. Every influence opposed the organization of such men into churches; even their public meetings were prohibited at times by law. Hence no churches were regularly

---

\* Sabbath Literature, Vol. 2, p. 198.

organized until about 1650. Between that time and the close of the century, at least eleven churches were organized, and there were many unorganized Sabbath-keepers scattered through the kingdom. These churches were located at Braintree, in Essex, Chersey, Norweston, Salisbury, in Wiltshire, Sherbourne, in Buckinghamshire, Tewksbury, or Natton, in Gloucestershire, Wallingford, Berkshire, Woodbridge, in Suffolk; and three in London, viz: the Mill Yard Church, the Cripplegate Church, and the Pinner's Hall Church. The history of these churches may be found in detail in the Seventh-day Baptist Manual by Rev. Geo. B. Utter (Westerly, R. I.) published in 1858; and in the bound volumes of the Sabbath Memorial, published by the present pastor of the Mill Yard Church, Rev. Wm. M. Jones. The martyrdom of John James has also lately appeared from the pen of Mr. Jones. We have space only to say that from the English churches the Seventh-day Baptists were planted in America, as will be seen in a succeeding chapter. These European Sabbath-keepers, connecting with their Waldensian brethren, (see Chapter 18), keep the links unbroken between the Seventh-day Baptists of the United States, and the Apostolic Church, as it was before the Sunday usurpations, through the help of the civil law, and Pagan cult, made war on God's Holy Day.

## CHAPTER XXV.

# THE SUNDAY IN AMERICA--COL- ONIAL PERIOD.

About the beginning of the seventeenth century, certain dissenters fled from England to Holland. Failing to succeed in propagating their views among the Hollanders, and finding their own purity on the decline, they determined to seek a home in the New World. They reached America in 1620, and settled at New Plymouth. In 1629 a large colony from England joined them. Thus came the birth of New England, and the establishment of Puritanism in America. The civil government which these men adopted was the direct outgrowth of their religion. The "Theocracy" of the Hebrews under Moses furnished the much approved model after which it was patterned. The result was more than a union of Church and State; it was, rather, a "state" in the Church. Hence, in the civil laws of those times we find the practical expression of the orthodox theology; and in the execution of those laws, an index to the vitality and power of the prevailing religion. It is, therefore, suited to the purposes of this chapter to collect the laws of the early colonists concerning Sunday, and, as far as may be necessary, to sketch the history of

their execution. This will be done in the following order :

1st. The laws of the Plymouth Colony up to the time of its union with Massachusetts ; then the laws of Massachusetts as a colony, a province, and a state.

2d. The laws of the New Haven and Connecticut colonies in a similar order.

There were no direct statute laws concerning the observance of Sunday during the earlier years of the Plymouth colony. There was, however, a rigid "Common Law," founded on the laws of the Jewish Theocracy. In 1650, June 10th, the general court enacted the following :

"Further be it enacted, that whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day by doing any servile work, or any such like abuse, shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings, or be whipped."

In 1651, June 6th :

"It is enacted by the court that whatsoever person or persons shall neglect the frequenting the public worship of God that is according to God, in the places where they live, or do assemble themselves upon any pretense whatsoever, contrary to God and the allowance of the government, tending to the subversion of religion and churches, or palpable profanation of God's holy ordinances, being duly convicted, viz., every one that is a master or dame of a family, or any other person at their own disposing, to pay ten shillings for every such default." \*

It is also

---

\* Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. XI, p. 57, 58.

“ Enacted by the Court, that if any in any lazy, slothful or profane way doth neglect to come to the public worship of God, they shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings, or be whipped.” \*

In 1658, we have the following :

“ Whereas, complaint is made of great abuses in sundry places in this government of profaning the Lord’s-day by travelers, both horse and foot, by bearing of burdens, carrying of packs, etc., upon the Lord’s day, to the great offense of the godly, well-affected amongst us: It is therefore enacted by the court, and the authority thereof, that if any person or persons shall be found transgressing in any of the precincts of any township within this government, he or they shall be forthwith apprehended by the constable of such town, and fined twenty shillings to the colony’s use, or else set in the stocks four hours, except they can give a sufficient reason for their so doing; and they that transgress in any of the above said particulars, shall only be apprehended on the Lord’s-day; and on the second day following shall either pay their fine, or sit in the stocks as aforesaid.” †

The general laws concerning attendance on public worship passed in 1651, were repealed in 1659, and the following enacted, and repeated in 1661 :

“ It is enacted by the court, that whatsoever person or persons shall frequently absent or neglect, upon the Lord’s day, the public worship of God that is approved of by this government, shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings.” ‡

The following “ Sunday Excise Law ” was enacted in 1662 :

---

\* Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. XI, p. 58.

† Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. XI, p. 100.

‡ Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. XI, p. 122.

“Whereas, complaint is made of some Ordinary keepers, in this jurisdiction, that they do allow persons to stay on the Lord's-day, drinking in their houses in the interims of times between the exercises, especially young persons and such as stand not in need thereof: It is enacted by the court and the authority thereof, that no Ordinary keeper in this government, shall draw any wine or liquor on the Lord's-day, for any, except in cases of necessity, for the relief of those that are sick, or faint, or the like, for their refreshing, on the penalty of paying a fine of ten shillings for every default.”\*

In 1662 the court urges the strict enforcement of the laws against traveling and unlawful meetings on Sunday.†

In 1682 the general court, sitting at Plymouth, enacted the following: ‡

“To prevent profanation of the Lord's-day by foreigners, or any others, unnecessarily traveling through our towns on that day: It is enacted by the court, that a fit man in each town be chosen, unto whom, whomsoever hath necessity of travel on the Lord's-day in case of danger of death or such necessitous occasions, shall repair, and making out such occasions satisfyingly to him, shall receive a ticket from him to pass on about such like occasions, which if the traveler attend not unto it shall be lawful for the constable or any man that meets him, to take him up, and stop him until he be brought before authority, or pay his fine for such transgression, as by law in that case is provided. And if it after shall appear that his plea was false, then may he be apprehended at another time, and made to pay his fine as aforesaid.”‡

In 1674 :

---

\* Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. XI, p. 137.

† *Ib.*, p. 140. ‡ *Ib.*, p. 258.

“It is enacted by the court, that as to the restraining of abuses in ‘ordinaries,’ that no ordinary keeper shall sell or give any kind of drink to inhabitants of the town upon the Lord’s-day; and also that all ordinary keepers be required to clear their houses of all town dwellers and strangers that are there (on a drinking account), except such as lodge in the house, by the shutting in of the daylight, upon the forfeiture of five shillings, the one-half to the informer, and the other half to the town’s use.” \*

In the year 1665, the following law was enacted against “Sleeping in Church:”

“Whereas, complaint is made unto the court, of great abuse in sundry towns of this jurisdiction, by persons there behaving themselves profanely, by being without doors at the meeting house on the Lord’s-days in time of exercise, and there misdemeaning themselves by jesting, sleeping, or the like: It is enacted by the court and hereby ordered that the constables of each township in this jurisdiction shall, in their respective towns, take special notice of such persons, and to admonish them; and if notwithstanding, they shall persist on in such practices, that he shall set them in the stocks, and in case this will not reclaim them, that they return their names to the Court.” †

Four years later, July, 1669, this law was further added to as follows:

“It is enacted by the court, that the constable or his deputy in each respective town of this government, shall diligently look after such as sleep or play about the meeting house in times of the public worship of God on the Lord’s-day, and take notice of their names, and return such of them to the court who do not, after warning given to them, reform.

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 236.

† *Plym. Col. Rec.*, XI, p. 214.

“ As also that unnecessary violent riding on the Lord’s day; the persons that so offend, their names to be returned to the next court after the said offense.

“ It is enacted by the court, that any person or persons that shall be found smoking of tobacco on the Lord’s-day, going to or coming from the meetings, within two miles of the meeting house, shall pay twelve pence for every such default to the colony’s use.”\*

In 1668 the matter of attendance on public worship was again taken up, and the following law enacted :

“ Whereas, the court takes notice of great neglect of frequenting the public worship of God on the Lord’s-day : it is enacted by the court and the authority thereof that the selectmen shall take notice of such in their townships as neglect, through profaneness or slothfulness, to come to the public worship of God, and shall require an account of them ; and if they give them not satisfaction, that then they return their name to the court.” †

This not having the desired effect, the following was enacted in June, 1670 :

“ For the further prevention of the profanation of the Lord’s-day, it is enacted by the court and the authority thereof, that the selectmen of the several towns of this jurisdiction, or any one of them, may, or shall, as there be occasion, take with him the constable or his deputy, and repair to any house or place where they may suspect that any slothfully do lurk at home, or get together in companies, to neglect the public worship of God, or profane the Lord’s-day ; and, finding any such disorder, shall return

---

\* Plym. Col. Rec., Vol. XI, pp. 224, 225.

† Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. XI, pp. 217, 218.



the names of the persons to the next court, and give notice also of any particular miscarriage that they have taken notice of, that it may be inquired into."\*

In 1652 and again in 1656, laws were passed, prohibiting Indians from hunting, working or playing on Sunday, within the limits of the colony. †

In 1691 Plymouth became united to Massachusetts under a new charter, from which time their histories are identical.

#### MASSACHUSETTS-BAY COLONY.

There were no formal statutes concerning Sunday by the local authorities of this colony during the first years of its existence. The "first general letter" from the governor and deputy of the "Company" in England, dated April 17th, 1629, contained the following instruction :

"And to the end the Sabbath may be celebrated in a religious manner, we appoint that all that inhabit the plantation, both for the general and particular employments, may surcease their labor every Saturday throughout the year, at three of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catechising, and preparations for the Sabbath, as the ministers may direct." ‡

This instruction and the "common law," like that of the Plymouth colony, formed the basis of the earliest customs. In the formation of the government upon those points wherein the civil authorities were in doubt concerning any question, the matter was referred to the "elders." Among

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 228.

† *Ib.*, pp. 60, 184.

‡ *Mass. Colony Records*, Vol. 1, p. 395.

the "Answers of the Reverend Elders to certain questions propounded to them," November 13th, 1644, is the following :

"The striking of a neighbor may be punished with some pecuniary mulct, when the striking of a father may be punished with death. So any sin committed with an high hand, as the gathering of sticks on the Sabbath-day, may be punished with death, when a lesser punishment might serve for gathering sticks privily, and in some need."\*

Concerning this point, Hutchinson, the historian, says :

"In the first draught of the laws by Mr. Cotton, which I have seen corrected with Mr. Winthrop's hand, diverse other offenses were made capital, viz., profaning the Lord's day in a careless or scornful neglect or contempt thereof. Numbers 15 : 30-36."†

On the 4th of November, 1646, the general court decreed :

"That wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established, according to the order of the gospel, throughout this jurisdiction, every person shall duly resort and attend thereunto, respectively upon the Lord's-days, and upon such public fast days and days of thanksgiving as are to be generally held by the appointment of authority. And if any person within this jurisdiction shall, without just and necessary cause, withdraw himself from hearing the public ministry of the Word, after due means of conviction used, he shall forfeit for his absence from every such public meeting five shillings."‡

Some questions having arisen concerning the mean-

\* *Ib.*, Vol. 2, p. 93.

† *Hist. Mass.*, Vol. 1, p. 390.

‡ *Mass. Col. Records*, Vol. 2, p. 178.

ing of the passage "after due conviction used," in the above law, it was explained May 10th, 1649, as meaning "legal conviction." A little later, a general court, sitting at Boston, on the 30th of August, 1653, enacted the following :

" Upon information of sundry abuses and misdemeanors committed by several persons on the Lord's-day, not only by children playing in the streets and other places, but by youths, maids and other persons, both strangers and others, uncivilly walking the streets and fields, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, frequenting common houses and other places to drink, sport, and otherwise to mispend that precious time, which things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, and the profanation of his holy Sabbath, the sanctification of which is sometimes put for all duties immediately respecting the service of God, contained in the first table : It is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that no children, youths, maids, or other persons, shall transgress in the like kind, on penalty of being reputed great provokers of the high displeasure of Almighty God, and further incurring the penalties hereafter expressed, namely, that the parents and governors of all children above seven years old, (not that we approve of younger children in evil,) for the first offense in that kind, upon due proof before any magistrate, town commissioner, or selectman of the town where such offense shall be committed, shall be admonished; for a second offense, upon due proof, as aforesaid, shall pay a fine of five shillings; for a third offense, upon due proof, as aforesaid, ten shillings ; and if they shall again offend in this kind, they shall be presented to the county courts, who shall augment punishment, according to the merit of the fact. And for all youths and maids, above fourteen years of age, and all elder persons whatsoever

that shall offend and be convicted as aforesaid, either for playing, uncivilly walking, drinking, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, sporting or any way misspending that precious time, shall, for the first offense, be admonished, upon due proof, as aforesaid; for a second offense, shall pay as a fine, five shillings; and for a third offense, ten shillings; and if any shall farther offend that way, they shall be presented to the next county court, who shall augment punishment according to the nature of the offense; and if any be unable or unwilling to pay the aforesaid fines, they shall be whipped by the constable not exceeding five stripes for ten shillings fine; and this to be understood of such offenses as shall be committed during the daylight of the Lord's-day."\*

In volume four another record of this action may be found with this addition:

"This law is to be transcribed by the constables of each town, and posted upon the meeting house door, there to remain the space of one month, at least." †

On the 18th of October of the following year, 1654, a general court, sitting at Boston, enacted that:

"Whereas, experience gives us cause to complain of much disorder in time of public ordinances, in the meeting houses of several congregations in this jurisdiction, through the unreverent carriage and behavior of diverse young persons, and others, notwithstanding the best means that have been hitherto used in the said assemblies, for the reformation thereof, it is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that it shall be in the liberty of the officers of the congregation, and the selectmen of such towns,

---

\* Ib. Vol. 3, pp. 316, 317.

† p. 151.

together, to nominate some one or two meet persons, to reform all such disordered persons as shall offend by any misdemeanor, either in the congregation or elsewhere near about the meeting house, either by serious reproof, more private or public, or other the like warning and meet correction of the magistrate or commissioners of that town judge meet. And we are not doubtful but the reverend elders of the several congregations, according to their wisdom, will so order the time of their public exercise, that none shall be ordinarily occasioned to break off from the congregation before the full conclusion of public exercises." \*

At the second session of the general court for 1658, held at Boston on the 19th of October, in view of the increase of Sunday profanation, the following action was taken :

Whereas by too sad experience it is observed, the sun being set, both every Saturday and on the Lord's-day, young people and others take liberty to walk, and sport themselves in the streets or fields in the several towns in this jurisdiction, to the dishonor of God and the disturbance of others in their religious exercises, and too frequently repair to public houses of entertainment and there sit drinking, all which tends, not only to the hindering of due preparation for the Sabbath, but as much as in them lies renders the ordinance of God unprofitable, and threatens rooting out the power of godliness, and procuring the wrath and judgments of God upon us and our posterity : for the prevention whereof it is ordered by this court, and the authority thereof, that if any person or persons henceforth, either on the Saturday night or on the Lord's-day night after the sun is set, shall be found sporting in the streets or fields of any town in this jurisdiction, drinking or

---

\* *Ib.*, pp. 200, 201.

being in any houses of entertainment (unless strangers or sojourners, as in their lodgings), and can not give a satisfactory reason to such magistrate or commissioner in the several towns as shall have cognizance thereof, every such person found, complained of and proved transgressing, shall pay five shillins for every such transgression, or suffer coporal punishment, as authority aforesaid shall determine.\*

At a general court called by order of the council on the 1st of August, 1665, and held at Boston the 1st of August, the following was enacted :

∴ This court being sensible that through the wicked practices of many persons who do profane God's holy Sabbaths, and contemn the public worship of his house, the name of God is greatly dishonored, and the profession of his people here greatly scandalized, as tending to all profaneness and irreligion, as also that by reason of the late order of Oct. 20th, 1663, remitting the fines imposed on such to the use of the several towns, the laws made for reclaiming such enormities are become ineffectual, do therefore order and enact, that henceforth all fines imposed according to law for profanation of the Sabbath, contempt or neglect of God's public worship, reproaching the laws and authority here established, according to his Majesty's charter, shall be to the use of the several counties as formerly, anything in the above said law to the contrary notwithstanding; and in case any person or persons so sentenced do neglect or refuse to pay such fine or mulct as shall be legally imposed on them, or give security in court, to the treasurer for payment thereof, every such person or persons, so refusing or neglecting to submit to the court's sentence, shall for such his contempt be corporally punished according as the court that hath cognizance of the case shall de-

---

\* Mass. Col. Rec., vol. 4, p. 347.

termine, and where any are corporally punished, their fines shall be remitted."\*

Three years later, October, 1668, the General Court, sitting at Boston, took up this matter again, and passed the following :

"For the better prevention of the breach of the Sabbath, it is enacted by this court and the authority thereof, that no servile work shall be done on that day, viz. such as are not works of piety, of charity, or of necessity ; and when other works are done on that day, the persons so doing, upon complaint or presentment, being legally convicted thereof before any magistrate or county court, shall pay for the first offense ten shillings fine, and for every offense after to be doubled ; and, in case the offense herein be circumstanced with profaneness or high-handed presumption, the penalty is to be augmented at the discretion of the judges. As an addition to the law for preventing profaning of the Sabbath-day by doing servile work, this court doth order, that whatsoever person in this jurisdiction shall travel upon the Lord's-day, either on horseback or on foot, or by boats from or out of their own town to any unlawful assembly or meeting not allowed by law, are hereby declared to be profaners of the Sabbath, and shall be proceeded against as the persons that profane the Lord's-day by servile work." †

At a general court held in Boston in 1667, the Sunday laws were further amended by an act of the 24th of May, running as follows :

"This Court, being desirous to prevent all occasions of complaint, referring to the profanation of the Sabbath, and as an addition to former laws, do

---

\* Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 4, p. 276.

† *Ib.*, p. 395.

order and enact, that all the laws for sanctification of the Sabbath and preventing the profaning thereof, be twice in the year, viz., in March and in September, publicly read by the minister or ministers on the Lord's-day in the several respective assembles within this jurisdiction, and all people by him cautioned to take heed to the observance thereof. And the selectmen are hereby ordered to see to it that there be one man appointed to inspect the ten families of his neighbors, which tything man or men shall, and are hereby, have power (this language is badly arranged, but such is the record) in the absence of the constable, to apprehend all Sabbath-breakers and disorderly tipplers, or such as keep licensed houses or others that shall suffer any disorders in their houses on the Sabbath-day, or evening after, or at any other time, and to carry them before a magistrate or other authority, or commit to prison as any constable may do, to be proceeded with according to law.

“And for the better putting a restraint and securing offenders that shall any way transgress against the laws, tittle Sabbath, either in the meeting house by abusive carriage or misbehavior, by making any noise or otherwise, or during the day time, being laid hold on by any of the inhabitants shall, by the said person appointed to inspect this law, be forthwith carried forth and put into a cage in Boston, which is appointed to be forthwith by the selectmen, and to be set up in the market-place and in such other towns as the county courts shall appoint, there to remain till authority shall examine the person offending and give order for his punishment, as the matter may require, according to the laws relating to the Sabbath.”\*

The same court made additional laws concerning Quaker meetings, ordering all constables, on penalty

---

\* Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 5, p. 133.



of the forfeiture of forty shillings, to "make diligent search" for such gatherings, especially on the Lord's-day, and if denied admittance, to break down the doors and arrest the frequenters according to law. It also ordered that persons complained of, as being absent from public service on Sunday, who would neither affirm that they were present nor that they were "necessarily absent by the providence of God," should be thereupon adjudged as convicted, and punished accordingly. \*

October 15th, 1673, the foregoing laws were amended as follows :

"As an addition to the law of the Sabbath, Sect. the second, it is ordered by the court and the authority thereof besides the penalty upon the persons there offending, the public house keeper, where any such person or persons are found so transgressing (as in the said law is expressed), shall pay five shillings to the treasury of the county where the offense is committed." †

On the 10th of October, 1677, the general court in session at Boston, made the following additions to this law :

"As an addition to the late law made in May last for the prevention of profanation of the Sabbath, and strengthening the hands of tything men appointed to inspect the same, it is ordered that those tything men shall be and are hereby appointed and empowered to inspect public licensed houses, as well as private and unlicensed houses, houses of entertainment, as also *ex officio* to enter any such houses

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 134.

† Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay, Vol. 4, p. 562.

and discharge their duty according to law ; and the said tything men are empowered to assist one another in their several precincts and to act in one another's precincts with as full power as in their own, and yet to retain their special charges within their own bounds."\*

Two years later, October 15th, 1679, the general court, at Boston, enacted certain local laws, of which the following is a copy :

“For prevention of profanation of the Sabbath, and disorders on Saturday night, by horses and carts passing late out of the town of Boston, it is ordered and enacted by this court, that there be a ward, from sunset on Saturday night, until nine of the clock or after, consisting of one of the selectmen or constables of Boston, with two or more meet persons, who shall walk between the fortification and the town's end, and upon no pretense whatsoever suffer any cart to pass out of the town after sunset, nor any footman or horseman, without such good account of the necessity of his business as may be to their satisfaction ; and all persons attempting to ride or drive out of town after sunset, without such reasonable satisfaction given, shall be apprehended and brought before authority to be proceeded against as Sabbath-breakers ; and all other towns are empowered to do the like as need shall be.” †

: By the same court, the reading of the Sunday laws was placed in the hands of the town clerks, to be done at some public meeting of the town, instead of being done by the ministers on Sunday. ‡

Thus the laws stood with little or no change until the new charter and the provincial government.

---

\* Records of the Colony of Mass. Bay. Vol. 5. p. 155.

† *Ib.*, pp. 239. 240.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 243.

In 1691, Massachusetts, including Plymouth colony and other territories lying north and east, was reorganized under a new charter from King William and Queen Mary. The change did not, however, materially affect the status of the Sunday laws.

On the 22d of August, 1695, a general act was passed which embodied the substance of all the former colonial laws. By this, all "labor and sporting" was prohibited under penalty of five shillings fine. All "traveling" except in cases of great necessity was punishable by a fine of twenty shillings. The keepers of public houses were forbidden to entertain any except travelers and boarders, on penalty of five shillings fine. Any one justice of the peace was empowered to try the cases, and on his judgment to pass sentence, and the fines, if not forthcoming, were to be collected by distraint. If the offender was unable to pay the fine, he was to be "set in the stocks," or "caged," not to exceed three hours. These acts were in force from sunset on the seventh day forward. All civil officers and parents were enjoined to carefully enforce these acts.\*

In 1711, this law was added to in that twelve hours imprisonment was made one of the penalties of transgression, and constables were especially empowered and instructed to labor diligently to prevent profanation of the Sunday. †

---

\* Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass., Bay, from 1692 to 1719, folio edition, London, 1724, pp. 15, 16.

† *Ib.*, p. 277.

Four years later, in 1715, we find Sunday desecration on the increase, since, although many laws have been passed, it is said: "Many persons do presume to work and travel on the said day;" so that the authorities saw fit to increase the penalty for "working or playing" to ten shillings, and that for traveling to twenty shillings for the first offense. For the second offense these fines were doubled, and the parties made to give "sureties" for good behavior in the future. A month's continued absence from the public Sunday services was also made finable in the sum of twenty shillings, or "three hours in the stocks or cage."\*

In 1727, the fine for "working or playing" was increased to fifteen shillings, and that for traveling to thirty shillings for the first offense, and for the second three pounds. If the offender failed to pay, he was liable to the stocks or the cage for four hours, or to imprisonment in the county jail, not to exceed five days. At this time, also, funerals, since they induced "great profanation" of Sunday, by the traveling of children and servants in the streets, were prohibited, except in extreme cases, and then under license from a civil officer of the town. The director of a funeral transgressing this was to be fined forty shillings, and the sexton or grave digger twenty shillings. Shops for the retailing of strong drinks were also to be searched by the proper officers, and if any

---

\* Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass. Bay, p. 328.

were found there drinking, the proprietor and the drinker were each to pay five shillings. \*

In 1741, an additional act was passed against slothfully loitering in the streets or fields, making the penalty twenty shillings for the first offense and forty for the second, with costs, and imprisonment until paid. Appeal to the next court was allowed. †

In 1760, a general amendment was made by repealing all former laws relative to Sunday, and enacting a new code. The reasons for repealing are thus stated :

“Whereas by reason of different constructions of the several laws now in force relating to the observation of the Lord’s-day, or Christian Sabbath, the said laws have not been duly executed, and, notwithstanding the pious intention of the legislators, the Lord’s-day hath been greatly and frequently profaned, therefore,” etc.

The preface to the new law is as follows :

“And whereas, it is the duty of all persons, upon the Lord’s-day, carefully to apply themselves publicly and privately to religion and piety, the profanation of the Lord’s-day is highly offensive to Almighty God ; of evil example, and tends to the grief and disturbance of all pious and religiously disposed persons, therefore,” etc.

The main features of the new code were the same as those of the former laws. The provisions were these :

---

\* Acts and Resolves of the Province of Mass. Bay, Vol. 2. p. 456.

† *Ib.*, p. 1,071, Boston edition, 1874.

1. Work or play, on land or water, is fined not less than ten nor more than twenty shillings.

2. Traveling by any one except in extremity, and then only far enough for immediate relief, is liable to the same penalty.

3. Licensed public house keepers are forbidden to entertain any except "travelers, strangers and lodgers" in their houses or about their premises, for the purpose of drinking, playing, lounging, or doing any secular business whatever, on penalty of ten shillings; the person lounging, etc., also paying not less than five shillings. On the second conviction, the inn-keeper is made to pay twenty shillings, and on the third offense to lose his license.

4. Loitering, walking, or gathering in companies in "streets, fields, orchards, lanes, wharves," etc., is prohibited on pain of five shillings fine; and on a second conviction, the offender is required to give bail for future obedience.

5. Absence from public service for one month is fined ten shillings.

6. No one is to assist at any funeral, not even to ring a bell, unless it be a licensed funeral, on penalty of twenty shillings fine. In Boston, however, a funeral might be attended after sunset without a license.

7. The observance of the Sunday was to commence from sunset on the seventh day.

8. Twelve wardens were appointed in each town to execute these laws; these were to look after all

infringements of the laws, enter all suspected places, examine or inquire after all suspected persons, etc. In Boston, they were to patrol the streets every Sunday (very stormy or cold days excepted), and diligently watch and search for offenders. In case any one convicted on any point in this code failed to pay his fine at once, he was to be committed to the common jail, not less than five nor more than ten days. These laws were to be read at the "March meeting" of the towns each year. \*

In 1761, this code was supplemented by another act making it five pounds fine to give any false answers to a warden, or to refuse him aid or information when called upon.† These were all carried over, in essence, to the State laws, as will be seen in the next section.

#### STATE GOVERNMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The State Constitution of Massachusetts went into operation in 1780. Among the "Perpetual Laws" we find a Sunday code, passed October the 22d, 1782, prefaced by the following preamble :

"Whereas, the observance of the Lord's day is highly promotive of the welfare of the community, by affording necessary seasons for relaxation from labor and the cares of business ; for moral reflections and conversations on the duties of life, and the frequent errors of human conduct ; for public and private worship of the Maker, Governor and Judge of

---

\* Acts and Laws of the the Province of Mass. Bay, folio edition, pp. 392 to 397.

† Acts and Laws of the Province of Mass. Bay, folio edition, pp. 397, 398.

the world, and for those acts of charity which support and adorn a Christian society; and whereas, many thoughtless and irreligious persons, inattentive to the duties and benefits of the Lord's-day, profane the same by unnecessarily pursuing their worldly business and recreations on that day, to their own great damage, as members of a Christian society, and to the great disturbance of well-disposed persons, and to the great damage of the community by producing dissipation of manners and immoralities of life; be it therefore enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives," etc.

This law is much like the former provincial laws. Its leading features are:

1. All work, all play or attendance on any public place of amusement is fined not less than ten nor more than twenty shillings.

2. All traveling by any person is subject to the same penalty.

3. Walking, loitering, or gathering anywhere out of doors subjects to a penalty of five shillings.

4. No aid is to be given to any unlicensed funeral by sexton, grave-digger, porter, bearer or bell-ringer, on penalty of twenty shillings; and no funeral is to be licensed except in case of *necessity*.

5. All retailers of liquors, and keepers of public houses of entertainment, are forbidden to entertain any one in or about their premises, or allow any idling, playing, or doing of any secular business, on penalty of ten shillings for the first offense, twenty for the second, and a loss of his license "forever after" for the third offense. The persons thus



“lounging,” etc., to pay not less than five nor more than ten shillings.

6. The time to which the above regulations apply is stated to be from the “midnight preceding” to the “sunsetting of the same day.”

7. All entertainments for pleasure and all lounging, drinking, etc., are prohibited on the evening preceding the Sunday.

8. Absence from public meetings for one month without sufficient reason, is fined ten shillings, “provided there be any place of worship on which the offender can conscientiously and conveniently attend.”

9. Rude or indecent behavior “within the walls of any house of public worship,” is finable in “not less than five nor more than forty shillings.” Servants, and persons under age, whose masters, parents or guardians refuse to pay such fine, are to be imprisoned not less than three nor more than ten days.

10. Willful interruption or disturbance of any assembly for public worship is made finable in a sum from twenty shillings to ten pounds.

11. No civil process shall be served between midnight on Seventh-day and midnight on Sunday, under penalty of being made void, and liability of arrest for damages.

12—18. Twelve wardens to each town or district were to be chosen annually. These were given very full powers to search for, inquire after, and arrest all offenders. When chosen they could not refuse to

serve under a heavy fine, nor neglect any duty with impunity. False answers or refusal to aid such officers were severely punished. A warden's oath alone was sufficient evidence to convict an offender. Each warden to carry a white "wand, not less than seven feet in length, as a badge of his office," when on duty.

19. Masters and parents were made liable for the fines of servants and children.

20. All persons not paying their fines when levied, to be imprisoned in the county jail, not less than five nor more than ten days.

21. The appointment of these wardens does not release any other officers from their usual duties in connection with the Sunday laws.

22. Any justice of the peace to have jurisdiction over all cases where the fine does not exceed forty shillings. Fines not otherwise arranged for to be applied for the support of the poor. These laws to be publicly read at stated times, and all former laws relative to the Sunday to be repealed. \*

There are but few noteworthy differences between this elaborate code and the provincial laws which preceded it. Greater liberty of conscience is granted to those who do not accord with the ruling orthodox church, and corporal punishment, as a penalty, is laid aside. But our readers are familiar with the fact that at the present time these laws are essen-

---

\* Perpetual Laws of the Commonwealth of Mass. from 1780 to 1789, folio edition, pp. 198 to 203.

tially a "dead letter," and that the power of orthodoxy is far less in Massachusetts now than in former times. The present statute exempts those who observe the Seventh-day from the penalties of the Sunday law, providing they prove that they *conscientiously* and *habitually* observe the Sabbath.

#### NEW HAVEN COLONY.

The primary compact formed by the colonists at New Haven shows that they took the Bible as their guide in all things. The common law, based upon the Sabbath laws of the Jewish theocracy, was the accepted authority concerning the Sunday. In December, 1647, the transaction of certain ship masters in the harbor of New Haven, on Sunday, brought the matter before the civil court. The offenders, after examination, were dismissed, but the case created considerable interest, and the times seemed to demand some definite legislation. Hence, on the 31st of January, 1647, the court took the following action :

"It was propounded to the court to consider whether it were not meet to make a law for restraining of persons from their ordinary outward employments on any part of the Sabbath, and the rather, because some have of late taken too much liberty in that way, and have been called to answer for it in the particular court. The court, considering that it is their duty to do the best they can that the law of God may be strictly observed, did therefore order that, Whosoever shall, within this plantation, break the Sabbath by doing any of their ordinary outward occasions, from sunset to sunset, either upon the land or upon the water, extraordinary cases, works

of mercy and necessity being excepted, he shall be counted an offender, and shall suffer such punishment as the particular court shall judge meet, according to the nature of his offense."\*

The "New Haven Code," published for the use of the colony in 1656, embraces all the general laws which were enacted previous to the union between New Haven and Connecticut colonies. This code contains the following, relative to attendance on public worship:

"And it is further ordered that wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established within this jurisdiction, according to the order of the gospel, every person, according to the mind of God, shall duly resort and attend thereunto, upon the Lord's-day, at least, and also upon days of public fasting or thanksgiving ordered to be generally kept and observed. And if any person within this jurisdiction shall without just and necessary cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall, after due means of conviction used, for every such sinful miscarriage, forfeit five shillings to the plantation, to be levied as other fines."†

The following statute on the "Profanation of the Lord's-day," is worthy of careful notice:

"Whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day or any part of it, either by sinful seville work, or by unlawful sport, recreation, or otherwise, whether willfully or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally, according to the nature and measure sin and of the offense. But if the court upon examination, by clear and satisfying evidence,

---

\* New Haven Colony and Plantation Records, from 1638 to 1649, p. 358.

† New Haven Col. Rec., p. 588.

find that the sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand, committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death, that all others may fear and shun such provoking, rebellious courses. Numb. 15, from 30 to 36 verse."\*

In 1665, the colony of New Haven was united with that of Connecticut under the latter name. Its history will therefore be traced under that head from this point forward.

#### THE COLONY OF CONNECTICUT.

Here, again, there were at first no special statutes relative to Sunday. In 1650, a general code of laws was established in which is the following proviso, as a part of the law against burglary:

“ And if any person shall commit [such burglary, or] rob, in the fields or houses on the Lord’s-day, besides the former punishments, he shall, for the first offense, have one of his ears cut off; and for the second offense in the same kind, he shall lose his other ear in the same manner, and if he fall into the same offense the third time, he shall be put to death.”†

. At a general court, held Sept. 8th, 1653, the following was enacted relative to maritime matters:

“ Whereas, it is observed that many seamen divers times weigh anchors in the harbors of several plantations within these liberties, and pass out on the Lord’s-day, to the grief and offense of the beholders,

---

\* New Haven Colonial Records, p. 605.

† Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut, prior to 1665, p. 514.

for the preventing whereof it is ordered: That after the publishing this order, no vessel shall depart out of any harbor within this jurisdiction, but the master of the boat or vessel shall first give notice of the occasion of his remove to the head officer of the town next the said harbor where they so anchor, and obtain license, under the hand of the said officer, for his liberty therein. Otherwise they shall undergo the censure of the court." \*

The law relative to the attendance on public worship is the same, in essence, as those already noticed. It is as follows :

“It is ordered and decreed by this court and authority thereof, that wheresoever the ministry of the Word is established according to the gospel, throughout this jurisdiction, every person shall duly resort and attend thereunto, respectively upon the Lord’s-day and upon such public fast days and days of thanksgiving as are to be generally kept by the appointment of authority. And if any person within this jurisdiction shall, without just and necessary cause, withdraw himself from hearing the ministry of the Word, after due means of conviction used, he shall forfeit for his absence from every such public meeting five shillings, all such offenses to be heard and determined by any one magistrate or more, from time to time.” †

Two years after the union of the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut under one government, a law was passed forbidding Indians to profane the Sunday, on penalty of five shillings fine, or one hour in the stocks.

On the 19th of May, 1668, a general law was enacted as follows :

---

\* Colonial Records of Conn. prior to 1665, p. 247.

† *Ib.*, p. 524.

“Whereas, the sanctification of the Sabbath is a matter of great concernment to the weal of a people, and the profanation thereof is that as pulls down the judgments of God upon that place or people that suffer the same: It is therefore ordered by this court and the authority thereof, that if any person shall profane the Sabbath, by unnecessary travel, or playing thereon in the time of public worship, or before, or after, or shall keep out of the meeting-house during the public worship unnecessarily, there being convenient room in the house, he shall pay five shillings for every such offense, or sit in the stocks one hour; any one assistant or commissioner to hear and determine any such case. And the constables in the several plantations are hereby required to make search after all offenders against this law, and make return thereof to the commissioners or assistants.”

In 1676, the above was strengthened by the following:

“Whereas, notwithstanding former provisions made for the due sanctification of the Sabbath, it is observed that by sundry abuses the Sabbath is profaned, the ordinances rendered unprofitable, which threatens the rooting out of the power of godliness, and the procuring of the wrath and judgments of God upon us and our posterity; for prevention whereof it is ordered by this court that if any person or persons henceforth, either on the Saturday night or on the Lord’s-day night, though it be after the sun is set, shall be found sporting in the streets or fields of any town in this jurisdiction, or be drinking in houses of public entertainment or elsewhere, unless for necessity, every such person so found, complained of, and proved transgressing, shall pay ten shillings for every such transgression, or suffer corporal punishment for default of due payment. Nor shall any sell or draw any sort of strong drink at any time, or

to be used in any such manner, upon the like penalty for every default.

“It is also further ordered that no servile work shall be done on the Sabbath, viz., such as are not works of piety, charity, or necessity; and no profane discourse or talk, rude or unreverent behavior shall be used on that holy day, upon the penalty of ten shillings fine for every transgression hereof, and in case the offense be circumstanced with high-handed presumption as well [as] profaneness, the penalty to be augmented at the discretion of the judges.”\*

Under date of May, 1684, is found an act referring to the foregoing laws and their enforcement in the following words:

“Whereas, this court, in the calamitous time of New England’s distress by the war with the Indians in the years seventy-five and seventy-six, were moved to make some laws for the suppression of some provoking evils which were feared to be growing up among us, as viz., profanation of the Sabbath, neglect of catechising of children and servants, and family prayer, . . . which laws (for want of due prosecution of offenders that are guilty of the breach of them) have little tended to the suppressing of the growth of said evils amongst us, and have not answered that expectation of reformation which this court aimed at; it is therefore ordered by this court, that the selectmen, constables, and grand jurymen in the several plantations shall have a special care in their respective places to promote the due and full attendance of those forementioned orders of this court, by the several inhabitants of their respective towns. And the selectmen, constables, and grand jurymen shall, at least once a month, make presentment of all breaches of such laws as are come to their knowl-

---

\* Col. Rec. Conn. from 1665 to 1677, pp. 88, 280.



edge, to the next assistant or commissioner under their hands."

Any failure on the part of these officers to perform the above mentioned duties was made finable to the amount of ten shillings for every neglect. Two years later this act was renewed in nearly the same words.\* Thus did Sabbath desecration, so called, increase in spite of these stringent laws, guarded by severe and often-executed penalties.

Soon after this came the interruption of the government by Andros, which lasted between one and two years. When the government was restored, the general court declared all laws to be binding which were in force before the interruption. After this restoration of the colonial government in 1689, little appears concerning the Sunday laws for several years. In 1715, an especial act was passed concerning the movements of vessels in the harbors, and a general one requiring the officers to execute the existing law against vice and immorality, among which the Sunday laws are mentioned. The power of these officers to search after delinquents was also increased.† In 1721, additional laws were passed under the following preamble :

"Whereas, notwithstanding the liberty by law granted to all persons to worship God in such places as they shall for that end provide, and in such manner as they shall judge to be most agreeable to the Word of God; and notwithstanding the laws

---

\* Colonial Records of Conn. from 1678 to 1689, pp. 148, 203.

† Acts and Laws of Conn., folio edition, pp. 206—208, New London, 1715 and 1737.

already provided for the sanctification of the Lord's-day, or the Christian Sabbath, many disorderly persons in abuse of that liberty, and regardless of those laws, neglect the public worship of God on the said day, and profane the same by their rude and unlawful behavior; therefore," etc.

By this law,

1. Non-attendance on lawful public worship was subjected to a fine of five shillings.

2. The same penalty was incurred by going forth from one's place of abode for any reason except to attend worship or perform works of necessity.

3. A fine of twenty shillings was imposed for assembling in any meeting-house on Sunday without the consent of the congregation to whom it belonged and the minister who usually officiated in it.

4. Disturbing any meeting for public worship on Sunday was made punishable by a fine of forty shillings.

5. Failure to pay or secure a fine imposed for any of these offenses, within one week was punished by labor in the houses of correction for one month or less.

6. No appeal from a justice's court was allowed.

7. All charges were to be preferred within one month from the time of the offense. \*

Other supplementary acts were also passed, relating mainly to the duties of the civil authorities in executing these laws. In 1726, all assistant justices of the peace were empowered, on their own "plain view or personal knowledge" of profanity, drunk-

---

\* Acts and Laws of Conn., folio, pp. 261, 262, New London, 1715-1737.

eness, or Sabbath-breaking, to make out a judgment accordingly against the offender, "any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding." \*

In 1733, a more extensive code was established, of which the following is an outline :

1. Non-attendance on public worship for a specified time, was punished by a fine of three shillings.

2. Ten shillings was made the penalty for assembling in a meeting-house without the consent of the congregation and minister for whom it was provided. No persons were allowed to neglect public worship and meet in private houses, on penalty of ten shillings.

3. All work or play, on land or water, on Sundays, fast, or thanksgiving days, was prohibited under a fine of ten shillings.

4. Disturbing public worship by rude or clamorous behavior, in or within hearing of the assembly, was fined forty shillings.

5. All traveling, except in great extremity, was forbidden on pain of twenty shillings fine, and all absence from one's house, except for church attendance or "necessity," incurred a fine of five shillings.

6. Staying outside at the meeting-house (there being room inside), or going out unnecessarily during service, or playing or talking around places of worship, was finable in the sum of three shillings. Gathering in companies in streets, or elsewhere, on the evening before or the evening after the Sunday, or on the evening after any fast day, was liable to a penalty of

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 319.

three shillings, or two hours in the stocks, religious gatherings excepted.

7. Loitering or drinking in or about any public place after sunset on Seventh-day night, subjected both the offender and the keeper of the place to a fine of five shillings.

8. No vessel was allowed to put to sea from any harbor, river or creek within the colonial limits without license, granted only in extreme emergency, nor to weigh anchor within two miles of any place of meeting, unless to get nearer to that place, under forfeiture of thirty shillings.

9. Posting notices or publishing them in any way was declared illegal, and the proper officers were instructed to destroy all such as should be put up, and the one putting up the same was subjected to a fine of five shillings.

10. Two "tything men" were ordered to be appointed for every parish, these were empowered and instructed, after the usual manner, to execute these provisions. Whipping, twenty stripes or less, was the penalty for non-payment of a fine. \*

In 1761, in spite of all that had been done, traveling is declared to be a "growing evil," and all assistant justices of the peace are empowered to arrest, without a written warrant, any person traveling unnecessarily, and every sheriff, constable, grand jurymen and tything man was empowered to take such persons into custody, "upon sight, or present inform-

---

\* Acts and Laws of Conn., 1750 to 1772, pp. 139-142.

ation of others. Refusal to aid in any such arrest, when called upon, incurred the usual penalties. \*

In 1770, an act was passed allowing all sober persons who conscientiously differed from the established worship and ministry of the colony, to meet together for worship without incurring the penalties provided for in the preceding laws against such meetings, and against absence from the recognized services. †

Between the time when the colonial government ceased, and the opening of the nineteenth century, there were several partial or complete revisions of the laws of Connecticut, but no material change was made in the form or spirit of the Sunday laws. In 1808, the entire code was revised. In this revision, the only noteworthy change consisted in a reduction of some of the fines imposed for Sunday-breaking. ‡

The history of the Sunday laws in Connecticut thus far traced, shows the same results as in Massachusetts, namely, a steady increase of "Sabbath desecration," so called, while the civil authorities were putting forth all their power to check it. It is a significant fact, full of instruction. It shows that such legislation defeats itself. The true idea of the Sabbath is far higher than any civil law can reach, and more spiritual than human law can express. If the civil law be made thus stringent, it becomes more prominent than the law of God, and so becomes

---

\* *Ib.*, p. 259.

† *Ib.*, p. 351.

‡ See Public Statute Laws of Conn., Hartford, 1808, pp. 577—581.

practically the standard of action. Such a standard has no moral power over the conscience and soon loses its force. The Sabbath, or the day called such, becomes a civil institution merely, and, thus perverted, loses its power, ceases to draw men towards God, and becomes a failure. Added to this was the unscriptural theory by which the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment was applied to the Sunday, which of itself must work ruin. Hence it is that the "New England Sunday," with everything apparently in its favor in the beginning, has steadily sunk towards the low-ground "European Sabbath."

#### RHODE ISLAND COLONY LAWS.

The land of Roger Williams must of necessity have produced Sunday laws different from those of the other New England colonies. What these laws were will be clearly seen by the following extracts. The General Assembly, sitting at Newport, on the second day of September, 1673, enacted as follows:

"Voted, this assembly considering that the King hath granted us that not any in the colony are to be molested in the liberty of their consciences, who are not disturbers of the civil peace, and we are persuaded that a most flourishing civil government, with loyalty, may be best propagated where liberty of conscience by any corporal power is not obstructed, that is not to any unchasteness of body, and not by a body doing any hurt to a body, neither endeavoring so to do, and although we know by man not any can be forced to worship God, or for to keep holy or not to keep holy any day; but forasmuch as the first days of the weeks it is usual for parents and

masters not to employ their children or servants, as upon other days, and some others also that are not under such government, accounting it as spare time, and so spend it in debaistness (debauchery) or tippling, and unlawful games, and wantonness, and most abominably there practiced by those that live with the English, at such times to resort to towns. Therefore, this Assembly, not to oppose or propagate any worship, but as by preventing 'debaistness,' although we know masters or parents can not, and are not, by violence to endeavor to force any under their government, to any worship or from any worship, that is not debasing, or disturbing to the civil peace, but they are to require them, and if that will not prevail, if they can, they should compel them not to do what is debasing, or uncivil, or inhuman, not to frequent any immodest company or practices.

“Therefore, by his Majesty's authority it is enacted, that on the first days of the weeks, whoever he be that doth let any have any drink, that he or any other is drunk thereby, besides all other forfeitures for every one so drunk, they shall forfeit six shillings, and for every one that entertains in gaming or tippling upon the first day of the week, he shall forfeit six shillings. And by his Majesty's authority, thereby it is enacted, that for to prevent any such misdemeanors, if any are so guilty, to discover them, that every first day of the week, in every town in this colony there shall be a constable's watch, for every inhabitant fit to watch, to take his turn, that belongeth to the town, or pay for hiring one, so for one or more to watch in a day as the Town Council judge necessary to restrain any 'debaistness,' or immodesty, or concourse of people, tippling or gaming, or wantonness, that all modest assemblies may not be interrupted; especially all such that profess to meet for the worship of God; if some of them will be most false worshipers, they should only be strove against, therefore, with spiritual weapons, if they do

not disown that they should not be condemned, whoever they be, that be unchaste with their bodies, or with their bodies oppress or do violence to what is mortal of any man, but, as they should be subject to such, to suffer for such transgressions, parents may thereof correct their children and masters their servants: and magistrates should be a terror to such evil doers. \*

At a general assembly held at Newport, May 7th, 1679, the following action was taken:

“ Voted, whereas there hath complaint been made that sundry persons being evil-minded, have presumed to employ in servile labor, more than necessity requireth, their servants and also hire other men's servants and sell them to labor on the first day of the week: for the prevention whereof, be it enacted, by this assembly and the authority thereof, that if any person or persons shall employ his servants, or hire and employ any other man's servant or servants and set them to labor, as aforesaid, the person or persons so offending shall, upon proof thereof made, pay for every offense by him or them committed, five shillings in money, to the use of the poor of the town or place in which the offenses are committed; which said five shillings, if the person offending refuse, upon conviction before one magistrate, to pay, a warrant under the hand of one magistrate, directed to the sergeant of the town where the offense was committed, shall be his sufficient warrant to take by distraint so much of the estate of the offending party, together with two shillings for his service therein.

“ And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons shall presume to sport, game, or play at any manner of game or games, or shooting, on the first day of the week, as

---

\* R. I. Colonial Records, Vol. 2, pp. 503, 504.



aforesaid, or shall sit tippling and drinking in any tavern, ale house, ordinary, victualing house on the first day of the week, more than necessity requireth, and upon examination of the fact it shall be judged by one justice of the peace, the person offending, as aforesaid, upon conviction before one justice of the peace, shall, by the said justice of the peace, be sentenced for every of the aforesaid offenses to sit in the stocks three hours, or pay five shillings in money, for the use of the town or place where the offense was committed." \*

Various modification or simple re-enactments of the Rhode Island Sunday laws were made in 1750 and 1784. In 1798, the laws of the State were revised. The main features of the Sunday laws were not changed. All work or play was prohibited on penalty of one dollar for the first offense, and two dollars for the second. In default of payment, the offender was to suffer ten days' imprisonment, in the county jail. The same penalty was imposed for employing others. All complaints to be made within ten days after the offense. An appeal was allowed. Otherwise the law of 1798 was identical with the present law.†

#### NEW YORK.

There was no representative government in what is now the State of New York, until nearly a century after the first settlements were made within its limits. The records of the first half century of the existence of the colony of New Netherlands, as it

---

\* *Ib.*, Vol. 3, p. 31.

† *Public Laws of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*, Providence, 1798, pp. 577 to 579.

was called, are very meager. The government was administered by officers appointed in Holland. The religious views of the Hollanders made it impossible that such an observance of Sunday should obtain in New Netherlands as was common in New England.

In 1647, Peter Stuyvesant was made "Dictator" of the colony. According to the statements of Mr. Broadhead\* the social, civil, and religious affairs of the colony were in a sad state of decline. The preceding administration of Kieft had been ruinous in many respects. On the arrival of Stuyvesant, says Mr. Broadhead,

"Proclamations were immediately issued with a zeal and rapidity which promised to make a thorough reformation." Sabbath-breaking, brawling and drunkenness were forbidden. Publicans were restrained from selling liquors, except to travelers, before two o'clock on Sundays, 'when there is no preaching,' and after nine o'clock in the evening."

Stuyvesant was a member of the Reformed church at home, and was probably more strict than the most of his countrymen. In 1673, each town was empowered to make laws against Sabbath-breaking and other immoralities.† The administration of Stuyvesant was the beginning of efforts at Sunday legislation.

In 1691, a representative government was established under the English crown. In 1695, Oct. 22d. the first Sunday law was passed by that government.

---

\* History of New Netherlands, first period, p. 466

† Documents relating to the colonial History of New York Vol. 2, p. 621.

It was prefaced by the following preamble, which gives an idea of the state of the country at that time:

“Whereas, the true and sincere worship of God according to his holy will and commandments, is often profaned and neglected by many of the inhabitants and sojourners in this province, who do not keep holy the Lord’s-day, but in a disorderly manner accustom themselves to travel, laboring, working, shooting, fishing, sporting, playing, horse-racing, frequenting of tippling houses and the using many other unlawful exercises and pastimes, upon the Lord’s-day, to the great scandal of the holy Christian faith, be it enacted,” etc.

These are the provisions of the law :

1. Six shillings fine for any of the above named crimes, or any manner of work or play.

2. Any justice of the peace might convict offenders, on “his own sight,” “on their confession,” or on the testimony of “one or more witnesses;” fines were to be collected by distraint, if necessary. In default of payment, the offender was to sit for three hours in the “stocks.” If any master refused to pay the fine imposed upon a negro or Indian slave or servant, said slave or servant was to be whipped “thirteen lashes.” All complaint against offenders were to be made within one month.

3. It was lawful to travel any distance under twenty miles, for the purpose of attending public worship. It was also lawful to “go for a physician or nurse.” These exemptions were not good in favor of unchristianized Indians.\*

---

\* Laws of New York from 1691 to 1773. large folio edition. Vol. 1. pp. 23. 24. New York, 1774.

No other law concerning Sunday observance appears until after the establishment of the State government. In 1778, Feb. 23d, the following was passed :

“ Be it enacted by the People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That there shall be no traveling, servile laboring or working (works of necessity and charity excepted), shooting, fishing, sporting, playing, horse-racing, hunting, or frequenting of tippling houses, or any unlawful exercises or pastimes, by any person or persons, within this State, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and that every person being of the age of fourteen years or upwards, offending in the premises, shall for every such offense forfeit and pay to the use of the poor of the city or town, where such offense shall be committed, the sum of six shillings. And that no person shall cry show forth or expose to sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods or chattels upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, except small meat, and milk, and fish, before nine of the clock in the morning, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the same goods so cried, showed forth or exposed for sale, to the use of the poor of the city or town where such offense shall be committed, and if any person offending in any of the premises shall be thereof convicted, before any justice of the peace for the county, or any mayor, recorder or alderman of the city, where the offense shall be committed, upon the view of the said justice, mayor, recorder or alderman, or confession of the party offending, or proof of any witness or witnesses upon oath, then the said justice, mayor, recorder or alderman, before whom such conviction shall be had, shall direct and send his warrant, under his hand and seal, to some constable of the city or county where the offense shall have been

committed, commanding him to seize and take the goods so cried, showed forth or exposed to sale as aforesaid, and to sell the same, and to levy the said other forfeitures or penalties, by distress and sale of the goods and chattels of such offenders, and to pay the money arising by the sale of such goods, and the said other forfeitures and penalties, to the overseers of the poor of the city or town, where the said offense or offenses shall have been committed, for the use of the poor thereof, and in case no such distress can be had, then every such offender shall, by a warrant under the hand and seal of the said justice, mayor, recorder or alderman, be set publicly in the stocks by the space of two hours.

And further, that if any person shall be found fishing, sporting, horse-racing, hunting, gunning, or going to or returning from any market or landing, with carts, wagons, or sleds, on the first day of the week, called Sunday, it shall be lawful for any constable or other citizen to stop every person so offending, and to detain him or her until the next day, and then to carry or convey him or her to some justice of the peace, to be dealt with according to law. Provided always, That no person going to or coming from any church, or place of worship, within the distance of twenty miles, or going to call a physician, surgeon or midwife, or carrying a mail to or from any post-office, or going express by order of any public officer, shall be considered as traveling within the meaning of this act."

Section second makes the usual exception in favor of persons actually observing the seventh day, providing they do not "disturb other persons in the observance of the first day of the week as holy time."

Section third prohibits the service of any "civil process" on Sunday "except in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace," on penalty of the an-

nullment of the "process," and the liability of the officer for damages to the party thus disturbed. \*

In 1798, April 3d, the above law was amended so as to prohibit keepers of public houses or liquor stores, of any sort, from "selling or disposing" of any "strong or spiritous liquors, ale or porter," on Sunday, to any person or persons, "except lodgers and travelers tolerated by law," under penalty of two dollars and fifty cents fine for each offense.

Persons engaged in removing their families or household furniture were freed from the regulations concerning traveling, when the removal, having been commenced before Sunday, remained incomplete. †

#### PENNSYLVANIA.

The early Sunday laws of Pennsylvania were far less strict than those of the New England States. In 1700-1, a general law was passed, John Evans being Lieutenant Governor, under William Penn, of which the following is the substance :

1. All general servile work on Sunday, was prohibited on pain of twenty shillings fine. The exceptions under this provision were quite numerous. They allowed the preparing of food in public houses, the dressing and selling of meat by butchers and fishermen during the months of June, July and August, the selling of milk before nine o'clock in the morning, and the landing of passengers by watermen during the entire day.

---

\* Laws of New York, Eleventh Session, 1786, chapter 42, folio edition.

† Session Laws of New York, 1798, chap. 82.

2. No civil process was servable on Sunday.

3. Any person found "tippling" in public drinking houses was fined one shilling and six pence. Any dealer who allowed persons to drink and lounge about his premises, was liable to pay ten shillings fine. "Taverns" were however allowed to sell to regular inmates and travelers "in moderation."\*

There were various changes and modifications of this law, from time to time, up to 1786, when all former laws were repealed and a new one enacted. The new law imposed thirty shillings fine for working or sporting. It excepted "boatmen," "watermen," "stage coaches (having the consent of a justice on extraordinary occasions)," the general work of preparing food, and the "delivery of milk and other necessaries of life," before nine o'clock in the morning, and after five o'clock in the afternoon. Any offender, in default of payment of his fine, was liable to imprisonment. †

In 1794, the above law was repealed, and its place supplied by one differing only in a few particulars. By it the general fine was placed at four dollars, and "persons removing their families" were placed upon the list of exceptions under the head of traveling. ‡

There has been but little, if any, change in the statute Sunday law of Pennsylvania since 1794. There have been, however, certain decisions of the

\*Acts of the Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania, Vol. 1, pp. 19—21, folio edition, Phila., 1762.

†Laws of Pennsylvania, Vol. 2, chap. 297, folio edition 1762.

‡ *Ib.*, chap. 1747, 8mo. edition, Phil., 1803.

courts, under which there has been from time to time greater infringement upon the liberty of conscience than in any other State since the days of Puritan illiberalism. The following is a specimen decision :

“This act is binding on Jews and others who keep the seventh day as their Sabbath.”

VIRGINIA.

The early laws of Virginia have some resemblance to those of New England.

Hon. R. W. Thompson, Secretary of the Navy, in an address delivered in Washington, May 16, 1880, makes the following statement concerning a law made before the organization of the regular Assembly in 1619:

“The very first statute passed by the Cavaliers of Virginia provided that he who did not attend church on Sunday, should pay a fine of two pounds of tobacco. This was the first law ever enacted in the United States, and was passed in 1617, three years before the Puritans landed at Plymouth.” \*

In 1623, a law was passed in these words :

“Whosoever shall absent himself from divine service any Sunday without an allowed excuse, shall forfeit a pound of tobacco ; and he that absents himself for a month shall forfeit fifty pounds of tobacco.” †

In 1629, the authorities were ordered to take care that the above law was carefully executed, and to “see that the Sabbath-day be not ordinarily profaned by working in any employments, or by journeying from place to place.” ‡

---

\* Sabbath Doc. No. 45, p. 15, New York.

† Laws of Virginia, Vol. 1, p. 123. ‡ *Ib.*, p. 144.



In 1642, "church wardens" are bound by their oath of office, to present to the civil authorities all cases of "profaning God's name, and his holy Sabbaths." In the same year it was "enacted for the better observation of the Sabbath, that no person or persons shall take a voyage upon the same, except it be to church, or for other causes of extreme necessity, upon the penalty of the forfeiture for such offense, of twenty pounds of tobacco."\* In 1657-8, this law was extended so as to prohibit "traveling, loading of boats, shooting of game, and the like," and the penalty was increased to "one hundred pounds of tobacco," or a place in the "stocks." The execution of any ordinary civil process is also forbidden during this year. † In 1691, the penalty was changed to "twenty shillings," and in 1696, to "thirty shillings or two hundred pounds of tobacco." In 1705, the specifications of the law were increased, and all general acts of profanation by working, playing, drinking, etc., and also absence from church for one month, were included in one class, the penalty being "five shillings or fifty pounds of tobacco." In default of payment, the offender was subjected to "ten lashes." ‡

In 1786, a more elaborate code was passed, the substance of which was as follows :

1. All ministers properly licensed, and faithful to the commonwealth, were exempted from arrest on

---

\* *Ib.*, pp. 240 and 261.

† *Ib.*, pp. 434 and 457.

‡ *Ib.*, Vol. 3, pp. 73, 138 and 361.

any civil process while performing public religious duties.

2. "Maliciously disturbing any public religious meeting, was made punishable by fine and imprisonment.

3. All labor, whether performed by one's self, or by one's employes, was made liable to a fine of ten shillings.\*

In 1792, the foregoing law was re-enacted with little or no change. In 1801, a law was passed forbidding any one to trade with slaves on Sunday, without the consent of their masters, under penalty of ten dollars fine above the usual punishment for "Sabbath-breaking."†

In 1819, certain restrictions were placed upon the "excessive drinking" on Sunday, or other days of religious worship appointed by public authority, the penalty of the liquor seller being the "loss of his license."‡

#### ENFORCEMENT OF SUNDAY LAWS IN THE NEW ENGLAND COLONIES

Such was the Sunday Legislation during the Colonial period and in the leading colonies of the United States. The history of that period gives ample proof that the Sunday Laws were not a "dead letter." A few examples relative to their enforcement are here given. It would be tedious and useless to note every instance in which these laws were executed. The

\* *Ib.*, Vol. 12, pp. 336, 337.

† Acts of the Assembly of Virginia, Vol. 1, pp. 276, 432, Richmond, 1803.

‡ Revised Code of 1819, p. 283.

majority of the cases were, doubtless, disposed of by the common magistrates, and hence do not appear upon the records of the higher courts. A few representative instances are given.

October 6, 1636, John Barnes was found guilty of "Sabbath-breaking" by a jury, and fined "thirty shillings," and "made to sit in the stocks one hour." In 1637, Stephen Hopkins was presented for "suffering men to drink at his house upon the Lord's-day." Two years later, Web Adey was arraigned for working in his garden on Sunday. Before the year closes he repeats the offense and is "set in the stocks" and "whipped at the post."\*

In 1649, John Shaw was set in the stocks for "attending tar pits" on Sunday, and Stephen Bryant was arrested, and "admonished," for carrying a barrel to the same pits on the same day. The next year, 1650, Edward Hunt was arrested for shooting at deer on Sunday, Gowan White and Z. Hick called to account for "traveling from Weymouth to Scituate on the Lord's-day." In 1651, Elizabeth Eddy was arrested for "wringing and hanging out clothes on the Lord's-day in time of service." Aurther Howland, for not attending church, and Nathaniel Basset and Joseph Pryor, for "disturbing the church of Duxburrow," were also called to answer the demands of the law. †

In 1651-2, Abraham Pierce, Henry Clarke and Thurston Clarke, Jr., were arrested for lazily

---

\* Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. 1. pp. 44, 68, 86, 92.

† Plymouth Colony Records, pp. 140, 156, 165, 173-4.

spending Sunday, and staying away from public service. Two or three years later, Peter Gaunt, Ralph Allen, Sen. and George Allen appeared to answer to a similar charge, and William Chase was called to answer for having driven a pair of oxen in the yoke "about five miles on the Lord's-day, in time of exercise." In 1658, Lieutenant James Wyatt was "sharply reprov'd" for writing a business note on Sunday, "at least in the evening somewhat too soon." At the same time, Sarah Kirby was "publicly whipped" for disturbing public worship, and Ralph Jones paid "ten shillings fine" for staying at home when the authorities thought he had ought to have been at church. † Similar cases might be quoted until many pages were filled, in which the reader would see that not only ordinary manual labor on Sunday was punished, but "whipping of servants," playing at cards," "smoking tobacco," etc., were sharply dealt with. Those were times when laws were made to be executed. *Duty* was the central idea in the Puritan system, and zeal was ever on the alert to perform what conscience or law demanded. The "Blue Laws" which exist in tradition, though sometimes exaggerated, and facetiously misrepresented, are a fair index to the rigid spirit of those days. The compilations of the "Blue Laws" by Barber and Smucker are mainly, if not entirely correct. At the time of the adoption of the State Constitutions, corporal punishment in the "stocks" and the "cage," and at the "whipping post" was

---

† Plymouth Colony Records, Vol. 3. pp. 5, 10, 52, 74, 111, 112.

becoming obsolete. Since the opening of the present century, the execution of these laws has been less frequent. The results of the test made during those earlier times indicate that Sunday-keeping cannot be brought about by civil legislation.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### THE SABBATH IN AMERICA.

The same Divine Hand which guarded the Sabbath through the dark centuries between the first great apostasy and the Reformation, transferred it from England to America, the last battle-ground whereon the great reforms of modern times have been and are being carried forward. True Sabbath reform could not find a place among the masses until that second great error, the "Puritan Sunday" had borne its fruit, decayed in weakness, and crumbled from the hands of the Church. This trial could best be made in America. Hence, guided by that "divinity which shapes our ends," in 1664 Stephen Mumford emigrated from England to Newport, Rhode Island. He brought with him the opinion that the Ten Commandments as they were delivered from Mount Sinai, were moral and immutable, and that it was an anti-Christian power which changed the Sabbath from the Seventh to the first day of the week." He united with the Baptist Church in Newport, and soon gained several of its members to the observance of the Sabbath. This led to much discussion, and finally an open separation took place, and the first Seventh-day Baptist Church in America was organized by these Sabbath-keepers in the month of De-

ember, 1671.\* “ William Hiscox was chosen and ordained their pastor which office he filled until his death in 1704. He was succeeded by William Gibson, a minister from London, who continued to labor among them until he died, in 1717. Joseph Crandall, who had been his colleague for two years, was selected to succeed him and presided over the church until he died, in 1737. Joseph Maxson and Thomas Hiscox were evangelists of the church about this time, the former having been chosen in 1732, he died in 1748. John Maxson was chosen pastor in 1754, and performed the duties of the office until 1778. He was followed by William Bliss, who served the church as pastor until his death in 1808, at the age of 81 years. Henry Burdick, succeeded to the pastorate of the church, and occupied that post until his death. Besides its regular pastors, the Newport Church ordained several ministers, who labored with great usefulness, both at home and abroad. The church also included among its early members several prominent public men, one of whom, Richard Ward, Governor of the State of Rhode Island, is well known to history.

“ For more than thirty years after its organization, the Newport Church included nearly all persons observing the Seventh-day in Rhode Island and Connecticut; and its pastors were accustomed to hold religious meetings at several places, for the better accommodation of the widely-scattered membership.

---

\* A full and interesting account of the formation of this Church with a complete account of the discussions and final separation, may be found in Vol. 1, of the Seventh-day Baptist Memorial, pp 22 to 46.

In 1708, however, the brethren living in what was then called Westerly, R. I., comprehending all the south-western part of the State, thought best to form another society. Accordingly they proceeded to organize a church, now called the First Hopkinton, which had a succession of worthy pastors, became very numerous, and built three meeting-houses for the accommodation of the members in different neighborhoods." \* In this last place Mr. Backus adds the following notice in connection with his list of the pastors of what he calls the "Third Church in Newport, who keep the Seventh-day. Mr. Ebenezer David, (who was first converted in Providence College, and took his first degree there in 1772) belonged to this church; and having been a chaplain, much esteemed, in our army, died therein, not far from Philadelphia, a few days after Mr. Maxson."

The agitation concerning the Sabbath which the early Seventh-day Baptists induced was not confined to Newport. Mr. Backus says † that the Baptists in Boston sent a kind letter to these Sabbath-keepers before their separation from Mr. Clarke's Church, urging them not to chide, as "apostates," certain ones who had left the Sabbath, and not to separate themselves from their church relations with the First-day Baptists. In another place, ‡ Mr. Backus gives a long letter from Roger Williams, to Mr. Hubbard a member of the Newport Seventh-day

\* See manual of the Seventh-day Baptists, pp. 40, 41, also Backus's History of New England, Vol. 1, p. 411, and Vol. 2, p. 398.

† Hist. of New England, Vol. 1, p. 411.

‡ Vol. 1, pp. 510—12.



Baptist Church, who had called Mr. William's attention to the claims of the Seventh-day as the only Sabbath. Mr. Williams professes to have studied the subject carefully, but to be unable to agree with Mr. Hubbard's views concerning it. The following letter from a prominent Seventh-day Baptist in London, which was written because of the persecution of Sabbath-keepers in Connecticut is a specimen of the correspondence on this question at the time.

“Peter Chamberlain senior doctor of both Universities, and first and eldest physician in ordinary to his majesty's person, according to the world, but according to grace, a servant of the Word of God, to the excellent and noble governor of New England; grace, mercy, peace and truth, from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ; praying for you that you may abound in heavenly graces and temporal comforts.”

The letter goes on to say that the first design of the men of New England was to establish a system of civil and religious liberty, a system to “suppress sin, but not to suppress liberty of conscience.” He argues, showing great familiarity with the Scriptures, that “whatever is against the Ten Commandments is sin,” and closes as follows:

“While Moses and Solomon caution men so much against adding to or taking from—Deut. 4: 2, Prov. 30: 5, 6—and so doth the beloved apostle Rev. 22: 18, 19, what shall we say of those that take away of those ten words, or those that make them void, and teach men so! Nay, they dare to give the lie to Jehovah, and make Jesus Christ not only the breaker of the law, but the very author of sin in others, also

causing them to break them. Hath not the 'Little Horn' played his part lustily in this and worn out the saints of the Most High, so that they became 'Little Horn' men also? If you are pleased to inquire about these things and to require any instances or informations be pleased by your letters to command it from your humble servant in the Lord Jesus Christ."

PETER CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. Baekus also notices a similar correspondence between Dr. Chamberlain and one Mr. Olney, about the same time. \*

In Felt's Ecclesiastical History of New England, is found the following under date of April 3, 1646:

"John Cotton writes an argument to Thomas Sheppard to prove that the first day of the week, and not the seventh, should be observed as the Christian Sabbath. This subject was *much discussed* by New England ministers against objectors." †

On page 614 of the same volume is a similar notice of a letter from one Mr. Hooker to Mr. Sheppard on the same theme. Copies of a small book on the Sabbath, written by this same Thomas Sheppard and published at an early day in Connecticut, are still extant. These facts, and the one already referred to, that many prominent and learned men, both in the colony of Rhode Island and in England were Seventh-day Baptists, show that the agitation concerning the Sabbath was neither feeble in character, nor meager in extent.

Such was the beginning of the Seventh-day Bap-

---

\* Ibid.

† Vol. 1, p. 593.

tists in New England. Those who wish to read more concerning the foregoing points, are referred to the different works quoted, especially the Seventh-day Baptist Memorial. †

The second branch of the Seventh day Baptist Church in America was also planted by emigration from England. About the year 1684, Abel Noble a Seventh-day Baptist Minister from London settled near Philadelphia. The following extract from a late work by Rev. James Bailey † gives the following :

“Able Noble arrived in this country about the year 1784, and located near Philadelphia. He was a Seventh-day Baptist Minister when he came. About this time a difference arose among the Quakers in reference to the sufficiency of what every man has naturally within himself for the purpose of his own salvation. This difference resulted in a separation under the leadership of George Keith. These seceders were soon after known as Keithian Baptists. Through the labors of Able Noble, many of them embraced the Bible Sabbath and were organized into churches near the year 1700. These churches were Newton, Pennepeck, Nottingham and French Creek, and probably, Conogocheage.” . . . “The churches of Pennsylvania fraternized with the churches in Rhode Island and New Jersey, and counseled them in matters of discipline. Some of their members also united with these churches. Some of them, with some members of the church of Piscataway, and others of Cohansey, near Princeton, emigrated to the Parish of St. Mark, S. C., and formed a church on

---

† Vol. 1.

† History of the Seventh-day Baptist General Conference, pp. 11—15.

Broad River in 1754. Five years later, in 1759, eight families removed from Broad River and formed a settlement and a church at Tuckaseeking, in Georgia. These churches have long since become extinct." †

Speaking again of the Pennsylvania churches, Mr. Bailey says:

"Rev. Enoch David was, for several years, connected with these churches as their preacher." . . . "He was the son of Owen David, who emigrated from Wales. He lived some time in Philadelphia, and labored as a tailor." . . . "The churches coming out from the Keithian Quakers, and known as the Keithian Baptists and Seventh-day Baptists, retained many of their former habits, and in a few years, by divisions and removals, ceased to exist as distinct churches. They were very numerous in their most prosperous days. There are, however, many of their descendents in connection with our Southern and Western churches."

The third branch of the American Seventh-day Baptists originated from causes quite unlike those which gave birth to the two already mentioned. Edmund Dunham was the originator of this movement. He was a member of the First-day Baptist Church, in Piscataway, Middlesex county, New Jersey. About the year 1700, he had occasion to rebuke one Mr. Bonham for laboring on Sunday. Mr. Bonham replied by demanding the divine authority for the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath. Eager to answer this demand, Dunham began to search God's Word for that which he supposed could easily

---

† Traces of these Sabbath-keepers are still found in the South.

be found. His investigations led him to discard the Sunday and to embrace the Bible Sabbath. Others soon followed his example, and in 1705 the Piscataway Seventh-day Baptist Church was organized: Edmund Dunham was chosen pastor and sent to Rhode Island where he received ordination. At his death, his son Jonathan Dunham succeeded him in the pastorate. This church still flourishes at New Market New Jersey; and several other churches have been formed directly and indirectly from it.

The Seventh-day Baptists have spread from these three points, westward and southward, slowly but steadily. The report of their General Conference for 1884 shows an aggregate of 94 churches, with 8,655 members in the United States, England, Holland and China. The odds against which their existence has been maintained has made them much stronger than their numbers indicate. Their existence has been perpetuated and their growth secured under the conviction that God has commissioned them to uphold the doctrine of fealty to his law, until the Christian Church through its repeated failures to establish and maintain the sacredness of Sunday, either by the attempted transfer of the Fourth Commandment, or by the aid of the civil law, shall come to see that on God's law alone can either the idea of the Sabbath or the day of the Sabbath be maintained. The struggle for more than two hundred years has demanded much of patience and faith. The prospects at the present (1885) add hope to their undiminished

patience and faith, that the redemption of the Sabbath question from error is "at the doors."

Theologically, the Seventh-day Baptists have always been known as "thoroughly evangelical." In matters of general reform, moral and political, they have always been at the front. In the work of higher education they have done more than the average of other denominations in proportion to their numbers. Sabbath-keeping is not the product of sectarian bigotry, in their case, but the fruitage of a settled conviction that a return to the observance of the Sabbath is the only salvation from the morass of Sunday holidayism and dissipation. Time alone can test their faith, and that test they patiently await.

#### THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

This body of Sabbath-keepers has arisen during the past thirty-eight years, and is particularly distinguished by the fact that they are believers in the near advent of our Lord. To form a just judgment of this people, who in several respects differ from the Seventh-day Baptists, it is necessary to consider their position from their own stand-point. The advent movement of 1843—4, as believed and cherished by them, led directly to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. That movement was based upon three leading ideas :

1. That the great outlines of prophecy in the books of Daniel and Revelation, as the metallic image, the great beasts, the seals, the trumpets, and other prophetic series indicate the accomplishment of the long

period of Gentile rule, and the immediate advent of Christ and the judgment.

2. That the signs of the times mark these as the days of expectation of that event.

3. That the prophetic periods which relate to the closing events of our dispensation, and especially the 2300 days of Daniel 8: 14, point to 1843-4, as the year of their termination.

In studying the subject of prophetic time, they took the ninth chapter of Daniel as the key to the eighth. The period of 2300 days was therefore held to begin with the seven weeks at the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, B. C. 457. Ezra 7. Taking 457 from 2300 leaves 1843 for the year of the cleansing of the sanctuary. So the advent of Christ was expected that year, because the sanctuary was believed to be the earth, and its cleansing to be by fire at the coming of the Lord.

When 1844 had passed without the expected advent of Christ, the entire subject of the advent faith was re-examined and new questions were raised. Is the course of earthly empire as marked by Daniel and John just ready to expire? This appeared to the Adventists an undoubted fact. Is the millennium before or after Christ's advent? After that event, said they. Have the signs of Christ's second coming made their appearance? So the Adventists decided. Have the 2300 days been rightly reckoned? Is the earth the sanctuary? Is the sanctuary to be cleansed by fire? Does the Saviour cleanse the sanctuary

when he comes the second time, or does this take place before that event ?

The conclusion was arrived at from this re-examination that the 2300 days were ended, and that they indicated, not the close of human probation, but the commencement of the great work in the sanctuary which should bring the work of mercy to a final termination.

So the advent movement led directly to the heavenly sanctuary ; and with equal directness to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. For it was seen that the heavenly tabernacle with its sacred vessels was the great original after which Moses copied in making the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. Ex. 25, Heb. 9. It was further seen that the heavenly sanctuary had the same grand central object as the earthly, viz : the ark of God's testament. Rev. 11 : 19, Ex. 40 : 20, 21, Deut. 10 : 3, 5. The ark containing the Ten Commandments, with the mercy seat for its top, was that over which the typical atonement was made ; and hence the real atonement must relate to that law concerning which an atonement was shadowed forth. Lev. 16 : 15. And so the heavenly sanctuary contains the ark after which Moses patterned when he obeyed the mandate "see that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount," Heb. 8 : 5 ; 9 : 23. And in that ark is the original of that law which the great Law-giver copied with his own finger for the ark of the earthly sanctuary. Ex. 20 : 24, Deut. 9 : 10. And this great fact clearly indicates that the



Ten Commandments constitute the moral law to which the atonement relates; that they are distinct from the law of types and shadows; that they are unchangeable in their character, and of perpetual obligation; that our Lord, as high-priest, ministers before a real law; that men in the gospel dispensation must obey the law of the Ten Commandments; and so the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was found among the things which are as immutable as the pillars of heaven.

Thus the study of the heavenly sanctuary opened to their minds the Sabbath and the law of God. And so the ancient Sabbath of the Bible became with this people a part of the advent faith.

The Sabbath was introduced to the attention of the advent people first at Washington, N. H., by a faithful Seventh-day Baptist sister by the name of Preston.

A word relative to this woman may be in place. Rachel D. Harris was born in Vernon, Vt. When she was twenty-eight years of age she became a believer in the Bible Sabbath. She was faithful to her convictions of duty and united with the Seventh-day Baptist Church of Verona, Oneida Co., N. Y. Her first husband bore the name of Oaks. Her second that of Preston. She and her daughter, Delight Oaks, were members of the Seventh-day Baptist Church of Verona, N. Y., at the time of their removal to Washington, N. H. These sisters were faithful to the truth, were instrumental in raising up

the first church of Sabbath-keeping Adventists, and from this church the light shone forth upon those who have been instrumental in turning thousands to the Sabbath.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

# SUNDAY IN THE CREEDS OF THE CHURCHES.

It is truly said that "men are often better than their creeds." It is equally true that formulas and statements remain in the written symbols of faith long after they have become a dead letter. The reader must be left to decide how well the practice of the churches accords with their creeds as given below. We give, with little or no comment, the formulated faith of the representative denominations in the United States.

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Concerning the "Rule of Faith," in general the Catholic Church speaks as follows :

*Q.* What is the rule of our faith left us by Jesus Christ ?

*A.* The Christian world, as it stands at present, is divided into two great bodies in regard to this point. All, indeed, agree in this, that the Holy Scriptures, being dictated by the Holy Ghost, are truly the Word of God, and are, therefore, infallibly true in what they teach, both as to what we are to believe, and as to what we are to do in order to be saved. But, as the divine truths contained in them cannot be known without understanding the true

sense of these sacred writings, hence the great question arises : How is the true sense of the Scriptures to be known ? One of the two great bodies of Christians, to wit, the Protestants, affirm that the true sense of the Scriptures may be sufficiently known in all things necessary to salvation, by every man of sound judgment who reads them with humility and attention : and therefore they hold, that the rule left by Jesus Christ to man for knowing what we are to believe, and what we are to do in order to be saved, is the written Word alone, as interpreted by every man of sound judgment. The other great body of Christians, namely the Roman Catholics, affirm that the true sense of the Scriptures cannot be sufficiently known by any private interpretation, but only by the public authority of the Church ; and, therefore, they hold that the rule left us by Jesus Christ, is the the written Word as interpreted by the Church." \*

The same writer defines the commands of the Church as follows :

“ Q. What do you mean by the commands of the Church ?

A. The commands of the Church, in general, signify all those laws, rules and regulations which the pastors of the Church have made, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and for the edification of the body of Christ ; but what is meant in particular by the commands or precepts of the Church, are six general laws, which are of more eminent note in the Church, both on account of their antiquity (having been observed, as to their substance, from the very first ages) and on account also of their universality, as obliging every member of the Church whom they concern. †

---

\*The Sincere Christian Instructed, etc., by Right Rev. Doctor George Hay, Chap. XI, pp. 119, 120, Boston edition.

† Ibid., Chap. 16, pp. 168, 169.

*Q.* What is the first command of the Church ?

*A.* To hear mass on Sundays and holidays, and to rest from servile work. . . .

*Q.* Are these holidays of God's appointment under the old law binding upon Christians under the gospel ?

*A.* By no means ; they were instituted in memory of the particular temporal benefits bestowed on the people of Israel, and were binding on them alone ; and, like the rest of the exterior of their religion, which was all a figure of the good things to come under the gospel, they were figures of the Christian holidays, which were to be ordained by the church of Christ, in memory of the spiritual benefits bestowed by him on Christians, and therefore were fulfilled and done away when the Christian religion was established.

*Q.* By whom are the Christian holidays appointed ?

*A.* By the church of Christ ; which also, by the authority and power given her by her divine Spouse, ordained the Sunday or first day of the week, to be kept holy, instead of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was ordained to be kept holy among the Jews by God himself. . . .

*Q.* In what manner does the Church command these holidays to be kept ?

*A.* In the same manner as the Sundays ; by abstaining from all unnecessary servile works, and employing such a portion of the day in the exercises of piety and devotion, that we may be truly said to keep the day holy, and particularly to assist at the holy sacrifice of the mass.

*Q.* Why are the holidays commanded to be kept the same way as the Sundays ?

*A.* Because (1) the intention of instituting both Sundays and holidays is the same. (2) God commanded the holidays of the old law to be kept in the same way as the Sabbath ; and as these were only figures of the Sundays and holidays of the new law,

if this was done in the figure, where only temporal benefits were commemorated, much more ought it to be done in the substance, which regards the great spiritual benefits of our redemption.”\*

Such is the basis of Sunday observance in the Roman Catholic Church. This “Ecclesiastical” theory is prominent in all the reformed churches on the continent of Europe, and underlies all other theories of Sunday observance among Protestants. The earlier laws of the Church of England made the same classification, placing Sunday with the other holidays. The present theory of that church, as defined by one of its most scholarly writers on the Sabbath question, Dr. Hessey, is a modified form of Romish theory, but yet resting on an ecclesiastical basis. He says :

“We are warranted then, I think, in concluding that so far as her fully authorized documents are concerned, the Church of England does not pronounce in favor either of the purely ecclesiastical, or of the Sunday-Sabbatarian view of the Lord’s-day. Not of the former, for the day is of divine institution. Not of the latter, for though she presents the parable of the Jewish law as a reminder that the Sunday is of divine institution, she does not assert that the Sabbath is continued. So far as those documents are concerned we seem to be justified in ‘standing in the ways and seeing, and asking for the old paths, where is the good way, and walking therein,’ if happily thereby, we ‘may find rest for our souls.’” †

#### THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

This church in America rests upon the same doc-

---

\* The Sincere Christian Instructed, etc., chap. 15, sec. 1, pp. 170, 171. † Sunday Lec. 7, pp. 195, 196.

trinal basis as the Church of England. In a "Catechism on the Doctrines, Usages and Holy Days of the Protestant Episcopal Church," we find a number of questions and answers which form a sort of Puritan theory on an ecclesiastical basis. So far as these refer to the early history of Sunday, especially during the patristic period, they are remarkable for the ignorance they evince, concerning the latest investigations in that department, or else for their indifference to the results which those investigations have reached. The following are some of the questions :

SUNDAY, OR THE LORD'S-DAY.

*Q.* What day of the week does the Christian Church keep holy ?

*A.* The first day of the week, called Sunday.

*Q.* What authority have we for the change of this day from the seventh to the first day ?

*A.* The authority and practice of the Holy Apostles, and the Church in all ages.

*Q.* Why was Sunday made the great day for Christian rest and worship ?

*A.* Because the resurrection of Christ took place on the first day of the week.

*Q.* Would the Apostles have changed the day if Christ had not instructed them to do so ?

*A.* No, they acted under his inspiration and by his authority.

*Q.* When did Jesus instruct his disciples ? Acts 1 : 2, 3.

*A.* In the three years of his ministry, and also during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, when he gave commandments to the Apostles whom he had chosen, and spake of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

*Q.* Did Christ claim to control the Sabbath? Luke 6: 5.

*A.* Yes, he declared 'the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.'

*Q.* Have Christians always kept the first day since our Saviour's time?

*A.* Yes, they have, in all ages of the Church, and this universal observance of the first day proves that it must have been so ordered by Christ and his Apostles.

*Q.* What happened on the first Lord's-day.

*A.* Jesus Christ arose from the dead, and on the evening of the same day appeared to his disciples, and gave them their commission. John 20: 21, 22.

*Q.* What happened on the next Sunday? John 20: 27.

*A.* Jesus appeared to the disciples again, when he gave St. Thomas the proof he required to confirm his faith."

Then follow the usual references to the day of Pentecost, Acts 2: 4; also the reference to Acts 20: 7 and Rev. 1: 10. \*

#### THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION AND THE SUNDAY.

The Westminster Confession forms the basis of the doctrines of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist branches of the Church, which have been developed from the Puritan stock in England, Scotland, and America. The general modifications which have been made in the creed have not materially affected its statements concerning the Sabbath question. Chapter 21 treats of "Religious Worship, and the Sabbath-day." Sections 7 and 8, are as follows:

---

\* Catechism, as above, pp. 8—11, Church and Book Society, New York.



“As it is of the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God so, in his Word, by a positive, moral and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him (Ex. 20 : 8, 10, 11 ; Isa. 56 : 2, 4, 6, 7), which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week, (Gen. 2 : 2, 3 ; 1 Cor. 16 : 1, 2 : Acts 20 : 7), and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord’s-day (Rev. 1 : 10), and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath.” (Ex. 20 : 8, 10, with Matt. 5 : 17, 18.)

“This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations (Ex. 20 : 8 ; 16 : 23, 25, 26, 29, 30 ; 31 : 15-17, Isa. 58 : 13, Neh. 13 : 15-22), but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.” (Isa. 58 : 13 ; Matt. 12 : 1-13.)\*

Those branches of the Church which have sprung from the “Continental” stock, and have found a home in America, are less positive and rigid in their Sunday creeds. The Reformed Church in America (Dutch) accepts the “Heidelberg Catechism,” and the “Canons of the Synod of Dort,” as doctrinal standards. The catechism, as issued by the Board of Publication, New York, varies slightly from the

---

\* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 3, pp. 648, 649.

text as given by Dr. Schaff,\* and adds references to the Scriptures which are assumed to support the statements made in answer to the 103d question. The following is from the American edition:

“ Q. 103. What doth God require in the fourth command ?

A. First; that the ministry of the gospel, and the schools be maintained; and that I, especially on the Sabbath, that is, on the day of rest, diligently frequent the church of God, to hear his Word, to use the sacraments, publicly to call on the Lord, and contribute to the relief of the poor, as becomes a Christian; secondly, that all the days of my life I cease from my evil works, and yield myself to the Lord, to work by his Holy Spirit in me; and thus begin in this life the eternal Sabbath.”

In the “Canons of Dort,” and in the “Belgic Confession” as accepted by this church in America, no reference is made to the observance of Sunday. †

The Lutheran Church, accepting the “Augsburg Confession,” teaches the ecclesiastical theory. Witness the following :

“ What shall we think, then, of the Lord’s-day and church ordinances and ceremonies ? To this our learned men respond, that it is lawful for bishops or pastors to make ordinances, that things be done orderly in the church ; not that we should purchase by them remission of sins, or that we can satisfy for sins, or that consciences are bound to judge them necessary, or to think that they sin who without offending others break them.” . . .

“ Even such is the observation of the Lord’s-day,

\* Creeds, etc., Vol. 3, p. 345.

† Ib., Vol. 3.

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

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

#### THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The "Articles of Religion," as put forth by the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, contain no

---

\*The Unaltered Augsburg Confession, pp. 174, 175, N. Y., 1850.

reference to the Sunday question.\* Among its denominational publications are several tracts on the Sabbath question. Two of these—one entitled, “The Proper Observance of the Sabbath as taught in the Scriptures, and the other, “The American Sabbath”—indicate that their views thus expressed, are of the modified Puritan, or “Anglo-American” school. Two others, put forth, one in 1878, and one in 1880, are specially intended to defend the Sunday against the Sabbath. The utterances of this church in its various organic forms are also in favor of the religious, orthodox observance of Sunday. So that although the creed *per se* does not affirm anything directly concerning the question under consideration, it is just to catalogue the Methodist Episcopal Church with those who believe in the Sabbatic observance of Sunday, on the general basis of the “Westminster” platform.

#### THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

The Baptist Church has already been classified with the branches which accept the Westminster platform concerning Sunday. The views of the “Regular” Baptists are put forth in detail, in the following extracts from the “Directory,” by Dr. Hiscox :

#### “THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.”

“We believe the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord’s-day, or Christian Sabbath, and is to be kept sacred to religious purposes; by

---

\* See Schaff, Creeds, etc., Vol. 3, p. 807, seq.

abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreations, by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private and public; and by preparation for that rest that remaineth for the people of God."

"PLACES IN THE BIBLE WHERE TAUGHT."

1. "Acts 20 : 7, On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them. Gen. 2 : 3, Col. 2 : 16, 17, Mark 2 : 27, John 20 : 19, 1 Cor. 16 : 1, 2."

2. "Ex. 20 : 8, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Rev. 1 : 10, I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day. Psa. 118 : 24, This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it."

3. "Isa. 58 : 13, 14, If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob. Isa. 56 : 2-8."

4. "Psa. 118 : 15, The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous."

5. "Heb. 10 : 24, 25, Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is. Acts. 11 : 26, A whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. Acts 13 : 44, The next Sabbath-day, came almost the whole city together, to hear the Word of God. Lev. 19 : 30, Ex. 46 : 3, Luke 4 : 16, Acts 17 : 2, 3, Psa. 26 : 8; 87 : 3."

6. "Heb. 4 : 3-11, Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest."\*

---

\* Baptist Church Directory, by E. T. Hiscox, D. D., pp. 171, 172.

Very slight analysis is needed to show that all these theories are based on the parent theory of the Romish Church. That was the first theory promulgated concerning Sunday observance. It was not essentially modified until the Puritan movement, at the close of the sixteenth century. That movement added the *claim* that the fourth commandment had been, or might be transferred to the Sunday. But since candor and intelligence are forced to admit that the Scriptures do not authorize such a transfer, the Puritan theory only "changes the place, and keeps the pain," and fails to lift Sunday-keeping above the level of human authority. The battle must still be kept in array around this vital issue, viz.: *are the Scriptures, God's Word, the ultimate authority concerning the Sabbath, or shall these be set aside, and the custom of the church, and the civil law be accepted in their stead?*

The undeniable fact that the Sabbatic observance of Sunday has become a thing of the past to so great an extent in the United States, shows that the loose and indefinite creeds given above have little or no power over the lives of those who assert them. Such disastrous results must always come when men cut loose from the Word of God, or compromise between the demands of his law and their own earth-born theories.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

# OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is now pertinent to inquire what the actual state of the case is as regards the practical observance of the Sunday under these creeds as given in the preceding chapter, and the additional influences which are at work. In presenting this part of the picture we shall aim to give the opinions of representative men who have lately spoken, rather than our own opinions, since it is easy to charge an author with "manufacturing facts," when he gives only his own conclusions. The best exposition of "orthodox" opinions, as now held is found in the late volume of Sabbath Essays, written in 1879, which has already been referred to in former pages. The volume is valuable as an embodiment of current history. First, note the following :

"THE AMERICAN SABBATH."

*By Rev. Edward S. Atwood of Salem, Mass.*

"It needs only slight alteration of accent to change holy-day into holiday ; and yet what practical shift of emphasis of that sort has been effected in regard to the American Sabbath has been wrought by a multitude of factors working through more than a

century of national life. That the general estimate of the Lord's-day has undergone serious modification is beyond question; that the present trend of popular thought is towards a more exhaustive denial of its special sanctity is equally evident. There is reason for sorrow and alarm in the fact that the nation has been swept so far from its original status; there is ground for comfort and hope in the fact that the drift has been so slow, in spite of the push of almost irresistible winds and tides."

In the conclusion that the "drift has been slow," Mr. Atwood will find many who cannot agree with him, but who, on the contrary, will see a most *rapid* change, especially during the present century. The facts which he goes on to enumerate indicate rather a swift decline than a slow drifting. It is more nearly like the fatal sinking of a fever than the gradual advances of a chronic disease. In the next paragraph Mr. Atwood says:

"The actual decline in Sabbath reverence is best measured by contrasting initial and terminal facts. In 1620 a company of Pilgrims, after a wearisome voyage, making an exploration for a place to land, are driven by stress of weather to an unknown island, and, finding themselves unable to regain the ship before the Sabbath, spend the Lord's-day unsheltered in the bleak, wintry air, rather than seem to trespass on holy time. In this year of grace, great excursion-steamers plough through the same waters on the Sabbath, loaded with pleasure-seekers, and the shores of Clark's Island echo back the sound of careless laughter and the crash of bands. In 1621, when the very existence of the colony seems to depend upon friendly relations with the Indians, chief Samoset and a company of his braves make their ap-



pearance on Sabbath morning, and commence overtures of peace by a proffer of traffic; but, in spite of the imminence of the crisis, the sturdy Pilgrim refuses to desecrate the Lord's-day by business, and the embassy retires in ill humor, leaving the aspect of affairs more threatening than ever. In this year of grace, on each Sabbath-day, railway trains are thundering north, south, east and west; metropolitan post-offices are alive with a corps of busy workers; manufactories are taking advantage of the time to make repairs in the machinery; steam presses are clattering with preparation for the issue of the morning journals; the cry of the news boys with their Sunday papers dins the ears of the worshipers on their way to church; public pleasure resorts find it their most profitable day for business; restaurants and saloons have a thriving trade; and sacred (?) concerts and a variety of entertainments fill out the last of the holy hours. I am aware that this is a partial showing of American Sabbath observance; there is another side to the matter; but these things *are*, and must be set in contrast with the things that *were*."

And this in Boston? Let the reader remember that it is not of Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, Paris or Berlin, that Mr. Atwood writes these trenchant words. It is Boston, the home of Puritanism and of culture; the place yet holding the memory of days when no man could even smoke tobacco within two miles of a church on Sunday, unpunished, or stay away from the public worship unchallenged. As a fact in history, however the reader may look upon the merits of the case, it is a sweeping and most significant change. It indicates also another important feature of the subject which

these pages are considering, viz., the Sunday Laws. On this point Mr. Atwood says :

“ An almost equal difference is noticeable in the legislation of the two periods. The first codification of the laws of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was made in 1648, in the framing of which Bellingham and Cotton had a large share. In the first draught of those laws by Mr. Cotton, among the crimes punishable with death was ‘ Profaning the Lord’s-day in a careless or scornful neglect or contempt thereof.’ This penalty was erased by Winthrop, and it was ‘ left to the discretion of the court to inflict other punishment short of death.’ In Connecticut it was enacted in 1643, that ‘ Profanation of the Lord’s-day shall be punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporal punishment ; and, if proudly and with a high hand against the authority of God, with death.’ The earlier legislation of New York, as represented by the ‘ Decrees and Ordinances of Peter Stuyvesant,’ 1647-48, makes special provision for securing the sanctity of the Sabbath. All of the original States of the Union had Sabbath-laws on their statute-books, and the same thing has been true in the growth of the Republic. Every commonwealth in the land makes formal recognition of the Lord’s-day in its laws ; and the general government adds the weight of its sanction, in its provision for a rest-day for its employes. But in this year of grace (1879) stormy mass-meetings demand the abrogation of these laws, and widely circulated journals and pamphlets declaim against this infringement of the rights of man. The provisions still stand on the statute-book, but, as ‘ *inter arma silent leges* ;’ so in this war of opposition they are not executed, and to a great extent, all over the land, the Sabbath-law is a dead letter so far as its restraint upon individual conduct is concerned.

During the first century and a quarter of American history, the shift in popular sentiment in the direc-

tion of looseness in the matter of Sabbath observance was exceedingly slow and comparatively insignificant. No small stress has been laid on the demoralizing influence of the war of the Revolution, and by many it is thought that the first damaging blow was then struck at the Puritan idea. It is questionable, however, whether far more mischief was not wrought by the epidemic of French infidelity which set in immediately after the recognition of the Republic—a sneering, mocking unfaith in every thing sacred, which became the vogue in high circles, and numbered among its adherents men of brilliant talents and foremost station, like Aaron Burr and Thomas Jefferson. The religious criticism and disbelief of the times were hardly likely to leave undisturbed in the popular reverence the institution of the Sabbath, which was one of the mightiest pillars of the temple they were endeavoring to overthrow. . . .

“The second period in the history of the American Sabbath may be loosely said to cover a period of some forty years, commencing with the revival and wonderful stimulation of the material prosperity of the country after the close of the war of 1812. There had been a previous development of industrial enterprise, but it seems trivial in the light of to-day. The hum of the spindles had not yet been heard in Lowell and Lawrence, and Manchester and Fall River, and the great manufacturing centers of New England. Buffalo and Chicago, and the teeming cities of the West, had not yet entered even into the dreams of the most enterprising capitalists. Commerce crept slowly in diminutive vessels from port to port. A ship of five hundred tons was considered a wonder. Railways and steam-boats and telegraphs and labor-saving machinery were yet to come. But they came; and between 1820 and 1860 there was in America the most amazing development, the most magnificent flowering-out of industrial enterprise, which

the world has ever seen. The financial depression of 1837 arrested the progress for a moment, and then the push onwards was more impetuous than before. In the hurry and fever of that hot race sacred things lost their sanctity. The spiritual was subordinated to the material. It is true that within this period religion caught something of the same spirit of enterprise, and concentered and crystallized its enthusiasms in great benevolent organizations, like the American Board, and similar corporations. At the same time, it is undeniably true that a process of disintegration was going on in the religious sentiment of the people. Spirituality was losing its hold, and business was tightening its grip. The money-making day was getting to be more highly esteemed than the Lord's-day. But along with this, and more than this, immigration was introducing a vast alien element into the population of the country. The ocean was turned into a vast highway, over which day and night tramped the unending procession of those who were seeking these shores. They came from lands where the Sabbath is a holiday, and they brought their Sabbath with them. The elasticity of American laws regulating religious liberty allowed them large license in this matter of Sabbath observance. The coercion of the civil statute went no farther than the restraint put upon open business, and the requirement of non-disturbance of worshipers. It was nearly equivalent to no restriction. Between those two poles there was room for a whole globe of laxity. Sabbath pleasure-resorts began to multiply; Sabbath entertainments were inaugurated in the great cities. The roads grew thick with the dust, and the harbors were white with the sails, of the holiday seekers. The desecration of the day was bad enough in itself, but it was worse in its influence. It continually stood out as a protest, and flaunted its defiance at the American idea of the Sabbath. More than that, by

contrast it had its fascination. It was attractive to the young and thoughtless. Its freedom and sparkle were tempting to the man whose confining labor had indisposed him to serious thought. And so, gradually, the European theory began to color and modify the American theory, encroaching more and more, and striking its stain deeper and deeper, until the panic of 1857 broke upon the country, and over the *debris* of ruined fortunes and shattered business the Spirit of God marched through the land, and through the new-born religious enthusiasm of thousands, the day recovered something of the old reverence of the popular heart.

“The third period in the history of the American Sabbath—the period in which we are now living—commenced with the war of the Rebellion. In a paper read before the National Sabbath Convention at Saratoga, in 1863, Dr. Philip Schaff said, ‘The severest trial through which the American Sabbath ever had to pass, or is likely to pass in the future, is the civil war which has now been raging with increasing fury for more than two years. The desecration of the Sabbath soon after the outbreak of the war increased at a most alarming rate, and threatened the people with greater danger than the Rebellion itself.’ The accuracy of the prophecy has been abundantly proved. Probably no great war was ever carried on in which such strenuous endeavor was made to secure the *morality*, as well as the *morale*, of the army. The ‘orders’ of some of the commanders, conspicuous among which are ‘general orders’ of the President himself, read like sermons eliminated of their dullness. A corps of the Christian Commission marched with every brigade and division of the grand army, and pitched their tents or built their chapels for Sabbath worship. Religious books and newspapers were widely circulated. In field and hospital alike devoted chaplains labored to keep alive reverence for

God and his laws. The postal service transmitted thousands of letters filled with religious counsel. The whole atmosphere was tremulous with prayer. And yet in a little more than a decade after all this, the outlook is so threatening that a convention is in session in the metropolis of New England to devise measures to re-establish and perpetuate the sanctity of the Lord's-day.

“History repeats itself. Just as after the war of the Revolution, French infidelity saw and was quick to embrace its opportunity to infatuate men with its frivolous criticisms upon Christianity; so in the last decade English materialism and German mysticism have taken advantage of the relaxed condition of the popular thought to push themselves into prominence, and secure acceptance. Next to the Word of God the Sabbath is the Gibraltar of the Christian system, the imperial fortress that secures the whole Mediterranean of revealed religion. It is, therefore, nothing surprising that the assaults upon it should be so sharp and so persistent. Materialism and mysticism both see that it is easier to induce men to loosen their grip upon an institution than it is to persuade them to renounce a system, especially where their hold upon that institution has been relaxed by some great strain of national history; but materialism and mysticism see with equal clearness that with the Sabbath swept away, or essentially modified in its observance, complete victory is only a question of time. Happily, but none too soon, the church of God sees it also, and is beginning to prepare itself for the coming Armageddon of American Christianity.

“There are three things that at the present time specially stand in the way of the perpetuity of the American Sabbath:

“I. *The impotence of the civil law.* To what extent it is wise and well to push the endeavor to secure the observance of the Lord's-day by legislation

it is not the province of this paper to discuss ; but so long as restrictive regulations stand upon the statute-books, and are not adjudged illegal or unjust, *they should be enforced*, and their annexed penalties inflicted, whether the violator be an individual or a great corporation. That they are operative, except in a trivial and farcical way, no man pretends. Now and then some poor beggar is under arrest for card-playing on the Sabbath ; but the managers of great Sunday excursions, that turn out to be perfect pandemoniums, coolly pocket their profits, and defy the authorities to touch them. The inaction of the law breeds contempt of the law and of that which the law is set to guard. The paralysis of the civil arm encourages outrage. The danger in this quarter is incalculable. Few men have even *read* the Sabbath-laws of this Commonwealth, and fewer still have urged their enforcement. It is well judged by interested parties, that the inefficiency of the statutes is due to the fact that there is no solid public sentiment that supports them ; and, where this is lacking, the technic of the code is as powerless as the Pope's bull against the comet.

“ II. A second danger lies in *the false notions of personal liberty* that are obtaining with great masses of the population, and which are humored, if not fostered, by political leaders for party ends. The clamor in New York and Cincinnati and Chicago, against Sabbath-laws as an infringement upon the rights of the individual, is not sporadic, but symptomatic. Communism is half-sister of republicanism ; and those subtle and perilous theories of freedom that privilege every man to do as he pleases under a representative government have made surprising headway. Restraint on what seems to be the *religious* side is peculiarly obnoxious. Political fallacies re-enforce personal preferences in the attempt to secularize the Sabbath ; and in a country like ours that

constitutes a formidable alliance. That central truth of State-craft, liberty under authority, imperatively calls for re-affirmation. The subordination of individual right to the general good, the limitation of personal privilege by the common need, are integral elements in a stable national life ; but in some directions there is strenuous endeavor made to remand them to obscurity ; and especially in the matter of abrogating or neutralizing Sabbath-law, in the name of liberty, there is surprising persistence and enthusiasm.

“ III. The third and, perhaps, greatest peril is the *apathy of the Christian church*. The assembling of this convention might seem to refute that statement, but at most it is only a late confession of sin. From time to time some of the pulpits of the land have been outspoken on the subject, and ecclesiastical bodies have formulated their faith, and then buried it in the sepulchre of a series of resolutions ; but the work has too often been merely perfunctory, and seldom if ever has been followed by the edge and flame of enthusiastic effort. Our dearly-bought rights in this matter, inherited from the fathers, have many of them been wrested from our hands ; and the church has made its little moan over the theft, but has uttered no strong protest, and put forth no mighty endeavor to recover its lost jewels. As we contemplate the future of the American Sabbath, the darkest cloud that looms above the horizon is the indifference of the nominal Christianity of the land. The church of God is the one sovereign human instrumentality by whose efficiency or inefficiency the position of the Lord’s-day, in the estimate of the coming generations, is to be settled ; and, since the beginnings of Christianity, no graver responsibility has been laid upon the discipleship than rests upon it at this hour and in this particular.

“ It has been the peculiar boast of the Christianity



of the land that in no country was the actual so nearly the ideal Sabbath as in America. There have been times when that was true. The shrewd French observer Duponceau once said that, 'of all we claimed as characteristic, our observance of the Sabbath is the only one truly national and American.' That boast is not wholly without warrant still. The closed doors of the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia preached a manly and eloquent sermon. The Sabbath stillness in the halls of magistracy, in banks and custom-houses, in great manufactories whose din and smoke fill the air the other six days, the church-bells that ring out in city and village, and the thousands that gather for worship—these things must not be forgotten or undervalued. And yet undeniably there is a vast drift of popular sentiment the other way—a drift that is steadily growing in volume and momentum, which has already gone too far, which must be arrested soon, or it will become irresistible."\*

Such are Mr. Atwood's views. His paper is a valuable one. Some points in it will be considered in a succeeding chapter, when we come to consider the "Verdict of History." The decline in regard for Sunday, which Mr. Atwood describes as being so marked in 1879, has increased with accumulating momentum, until 1884 and 1885 have seen more widespread and defiant trampling on Sunday, in Boston and elsewhere, than any previous period has shown. Disregard for Sunday rushes over the land like an avalanche nearing the foot of the mountain.

In these same Sabbath Essays, Rev. Reuben

---

\* Sabbath Essays, pp. 262-271.

Thomas, of Brookline, Mass., presents a paper upon "The Sabbath and Our Foreign Population." Speaking of their relation to the Sunday question in America, he says :

"But what of Germany in regard to this question? Probably her population, thronging the cities of the expansive and fertile West, will exercise here an influence for good or evil in many things, the magnitude of which is hardly yet perceived even by the men of keenest vision. The vote of our German population will, I fear, be adverse to any thing like a perpetuation of the old New England ideas of the Sabbath. We have only to visit Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Chicago, and other cities, to see in what direction things are moving. On Sunday Cincinnati is little else than a huge beer-garden rapidly on its way to become a huge beer-garden.

"I was in Chicago in July, occupying the pulpit of the Second Presbyterian Church for three Sundays. The First Presbyterian Church is within a few hundred yards. Other influential churches are in that immediate neighborhood. But the whole of them together are not strong enough to prevent the opening of a huge beer hall and garden close to their very doors. This, be it remarked, in what is considered the most respectable part of the city, where some of the wealthiest Chicago merchants live. This beer hall and garden is open every day of the week, but it seems to be particularly open on Sundays. On the Sunday in July to which I refer it seemed to have a patronage far in excess of the most popular churches. And 'if these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?' If they be done in the very teeth of the most influential religious men of a city, what will they do in those populous parts where the poorer men and women

congregate, and from whence too often churches emigrate ?”\*

The papers for November, 1884, say that “Sunday theatrical performances are tolerated by law in five of the principal cities in the United States: San Francisco, Cincinnati, St. Louis, New Orleans, and Chicago. Chicago has eleven regular theatres open Sunday night.” So the tide increases.

Under the head of “Corporations and the Sabbath,” Rev. W. F. Mallalieu, D. D., of Chelsea, Mass., makes the following statements. It will be seen that his statements assume that Boston and Massachusetts represent the rest of the United States. Whereas it is undoubtedly true that the “desecration” of Sunday is far greater in many other places than in Boston and Massachusetts.

“The great Sabbath-breaking corporations of the country are those controlling the railroads and steam-boats.

“Boston and Massachusetts may serve as an example of the manner in which the Sabbath is desecrated all over the country.

“Twenty-five years ago such a thing as a Sunday steam-boat excursion was unknown; but now, all through the summer months, the harbor of Boston is alive with excursions. The last summer was worse in this regard than any that has preceded it, and the next threatens to be worse than this.

“The churches are shut, or only open a half-day; ministers are away, the saints are scattered or asleep, and the devil holds high carnival. Press and pulpit are alike silent on the open and shameless violation

---

\* Sabbath Essays, pp. 321, 322.

of the laws of God and men ; and some go so far in their mawkish sympathy as mildly to apologize for all this wickedness. So much for the religious press and the pulpit. The secular press is utterly silent, or approves of the Sabbath desecration.

“ But the railroads centering in Boston are worse, if possible, than the steam-boats. Twenty-five years ago the running of a train of cars for any purpose was a thing to be remarked ; but now there is not an exception to the desecration of the Sabbath by any road. Not only are passenger trains run on Sunday, but also freight, and these, in some instances, connecting with steam-boats, as is notably the case with some of the lines running to New York.

“ This deplorable condition of affairs is growing worse and worse from year to year ; and from present indications these great corporations will in the future as thoroughly ignore the existence of the Sabbath as though there were none.

“ Along the same line of operations we see that the horse-railroads, especially in the summer-time, make the Sabbath their harvest-day. Then it is that they are thronged by pleasure-seekers and Sunday visitors, who are thoroughly careless of the Sabbath. These roads are run, not as a matter of necessity or mercy, but simply and solely for the money that is to be made.

“ These corporations, controlling the steam-boats, steam-railroads, and horse-railroads, are the great, shameless, audacious, defiant leaders in the sin of public Sabbath-breaking.

“ The evil consequences of this Sabbath violation are threefold :

“ I. First, there is involved the necessity of the employment of vast numbers of men to carry on the work that must be performed. Tens of thousands of men are employed by these corporations every

Sabbath; and it is an almost impossible thing for any man habitually to violate the law of God in the desecration of the Sabbath, and still maintain a high standard or morality. The universal experience and observation of many years in this connection establish the fact that the character of workmen will deteriorate in morals in proportion as they neglect the Sabbath. The men themselves may, or may not, be conscious—probably they are not—of the effect produced; but still it is none the less certain and destructive. And they seem to be equally unconscious of the fact that the tendency of late years has been to keep the wages of laboring men down to the very lowest point of comfortable support; and in many cases they have been reduced so low that only with the utmost exertion could the necessaries of life be obtained, especially where growing families have been dependent. The result has been, that by working six days in a week, and three hundred and thirteen days in a year, honest hard-working men have just been able to take care of themselves and their families. Now, the inevitable consequences of the Sabbath-breaking so recklessly engaged in by these corporations will be, first, the destruction of the morals of the workmen; and, secondly, the establishment of such conditions of labor that it will take three hundred and sixty-five days' toil to secure the same comforts of life as are now procured by the labor of three hundred and thirteen days. Hence *the Sabbath-breaking corporations are the worst enemies of the working man*; and this, equally in regard to his social, moral, and religious interests. And it should be added, with special emphasis, that any system or institution which debases thus the working men affects in like manner their families. Nor can it be doubted that the security of our national future and the continuance of our present form of government, to say nothing of the success of the

Christian church, depend very largely upon the social, moral, and religious status of our working men. Hence, in just so far as the corporations degrade the character of working men by their conscienceless Sabbath desecration, they are the enemies of the Republic.

“II. Again, the great transportation corporations under consideration constitute one of the greatest educational forces of modern society; and it must be acknowledged, that, so far as they are related to the observance of the Sabbath, their educational influence is all in the wrong direction.

“In the olden time, when good people and the community, almost without exception, laid aside their usual employments at the close of the week, and carefully abstained from all labor on the Sabbath: when a quiet hush settled down on home and street, on shop and farm, every child conscious at all of what was taking place around him could but feel that he was brought into the presence of the divine command which produced these results, and almost into the presence of the divine Being who had given the command. This influence was felt not only by the children, but also by the youth, and, in fact, by all classes of people. From the very necessities of the case the minds of the people were called away from worldly and secular concerns, and all were compelled to feel that there were moral and religious obligations resting upon them which had been imposed by the Ruler of the universe. The quiet of the Sabbath, and the cessation of all servile and unnecessary labor on that day, were moral forces for the conservation of the best interests of society which were of immeasurable consequence.

“How different the conditions under which the people of this country are placed to-day! In a thousand towns and cities may be heard the scream of the locomotive and the rush of the railroad train.

Steam-boat excursions, and other means of Sunday pleasure travel, are abundantly supplied. The ordinary time-tables, and flaming handbills conspicuously displayed, announce the business of the Sabbath with the same particularity as that of ordinary weekdays. The newspapers advertise Sunday excursions with as much regularity as they do the services of the sanctuary; and they give, in many instances, fuller notices of Sunday excursions and frolics than they do of the sermons.

“The boy living on the hillside farm in the most rural town through which the railroad runs, looking upon the Sabbath trains that pass, whether freight or passenger, will, unless there be some mighty counter-acting moral force, gradually and imperceptibly fall into the way of thinking that the Sabbath has no special sacredness; and the end, in many cases, will be, that he becomes thoroughly indifferent to the claims of God which demand that he should keep holy the Sabbath-day. Let this same youth, thus perverted from the right and good way, become the father of a family, and, if his wife be like himself, his children will in all probability grow up in practical heathenism.

“Now, the same influences are operating upon unnumbered thousands, not only in our large cities and centers of population, but to a greater or less extent all over the country.

“The Pilgrim Fathers left Holland, the land that had protected them and given them a home and shelter, and dared the perils of the sea and the wilderness, because they would not bring up their children in the godless society which surrounded them; but our children and youth are, in some respects, surrounded by as deplorable influences as those of Holland. If things go on as they have done for the last twenty-five years, there seems to be great danger that we shall become a nation of Sabbath-breakers,

and as always happens in such cases, an immoral and irreligious nation, and, consequently, a nation upon which will rest the frown and curse of Almighty God."\*

Treating the same phase of the question under the head of "The Sabbath and Railroads and Steamboats," Hon. William E. Dodge, of New York, puts the case as follows :

"Railroads have wrought wonders in the rapid development and general prosperity of our country during the last half-century. They have become the great highway for the millions; have vastly increased travel; brought the distant parts of the country together; given to traffic and commerce a new impulse; equalized values of the soil and manufactory; made a journey of thousands of miles but as a pleasure trip: and, with the aid of the telegraph, have enabled merchants while residing thousands of miles away to sell and buy in our principal coast cities, and even fix a date of delivery. They are building up vast centers of traffic along these lines; have added untold millions of wealth to the country, and are increasing at a most rapid rate; and, in a few years, will have united our entire country with iron bands. They have become every day more and more an absolute necessity.

"With *thousands of millions* invested, hundreds of thousands of our citizens employed in connection with their direct management, and furnishing the necessary machinery and material, and with the vast number of stockholders and the entire traveling community, their moral influence is beyond calculation.

"But if railroads, with all these wonderful advantages cannot be conducted without changing the

---

\* Sabbath Essays, pp. 334-338.



habits and customs of our people, and trampling on the right of the community to a quiet day for rest and worship, and training up the thousands in their employ to desecrate the Sabbath, and rushing by our cities and towns and quiet villages, screaming as they go, *No Sabbath! No Sabbath!*—then they will become a real curse rather than a blessing. Consider the vast sums invested; the great competition of the principal trunk-lines, the constantly increasing demands for rapid passenger trains, and the press of freight to the seaboard, becoming every year larger, particularly that bound for Europe, much of it sold for shipment by special steamers, and intended so to arrive as to be in time for trans shipment at once, or with the least possible delay or expense; parties perhaps in Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, or Cincinnati—these having been made ports of entry and shipping direct to all parts of the world—telegraphing the superintendent of the road, ‘We have shipped to-day twenty-five cars of wheat, or perhaps ten cars of live-stock, which are to be delivered to such a steamer on such a day; and we shall depend on your giving us rapid transit and prompt delivery.’ Now, this superintendent feels his responsibility, and by this continual press and excitement, which the system of railroads and telegraphs almost of necessity creates, has come to lose all thoughts of the Sabbath, or perhaps has tried to convince his conscience that these long lines of inland transportation are like ocean travel—not expected to stop on the Sabbath.

“These difficulties are constantly increasing; so that, whereas a few years ago the running of freight trains on the Sabbath was the exception, now, on many of our trunk-lines leading from the West, there are more on the Sabbath than on other days, as the passenger trains are generally less, and they use the Sabbath to make up lost time, and hurry on the freight to the sea-board. The constant extension

of lines west and north, tributary to these trunk-lines, only increases the evil; and, unless some prompt measure can be adopted soon, the matter of Sabbath desecration by our railroads will be past prevention.

“In regard to passenger traffic, there is very great difficulty in drawing the line between entire rest and the running of such trains as the general public would demand for long or through travel, trains for the carrying of the mail, and, near our cities, milk trains. If our railroad managers could be made to feel their obligations to God, to the morals of the country, and their duty to their employes, so as on these long lines of travel to run only a single mail train each way on the Sabbath, it would of itself go far to honor God’s day of rest.

“The fact is, the railroad interest has become the all-powerful, overshadowing interest of the country, and ever year is adding to its influence. Railroads will double in the next twenty years; and what is done must be done promptly, or their power will be beyond control. The question of the day, for every man who loves his country and believes in the importance and value of the Christian Sabbath, as we in America have cherished and honored it—I say the great question is, Shall this vast railroad interest be so conducted as to prove a *blessing* to the land? or shall it defy and trample on all we hold dear, and become one of the principal instruments in changing our American Sabbath into the Continental holiday? or, as it is fast growing, a day like all the others of the week?”\*

After detailing some efforts that have been made to correct the matter of Sunday trains, Mr. Dodge continues in these words :

---

\* Sabbath Essays, pp. 342-345.

“Our great cities are suffering from the demands of the foreign population that the Sabbath shall be a day of recreation for themselves and families; and in some of our cities the Continental Sabbath begins to appear. The railroads and steam-boats are ready to meet this desire; and now thousands crowd every conveyance that will carry them out into the country for a holiday; and our new lines of elevated roads in New York, while a great convenience on week-days, are becoming a great nuisance on the Sabbath, and are run for no other reason than to make money.

“Trains are rushing up and down our avenues as if determined to wipe out every vestige of the Christian Sabbath; and yet the men who started and now control these elevated roads are men who profess to value the Sabbath and the house of God. Very recently they have put up large placards advertising with great prominence that trains will run on the Sabbath regularly, from half-past seven in the morning until half-past seven in the evening, from the Battery to Harlem.

“A few years since, the Sabbath committee addressed a communication to a large number of railroads, asking to know if they ran trains on Sunday, and, if so, how many, and their experience as to its being, on the whole, profitable or otherwise, and their views as to the necessity of running trains, and particularly common and freight trains.

“They received replies from a very large number, sixty-five reporting that they did no work on Sunday; others, that they only ran mail or milk trains; others, that they did as little as possible; and many expressing anxiety to stop all work on the Sabbath for the sake of their men. *The general excuse of many was that the running of the trunk-lines and competing roads made it necessary, though they would prefer to rest on the Sabbath.* The impression, on the whole was favorable, and encouraged efforts to se-

cure a general suspension of all freight trains, and reduction of passenger trains.

“The rapid growth of the railroads, and their danger if not checked, should arouse to effort every lover of the Sabbath. What we do, we must do at once. In all our principal cities, influences are at work to undermine and secularize our American Sabbath. Let there be one earnest, united effort of God’s people; let the clergy ring out the danger from the pulpits; the religious and, as far as possible, the secular press enlighten the people as to the necessity and value of a day of rest for the working man. Above all, let there be constant, earnest prayer for a general revival of religion all over the land, that the Lord of the Sabbath would open the eyes of the nation to a true sense of its necessity.

“And now I want to say [throwing aside his manuscript] that I came up here with the idea that, as Christians, we were awake to the fact that we were just on the eve of losing our Sabbath. I know that you, perhaps, in New England, in your quiet villages, do not understand it as we do in the cities—as our Western cities do, with these railroads rushing through the towns and villages everywhere, and with their shops at work on Sunday, and with every thing indicating that this gigantic power of railroads is to be increased. For it is but in its infancy to-day; and when it shall be fifty years older than it is now, unless something is done to check this evil to-day by the Christian people of this country, it will be altogether too late. There will be three times the number of miles of railroad in twenty years from now that there are to-day, and there is a monstrous responsibility connected with it. It is not only the railroad interest, but there is a constant letting-down of the Sabbath even by Christians throughout the country. We must look the difficulties right in the face, just as they are, and ask what we can do,

and ought to do, as Christians. What we want to do, friends, is to fasten on the Sabbath, if we love it, if we cherish it, if we want our children and children's children to enjoy what we have enjoyed. God has spared my life for more than threescore years and ten; and I look back to the quiet village in Connecticut where I was brought up, and I cherish the New England Sabbath, and I hope my children and children's children will know something of its value.

“But, if we would do anything, let us be about it; and, above all things, let Christian men who are interested in these railroads ask themselves the question whether they can properly be partners in concerns that are deliberately breaking down the Sabbath. What an effect would be produced among our Western railroad men if it were known that the New England Christian men and the New England men who were not professed Christians, but who loved New England's quiet that had grown out of the Sabbath, would ask as the first question, when they were called upon to invest in a Western railroad, ‘Is your road going to run on Sunday?’ and, if the answer was in the affirmative, then they would say, ‘I don't want the stock!’” Would that Christian men in New England would ask themselves the question on their knees before God, whether they could conscientiously hold stock in railroads that were paying them dividends earned by breaking down the Sabbath! I think that many of them, as they offered a prayer to God for the Sabbath, would find their mouths stopped before God when they remembered that they were partners in these gigantic companies that were rushing through the land, and destroying every vestige of the Sabbath.

“And now, one thing more. God lives, *God lives*, and God hears prayer. If you look back over the long history of the New England church, you will find that God has been the hearer and answerer of

prayer. But what we want now is one of those old-fashioned New England revivals throughout the length and breadth, not only of New England, but of the land; and if Christian men and women will only act like Christian men and women, and hold no communion with the works of darkness, and refuse to be associated with an institution that will dishonor the Sabbath, we will see a great change for the better." \*

Be it remembered that the foregoing writers are men of character and position, religious men, deeply anxious and intensely earnest in their efforts to save the Sunday from the non-Sabbatic influences which are at work in the United States. It is, therefore, certain that they do not make the case worse than it is. It is also significant that the state of things described by them exists in New England, in the cradle of Puritanism, at Plymouth Rock. Nothing could tell more forcibly the story of the change that has already obtained on the Sunday question in the United States. The results of the late effort to correct the matter by appeal to the civil law is told by a recent writer as follows:

“ THE SUNDAY LAWS OF NEW ENGLAND. ”

“ On alternate Sundays during the past summer a small steam-boat left the wharf of a certain New England city, and after stopping at another city made its way across the water to a summer resort on the coast, returning in the afternoon. In many cities in New England, in a great many out of New England, such excursions are of common weekly occurrence, and neither excite remark nor attract attention, but

in the two cities from which this boat took her departure Sunday excursions were almost unknown, and the advertised trips of the boat provoked remark and criticism. The blowing of her whistle and the blare of her band grated unpleasantly on some unaccustomed ears; her passengers were disorderly, and too often returned helplessly or noisily drunk. Some citizens remonstrated with the proprietors of the boat, but the excursions paid, and the boat went on. A clergyman in one of these cities determined, if it were possible, to enforce the law which this steamboat company openly violated. It is not the purpose of this article to give in detail the progress and result of his undertaking. In one of the cities he failed utterly, the prosecuting officer refusing to entertain the complaint. In the other the case was tried, the officers of the boat fined and they are now awaiting trial in the higher court to which they have appealed.

“This attempt to enforce the law was made the subject of considerable comment by the press in New England and New York, and with very few exceptions the criticisms were hostile both to the law and its attempted enforcement. The Sunday laws of New England were stigmatized as blue laws and antiquated statutes which the world had outlived, and the instigator of the prosecution (or persecution, as it was frequently called) was soundly berated as a fanatical oppressor, or mildly sneered at as a clerical Don Quixote adorned with musty statutes and worm-eaten law-books tilting against the established enterprises of a workaday world.

“The press to a certain extent represents public opinion; that being the case, public opinion to a certain extent must be adverse to some of our Sunday legislation. To show what public opinion as to the observance of the Sabbath *was* the Sunday laws of New England are given below with some recent

decisions interpreting the law. What public opinion on the subject *is* must be left the reader.”\*

Sunday desecration by “Corporations” and by daily newspapers, in 1884-5 towered far above all that 1879 saw and mourned over. As an illustration take the following facts : The doors of the stations on the Philadelphia and Reading R. R. (N. J. Central) were first opened for Sunday traffic in the spring of 1877. The road then ran one train to New York, and one out of New York on Sunday, in accord with a provision of the statutes of New Jersey. The statute remains unchanged ; but public opinion and the demands of travel have changed until the time-table of that road, which took effect Nov. 16th, 1884, at a point twenty-five miles from New York shows *eleven regular passenger trains* running to New York and *ten* running out from that city. Such is the change within seven years.

Julius H. Ward discusses the question in the *Atlantic Monthly* for April, 1881, at length. We extract as follows :

“ THE NEW SUNDAY.”

“Sunday in America has been chiefly the Sunday of England in the seventeenth century transferred by the early colonists to the New World. It has always had the sombre tone of the period coeval with Cromwell and the Puritans. Though colonists came from Europe quite as freely as from England, and brought in the rough their religious institutions with them,

---

\* Walter Learned in “Good Company,” Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 124, 1879.



the Puritan type of thought was stronger than the Anglican or Roman type, and gradually imparted its color and tone to the life of whole country. The intellectual force lay in the minds of the Puritan gentry who founded Harvard and Yale, and the severe type of religious thought characterizing these noble ancestors of a great people had in it that element of leadership which gave it precedence everywhere. The strong hands that nearly choked the English church were not less powerful in a country where they could shape institutions at their will; and in communities where the rough natural industries which precede civilization had the first place in men's thoughts, the dominant ideas of English Puritanism took deeper root and had a more positive influence than they could possibly have had in English life. The nation, in its political development, is greatly indebted to the positive force of these ideas; in the State they met with a counteracting element which modified and broadened them to the needs of the whole country. In the spiritual realm it was not so. There was nothing to counteract Puritanism in religion. The grim colonists were never willing to hear the other side. The Quakers and Baptists, dissenters like themselves, were not allowed to have their say; nor the Anglican Christian from whom they sprang. The narrowness of Puritanism on its religious side is like the narrowness of Scotch Presbyterianism today—the narrowness of the fanatic, the unwillingness to entertain the thought of another; and this narrowness has been transmitted in the Puritan Sunday."

"An instance of the way in which the "lord brethren" ruled when they had the authority of the "lord bishops," as William Blackstone called them, is given in the following draught of a law intended by John Cotton, the minister who emigrated from Boston, in Lincolnshire, for the colony of Massachu

setts : 'Whoever shall profane the Lord's-day by doing unnecessary work, by unnecessary traveling, or by sports and recreations, he or they who so transgress shall forfeit forty shilling or be publicly whipped ; but if it shall appear to have been done presumptuously, such person or persons shall be put to death, or otherwise severely punished, at the discretion of the court.' These extracts indicate sufficiently the severity of the Puritan Sunday when the Puritans had things their own way. What was an act of voluntary religion in England was here enforced, not at the point of the bayonet, but at the instance of a court, in which the power of life or death was at the mercy of a narrow and sensitive conscience.

"It is necessary to go back to this excessive Sabbatarianism in order to explain the present reaction in the observance of Sunday, and to indicate the importance and true position of the day in our present life. The protest against the Puritan Sunday is now universal; even the recent Sabbath Essays—a volume as candid and honest as has ever come from the descendants of the Puritans, intended to bring back the Lord's-day to its rightful place in the religious institutions of a great people—has had hardly a feather's weight upon current opinion. We are borne to-day upon a tide of popular sentiment which is restless at the least interference with the principle of "do as you please" on Sunday. Public opinion is in a state of surge and unrest for which there is no precedent in our history. The old Puritan power has gone; the old Sunday laws are a dead letter; the ancient people no longer carry weight in Church or State: the uncurbed sentiment of a wild democracy in religion dictates the Sunday observance for the coming generation; and we are, as it were, at the meeting of diverse currents, where no "church of the essentials" has yet acquired sufficient influence to take

the leadership of public opinion, as in England, and where the State silently consents to the ignoring of existing law. The extreme of reaction from the unreasonable and uncompromising asceticism of the Puritan Sunday has not, probably, yet been reached, but the temper of the people is to throw off all allegiance to it.

“A great variety of agencies have come to lay claim to Sunday. The change in modern society since the middle of the seventeenth century is not greater in the range of morals than in the domain of practical science. The laws neither of morals nor of science are different from what they have always been, but their expression and application have created a new world in life and thought. The Sunday laws are obsolete, because modern society has gone outside of their range. They were intended at the time of their adoption to forward the interests of Christianity, but their rigorous enforcement to-day would put new burdens upon the laboring classes and thwart the best interests of society. They are the relic of that union of Church and State which, since the days of Constantine, has caused Christianity to depend upon secular aid for its support, and has been the source of its chief corruptions. The prevailing theory of religion has been that it could not maintain itself without State support. This was the view of the Puritans, with whom, as with the people from whom they sprang, Church and State were almost convertible terms; or, rather, the State was simply the secular arm of spiritual power. This idea has colored American legislation with reference to Sunday to the extent that in South Carolina and Vermont, to go no further, attendance upon religious worship on that day is still compulsory;\*

---

\*Sunday Laws. A paper read before the American Bar Association. By Henry E. Young, of the Charleston Bar, 1880.

and, even where there is no compulsion, the opinion of the most influential religionists has so largely controlled the social usage that church-going has been strictly regarded as a mark of respectability. It was assumed that everybody must engage in certain definite acts of worship on Sunday, and the authority of the assumption was unquestioned. It was the secular authority behind social usage. This gave great leverage to outward Christianity, when it was not considered decent to stay away from religious services; and this old tradition of duty, the Puritan church directing the New England State, if it no longer has the secular power of compulsion, is still expressed in the clerical-attitude toward the community at large. It is implied that the attendance upon religious services and the listening to sermons are the principal duties of man on Sunday. Preaching has been the chief act of Puritan worship, and the Sunday services are still controlled by the idea that everybody must 'go to meeting.' It is as if every voter in the commonwealth were a church member, and the church had a personal claim on him. This fiction is now passing away, but, quite naturally, the clergy are slow to see that they have no monopoly of Sunday outside of the people they can call their own. The last act has at length been reached in the tragedy of superstition which for fifteen centuries, under the dream of a Christian State, has induced the leaders of Christianity to depend upon the support of secular authority, when their true strength was in the changed minds and hearts of consecrated people. A strong writer has said,\* 'The greatest triumphs and best days of the gospel were when the States were all heathen. Christian "virtue gives herself light through darkness for to wade," and can hold her own candle better than the

---

\* Rev. Henry N. Hudson, the Shakespearean scholar.

State can hold it for her.' This is the point to which Christian civilization has now come in this country ; this is the upshot of the movement for the taxation of church property. It is the return of the Christian church, after all the centuries of its abasement at the feet of secular power, to the old principle of spiritual direction by which the gospel of Christ first conquered the world. The sooner the conviction is reached through the length and breadth of the American States that Christianity demands protection only to the extent that its adherents shall not be disturbed in the enjoyment of their rights as the children of God, the stronger will the Christian religion be in the hearts or its disciples and in the respect of an agnostic world."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The trend of the new Sunday is in the direction of a healthier and more persuasive Christianity, not wholly nor immediately what all could wish, but enough to give one hope of better things in store. The escape from the narrow requirements of an earlier day may for the moment even be the taking of some steps backward. To see social and religious changes correctly one must not look at them from a local point of view alone. The larger view is more correct, and the larger view of the rapid changes now going on in the observance and use of Sunday ranks them as steps in the wide and general education of a free nation in its many-sided responsibilities to God and man. The way is in preparation for a larger and more important work than Christianity has yet undertaken among us. The present influence of Sunday is to broaden the Christian conception of the possibilities of ethical life, and to uplift mankind on the physical, social, and intellectual, as truly as upon the moral and spiritual side. It is the part of what may be called Christian sagacity and statesmanship to recognize the facts in the present uses of

the Lord's-day for what they mean, and so change the methods in religious worship and instruction that men shall not be without the range of the spiritual renewal of life, and that Christianity shall stand in these days to those who long for light and peace for what it stood in the first days to Peter, James, and John." \*

Just as this chapter is passing through the press, several important testimonies appear in the public prints, which are worthy a place here. The full report of the *Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics* is not yet at hand, but we have collected the following from the public journals. By these it will be seen that Massachusetts, home of Puritanism, and of strict Sunday observance, reveals the startling fact "*that by far the chief part of the pressure by which the Sunday cars were caused to be put on came from the church members and church-going people.*"

"Part II, of the forthcoming 'Report of the Labor Bureau of Massachusetts,' is upon 'Sunday Labor' in that State; and is as the reports of that Bureau always are, an array of facts, leaving the discussion of the moral questions involved to those to whom it properly belongs. The report deals only with the Sunday labor where it is massed, so that there can be some breadth to the facts; and where also there is some question as to necessity for its being done.

"By far the largest of all the industries in the State, in which Sunday labor is systematically done, is that of the railroads. The first railroad train was on what was then the Boston and Worcester road. It began to run on Monday, May 1, 1834, going as

---

\* *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1881, pp. 526-529, and p. 537.

far as Newton, seven miles out. The first train that ran on Sunday was on the second road built in the State, the Boston and Providence. It began to run on Sunday, September 14, 1834, and continues substantially to this day. The old stage line, which this road was displacing, had been accustomed to go through from Providence to Boston on Sunday morning, 'to finish the trip' for those passengers who had come from New York on the Saturday night steam-boat. The railroad from the first did the same (finished the trip), and does to this day, as do all roads where the occasion arises.

"The first strictly Sunday train, *i. e.*, one which began the trip on Sunday, was a daily steam boat train on the same road, which was put on Saturday, April 2, 1836, but which only continued that summer

"On Sunday, July 2, 1837, a Sunday mail train began to run on the Boston and Worcester, which, in some form has continued ever since, except in the six years from '47 to '53, during which period, so far as can be learned, not even a mail train left Boston on Sunday on this road, except when, sometimes, the Cunard mail-steamer arrived too late for the last train Saturday night, and a special was sent through to New York Sunday night. But in May of the latter year a Sunday evening New York mail train was announced, which still continues; and that train inaugurated the present era of Sunday trains.

"The Sunday mail train on the Eastern road had a singularly suggestive history. It was put on as soon as the road began to run in the fall of 1838, and continued till February, 1847. On the last Sunday of that year it was hauled off, apparently because it did not pay, it being understood that the management of the road gave up one-seventh of the contract price to get released from that train; and it

is told in Salem, that on the last train from Boston, on that last Sunday afternoon, no passengers rode but employes of the railroad. Moreover, for many years after, even all during the War, the mail between Salem and Boston was carried by a one-horse wagon, there not being travel enough to pay for any kind of a coach. Indeed, the recent era of Sunday railroading, so far as that road is concerned, did not begin till June, 1872, with the putting on of the Bangor express.

“The Sunday ‘church trains’ were begun in November, 1860, by Mr. Twichell, of the Boston and Worcester, between Brookline and Boston, at the urgent and long-continued solicitation of members of churches who had lived in Boston but now lived in Brookline, and who wanted still to attend upon the ministrations of their Boston pastors. It was twelve years before the next church local was put on (on the Old Colony road), and now for more than twelve years every road has had them in some form. But the chief point of the matter is, that the whole system was begun and extended by church-going people, for church-going purposes; and that from these church excursion trains sprang the whole system of seaside Sunday excursion trains, now so vastly multiplied. A single incident illustrates the whole matter. A preacher who lived out of town, in a village on the Old Colony road, had an opportunity for a number of months of supplying a pulpit on the west side of Boston. The Sunday local which he used reached the City at 10.15 A. M., but he found the quarter of an hour to 10.30 too short to get to his appointment. So he wrote to the proper railroad officer, asking if that train could not be run in five minutes earlier. There is our Sunday excursion system in its germ.

“For some years after the horse railroads were established no cars were run on Sunday. The case



of the Cambridge road is an excellent example. It was at the first, and is yet, officered by conscientious men of the puritan type, who believe in keeping the Sabbath holy; but they were forced, after six years, by the conditions of the life of society in which they abode to yield and run their cars on Sunday.

“And the strange part of it all is, that by far the chief part of the pressure by which the Sunday cars were caused to be put on came from church members and church-going people, who wanted them run for their accommodation in going to church.

“Sunday steam cars and horse cars are by far the largest systematic Sunday industries in Massachusetts, and the others do not call for special mention.

“The investigation brought out two points which may be expected to be of special value in future discussion of the Sunday question, and which appear to be new. One is a classification of labor into two kinds, according to its objects; the other is a showing of the effect of Sunday labor in these two classes upon the health and wage of the laborers. The classification is stated thus:

“Human labor is performed for two purposes, for the production of goods and for personal service. In the first instance, it is applied to materials in a crude state for the production of things in a finished state, and such labor may be classified under the general head of productive labor. In the second instance, it is put forth by man at the demand of his fellow-man for service to his person, either for his convenience, his amusement, or his edification, his cleanliness, or his general bodily wants, and for his whims; and all these forms of labor may be classified as “personal service.”

“The classification being established, the investigation of the Bureau shows a very marked contrast in the effects of the two kinds of labor, both upon the health and wage of laborers. Concerning the

effect on health, setting the brakeman and the plowman, the horse-car conductor and the weaver, in contrast, the following statements are made :

“ ‘The plowman, during all the time that he is at his work, has his muscles all astrain ; but the brakeman does not use his one-tenth of the time.’

Again, referring to an actual instance of a horse-car conductor which is given, it says :

“ ‘The weaver who should tend his looms steadily for a thousand days in succession would probably break down completely in health long before the time was past, while on the contrary, the horse-car conductor goes through the whole term without losing a day, and finishes the period with vigor unimpaired.’

“ ‘In short, all that was learned goes to show that, what with ‘days off,’ which are generally taken, and the nature of personal service, the Sunday labor done in the Commonwealth does not produce any deterioration of health that can be discovered.

“ ‘A corresponding effect is shown concerning wages. The Report says :

“ ‘When systematic work for the production of wealth is done on Sunday, that is, when the worker labors seven days in the week in the production of wealth, there is a powerful and probably an irresistible tendency to break down the rate of pay, so that the total amount of the seven days’ wage will be no greater ultimately than the six days’ wage was, or would have been. But where systematic work in personal service is performed, there is no such tendency to break down the daily rate of wage; for the person who performs this class of labor for seven days receives a full day’s pay more than he would if he worked but six days, and so the average day’s pay is in no way diminished.’

“ ‘This classification and the results drawn from

it are deemed of special value, and it is believed that they will have an important bearing upon future discussions of the Sunday labor problem from the economic stand-point. Of course it follows, as the report says in closing, 'that the sheer will of man, actuated by no constraint of nature nor through the selfish motive of profit, but only for what is considered as some human convenience, causes all, or nearly all, the Sunday labor in Massachusetts.'\*

Equally suggestive is the following, from the pen of one whose opinion commands respect in all circles.

"DECAY OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE AMONG CHRISTIANS."

"Sunday observance, I say, instead of Sabbath observance, for I wish not to raise the Sabbatarian question, even in the association of a word.

"I began and I end what I have here to say with two illustrious, illustrative instances. For the sake of being strictly non-partisan, I may make these instances respectively republican and democratic in political bearing.

"The *New York Tribune*, during the late presidential campaign, told the country, one Monday morning, that Mr. Blaine, in course of accomplishing that magnificent, that unparalleled, progress of his, started from Chicago at half-past eleven the Saturday night previous, and reached Jamestown Sunday evening at ten. 'There were no demonstrations,' so the organ informs us, 'along the route.' 'Mr. Blaine desired that none should be made,' was the comment of the *Tribune*.

"This was, in that 'large utterance' which seems natural to the reporter, explained to be 'on account of the character of the day.' We are, of course, to

---

\* *Independent*, N. Y.

interpret the explanation as meaning, not because the day was cold, or wet, or windy, or otherwise unfavorable in 'character,' but because it was Sunday. Sunday, then, may be taken still to have, even in the view of a reporter attached to a Sunday-issue-printing newspaper, a certain 'character,' simply as Sunday. I suppose it really has, but at the rate we go on now it will not have much longer. Sunday observance is a fond superstition, a relic of former use and wont, that is fast passing away from among us.

"I do not call attention to Mr. Blaine's disregard of Sunday to criticise it. His disregard of the day seems, indeed—for we must be carefully just—not to have been a total disregard. Mr. Blaine regarded Sunday enough not to compete with the churches for audience at this point or at that as his train paused from its roaring rush along the rail. He only disregarded it enough to travel all day long, from the first moment of Sunday to almost the last. I say I do not refer to this conduct on Mr. Blaine's part to criticise it. I simply refer to it in the way of argument, by instance or illustration. It is, for me, a striking case in point, recent, and perhaps not too recent. That is all. It exhibits, for it exemplifies, now the decay of Sunday observance.

"It would be grossly unfair to treat Mr. Blaine's use of so-styled sacred time as a thing isolated, exceptional, singular; a thing on his part in contrast with the general practice of good and accepted Christians of to-day. This is by no means the fact concerning the matter. The breaking down of Sunday observance runs along the whole line of current Christian behavior.

"It did not occur so very long ago—at any rate I vividly remember being told the circumstance, then very recent, by a member of the Christian household immediately concerned—that an evangelical 'professor of religion,' a deacon of his own particular

church—indeed, the president of a great and famous society of distinctively Christian benevolence, this distinguished gentleman being at the time a tourist on the Continent—on a certain occasion used his Sunday there to do regulation sight-seeing with his children, active teachers they, one of them, at least, in the Sunday-school at home. Within the year past another distinguished president of a representative Christian society applied to me for information that should help him, hastening from the anniversary of that society at which he had presided, to get home by traveling on Sunday. At the same anniversary attended a devout Sunday-school superintendent who starting Saturday, had traveled all day Sunday to reach the place.

“Now, in the face of facts like these—and from my own individual observation, I could multiply them indefinitely—it is perfectly plain that Sunday observance is fast coming to be practically a confessed pious fiction—a fiction, therefore, that cannot continue long to impose on anybody. A ‘fiction’ (of the pious sort) I do not scruple to call the rule of Sunday observance as formally professed and as actually broken by so many unchallenged evangelical Christians, in all our American churches. It is a ‘fiction’ because the very men who thus freely secularize their Sundays themselves will often be found exclaiming against ‘Sabbath-breaking’ when it is done in certain forms by others.

“I do not now criticise anybody for failure in Sunday observance. I simply point out a fact. I think it is well that the fact should be faced by everybody concerned. And I believe that everybody is concerned. The fact is full of significance. It means nothing less than that the institution of ‘Sunday’ is fast going. The ‘character’ of the day is with us largely a mere tradition. The tradition fades daily. It is pale now to a degree.

“ I cannot guess how serious the regret really is, and by what proportion of average good Christians shared, at this undeniable decay of Sunday observance. I am quite inclined to think that what regret exists is mostly official, or else a matter of mere tradition and convention. I judge so from the easy conscience with which ministers, for example, use the railroads on Sunday to go to and fro for preaching appointments, and from the apparently unconscious proneness of any chance Christians you may meet, for example, to take the train upon occasion of a Sunday morning from the suburbs to the city for the purpose of hearing a favorite voice sound out from the pulpit the doctrine of the creeds—preaching, it well might happen, on the text ‘Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.’ This freedom on the part of the flock is, of course, not to be wondered at. The shepherd himself—that eloquent preacher—will perhaps preach the same sermon, on the same text, the evening of the same day, to a congregation forty miles distant, reached necessarily at cost to him of Sunday travel.

“ There is no need to accumulate instances. I seriously propose a question: As long as the state of the case is what we all of us perfectly well know it to be respecting Sunday observance among Christians, is it, can it be useful, for us to talk piously against Sunday newspapers, Sunday excursions, Sunday concerts, Sunday opening of places of amusement?

“ How is it? Has Sunday still left among us trace enough of its former ‘character’ to have inspired in some hearts a sentiment of shame, disgust, and indignation at the screaming profanation of the supposed sacredness of the day committed by the *New York Tribune* in sending out those yelling and tearing special expresses to rend the quiet of Sunday mornings, in the country in order, forsooth, that the

summer residents at the great watering places might begin to secularize their Sunday a little earlier, and secularize it by reading *that* journal rather than any of its out-done competitors? Possibly; but this journalistic enterprise and the journalistic braggadocio which so flagrantly proclaimed the triumph next morning, these are, let us all understand it well, only the world's way of doing what the church itself freely does. With what face can the church exclaim against it? Is the church sure that the church itself bought no *Tribunes* Sunday morning at Saratoga or in the Catskills?

“Sunday observance must be revived *among Christians*, or the institution is doomed. And the doom is ready, even now, presently to crack. I know nothing that could more impressively point, in conclusion, the truth and the timeliness of what my title implies than the late falsely reported fishing excursion of our present Chief Magistrate. This report has been fitly remarked upon in the editorial columns of *The Christian Advocate*, but what would that fishing excursion, had it occurred, have been but a monumental indication of the current *decay of Sunday observance* among us Americans?”\*

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

Prof. Wilkinson is a thoughtful and clear-headed writer. The facts he states are beyond question. He puts forth no theory as to the cure for this evil, but it is easy for the careful student of history and of the situation, to see that this decay is the result of an inherent weakness on the part of the Sunday. It came into the church as a festal holiday. It was never anything else, until Puritanism attempted to

---

\* Prof. W. C. Wilkinson, in the *Christian Advocate*.

transfer the authority of the fourth commandment to it, as a compromise with God for not returning to the whole truth, and the observance of the Sabbath. The Puritan Sunday was developed as a middle ground between the claims of the Sabbath, as pressed by the English Seventh-day Baptists, and the prevailing No-sabbathism of the Romish and English churches. The "decay" of which Prof. Wilkinson writes is only a return towards the normal level of Sunday. But there is hope when thoughtful men recognize the essential fact of this decay.

Thus do the friends of Sunday tell the story of its defeat and death in America. We might add the accumulating facts of every day, making the picture still darker and more hopeless. Enough is evident everywhere to show that the foundation on which Sunday, as a Sabbath, is reputed to rest does not exist. Unless a new and divine authority can come to its rescue from the Word of the Lord Jehovah, this process of decay will hasten, and end in burial.

We cannot close this chapter better than by adding the following from the pen of a well known Presbyterian clergyman of New York, Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, Jr. He writes in the *Independent* of Oct. 15, 1885, as follows :

"WANTED, A CLEAR VIEW,"

"We never shall get this question of Sunday observance rightly settled until we get a clear and consistent view of it. The trouble is not that Christian people have voluntarily and definitely abandoned or



betrayed their principle; the trouble is that they have no principle distinctively formulated and firmly grasped; the trouble is not that the church is indifferent or impotent to control the course of events; the trouble is that she is very much mixed on this question. She does not look it squarely in the face; she does not take hold of it intelligently and with a firm and earnest purpose; and, consequently, she does not act with unity and vigor. What we need is *a clear view*.

“And we need it at once. For, while we are waiting and talking melancholy sentiment about ‘the good old Sabbath of our fathers,’ and drifting vaguely in the dark, the question is settling itself in a very practical and a very unsatisfactory way. Without any serious philosophic or moral argument, without even an attempt to investigate candidly the teachings of the Scriptures, the amusement-mongers and money-makers are taking possession of Sunday for themselves. The Sunday newspapers fly everywhere on the wings of the wind. The Sunday trains run all over the land. The Sunday whistles are blowing, the Sunday bands are blaring and squealing and scraping, the Sunday shows are open, the Sunday fishermen are casting their flies, and the Sunday hunters are blazing away at the birds, the Sunday shops are crowded, and the notices of Sunday services at Coney Island display the names of popular divines to draw a larger patronage to the Sunday boats. Meanwhile the good Christian people are looking at each other somewhat blankly, and saying: ‘What do we think of it all anyway? What is Sunday? a civil holiday, or a divine institution? an ecclesiastical ordinance for Christians only, or a great humane provision for the wants of all men? How shall we agree to defend it? On what grounds and to what extent? Shall we go backward or forward? Shall we imitate our grandfathers or anticipate our

grandchildren? And how far backward or how far forward are we willing to go? Has this question any really practical importance? Is there any way of deciding it? Are there any fixed principles involved, or any genuine statistics available?

“You see what we want first is a clear view on four points:

“1. *A clear view of the meaning of Sunday.* Is it merely a ceremonial day, to be observed for its own sake, and in the strict keeping of which there is great merit? Or is it a day with a deep significance, and a high mission for the life of man? a day without which our spiritual life would shrivel and dry up, and blow away? a day, the breaking of which carries its own punishment with it, and never fails to revenge itself upon its despisers? Is it a day which is to be observed solely by abstaining from certain employments and recreation by denying ourselves in a mild sort of ascetism? Or is it a day which is to be observed by honestly and sincerely endeavoring to make some positive advance in the higher life by enjoying to the full certain privileges? Which view shall we take? For, if we are clear, how can we mix them?

“2. *A clear view of the authority of Sunday.* Has it nothing more than custom and churchly tradition to enforce it upon us? Or is it firmly fixed and definitely declared in the law of God? Are there only nine commandments in the Decalogue? Or is the fourth still binding? Did Christ do away with the necessity for a sacred rest-day, or only with the Jewish Sabbath? Does the Lord's-day really rest upon the fourth commandment, and perpetuate its spirit? We *must* look clearly and candidly at these questions before we can advance a step in any direction.

“3. *A clear view of the social and religious importance of Sunday.* Is it altogether a matter of inherit-

ance, or of sentiment whether we shall follow the Puritan or the European model? Is it a question by itself, or does it involve other and larger interests? Has it any bearing upon national prosperity and social conditions and moral developments? Can we trace any connection between the secularization of Sunday and the decline of religion in France and Germany? Has the observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship in England, and Scotland done anything for the physical, intellectual and moral welfare of the people? What will be the probable effect upon our churches and benevolent institutions and the spiritual quality of our people at large if Sunday becomes a day for money-making or merry making? Surely we do not wish to take a medicine without knowing whether it is likely to do us good or harm. We need to cast an eye toward the future, and look straight and square at the practical significance of the Sunday question.

“4. *A clear view of the best way to protect and enforce the observance of Sunday.* Is it to be done chiefly by the State, or by the Church? by law, or by example? by outward pains and penalties, or by the force of a general moral sentiment? How far has the State a right to go in saying what a man may not do on Sunday? And, above all, how far is it wise for the State to go? Can we summon any more potent force than has yet been invoked to preserve such a Sunday for the whole community as we honestly and clearly believe it ought to have? Is there any power to this end now latent in the church, which has never been fully called out, and which is from day to day becoming more and more dormant, simply for want of a clear view of what is to be done and how to do it?

“These are some of the points that we must illuminate and elucidate, every Christian for himself, and then altogether, as unitedly and as vigorously as

we can, for the whole community. The simple fact is that we are groping and drifting aimlessly. We are allowing men whom we would not trust in business, or philosophy, or morals, to settle the Sunday question for us after their own fashion. We are today in a far more lax condition than England, and, in our large cities, at least, rapidly going beyond Germany. We good folks, who dwell in our ceiled houses and go to church twice a Sunday do not quite realize what is going on. Are we willing that the matter should take its own course, without an earnest effort on our part to understand it or do anything about it? That is a coward's part, and an imbecile's as well. It is high time to awaken out of sleep, every one of us, and get a clear view of Sunday—what it is, what it will be, and what it ought to be."

The picture presented by Mr. VanDyke is not overdrawn nor painted in too lurid colors. The church is bewildered and "at sea" on the Sunday question. Some weakly bemoan the state of things, with no results beyond the sound of moaning. Some clamor for the execution of the civil laws, which are too dead to hear any call. Most seem to think that if they avoid agitation and talk in a general way about the need of "better Sabbath observance," the question will settle itself. All these methods of meeting the question have failed to check the general drift. It is true indeed that the Christian people of the United States must face the question squarely, and at an early day.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

# ELEMENTS OF AGITATION NOW AT WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

### CONVENTIONS.

The probable future of Sabbath reform work in the United States will be better understood by considering what has been done, and what influences are now at work. Those who desire to pursue the details of the movements in the past more fully than our space enables us to do, are referred to "Sabbath Essays," published by the Congregational Publishing Society, Boston; the publications of the New York Sabbath Committee; the history of the Seventh-day Adventists since 1845, and the history of the Seventh-day Baptists in the United States for the last two hundred years.

When the power of the "Puritan Sunday" began to wane, and the tendency to holidayism began to appear, the earnest Christian men of New England saw the impending danger, and sought for a remedy. The earliest effort at concert in consultation was made in Middlesex county, Mass., in 1814. Thir-

teen towns were represented in this convention; Rev. Justin Edwards, D. D., was a prominent worker. An address to the churches of Hampshire county by the Northern Association had been issued in 1801.

The following from Sabbath Essays gives the outline of the history of the agitation by the advocates of the Puritan theory.

“In May, 1828, in New York City, three hundred delegates met, representing fourteen States and Territories. Those present, these three days, declared they ‘never witnessed an occasion of such interest.’ The design was to form a general Sabbath Union; and an auxiliary convention met in Boston, May 30.

“A great Sabbath movement culminating about this time was the Sunday mail agitation. In 1810 a law passed requiring Sunday delivery, which was made more exacting in 1825. But in 1829, 467 petitions were presented to Congress, deprecating Sunday mails. Among the petitioners we find Josiah Quincy, Thomas L. Winthrop, Samuel T. Armstrong, Isaac Parker (Chief Justice), John C. Warren, M. D., Robert G. Shaw, Abbot Lawrence.

“In May, 1830, Senator Frelinghuysen presented the subject to the United States Senate in a form in which we trust it may yet be agitated successfully :

“*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be instructed to report a bill, repealing so much of the act on the regulation of post-offices as requires the delivery of letters, packets, and papers on the Sabbath; and, further, to prohibit the transportation of the mail on that day.”

“In 1840 met a ‘Bethel and Sabbath Convention’ in Cincinnati.

“In 1842, July 20 and 21, a convention of great interest assembled at Rochester, N. Y. Three hun-

dred delegates were present. Their pamphlet of ninety-four pages contains letters from Seward, Frelinghuysen, and Chancellor Walworth. Mr. Seward wrote, 'I need not assure you that every day's observation and experience confirm the opinion that the ordinances which require the observance of one day in seven, and the Christian faith which hallows it are our chief security for civil and religious liberty, for temporal blessings and spiritual hopes.'

"The year 1844 was prolific of conventions, in many States. Dr. Edwards was a prime mover. He was Secretary of the American and Foreign Sabbath Union, established in 1843. Jan. 10 and 11, the Baltimore Sabbath Society had a meeting addressed by Hon. Willard Hall. They called a National Convention, which met at Baltimore, Nov. 27 and 28. John Quincy Adams presided; and he remarked, 'So far as propagating opinions in favor of the sacred observance of the Sabbath, I feel it to be my duty to give all the faculties of my soul to that subject.' Dr. Edwards was present; Chief Justice Hornblower, Walworth, Frelinghuysen, sent letters. The pamphlet of eighty-two pages contains an Address to Railroad Directors—quoted from the New York Sabbath Convention—also to canal commissioners, and to the public.

"The same year, earlier, May 30 and 31, met a State Convention at Harrisburg, Va., in the Legislative Chamber. Dr. Edwards was present.

"Aug. 28 and 29 assembled the New York State Sabbath Convention at Saratoga Springs. President Eliphalet Nott, D. D., was chairman; Dr. Edwards was present.

"In 1846, Feb. 10 and 11, a Sabbath Convention was held in Frankfort, Ky. Rev. Drs. Edwards, and Scudder of India, were there.

"Two years later, in 1848, March 23 and 24, an Anti-Sabbath Convention met in Boston at the Melo-

deon. The call was from Garrison, the Jacksons, Parker, and others. Men of other opinions spoke. They opposed Sabbath laws, yet their address says, 'A day of rest from bodily toil, both for man and beast, is *not only desirable, but indispensable*. They need more, and *must have more instead of less rest*.' A meeting of the Free Religious Association in 1877 produced four addresses, 'How shall we keep Sunday?'

"In 1857, commenced a really great organization, permanent in power and usefulness, the 'New York Sabbath Committee,' which has restrained Sabbath desecration in New York City, pursued investigations on both sides of the Atlantic, and published valuable documents. For twenty-two years they have continued their 'unobtrusive but persevering labors.'

"A similar society, the 'Maryland Sabbath Association,' was organized in 1867. Its twelfth report shows a grand work in the face of opposition.

"A younger organization (1878), the 'International Sabbath Association' of Philadelphia, has the motto, 'Organization, Co-operation, Devotion, and Continuance.'

"In 1863, Aug. 11, 12 and 13, a National Convention met at Saratoga Springs. Nearly all the loyal States were represented. Norman White, Esq., Hon. G. H. Stuart and Hon. William E. Dodge made addresses. Valuable papers were presented: by Dr. Schaff, 'The Anglo American Sabbath;' by Willard Parker, M. D., 'The Sabbath in its Physiological Relations to Man;' by Rev. H. B. Smith, D. D., 'The Philosophy of the Sabbath;' and by Rev. President Mark Hopkins, D. D., 'The Sabbath and Free Institutions.'"\*

The volume of essays quoted above is made up of

---

\* Sabbath Essays, pp. 434-437.



papers presented at two conventions held in Massachusetts in 1879.

These Massachusetts "Sabbath Conventions" had their inception in the Evangelical Ministers' Association of Boston and vicinity, familiarly called the "Alliance."

In January, 1879, the Alliance resolved to hold these conventions.

The committee appointed early put themselves into communication with the pastors of Springfield, who heartily entered into the plan, and appointed an efficient committee of co-operation.

Besides the eminent writers secured, many distinguished persons were invited, who could not attend, among them Gen. Hawley, whose noble word is worth a hundred speeches: "Before God, I am afraid to open the Centennial gates on the Sabbath."

A "Statement of Principles," drawn up by Rev. W. W. Atterbury, Secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, was sent out in letters missive, as the basis of the convention.

#### "STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES."

"The convention is called on the following basis, and will consider only questions directly relevant thereto. The statement appended will be read at the opening of the convention, and will be voted upon at the close of the second day's morning session:

"*First*.—We hold the Sabbath, or weekly rest-day, as founded by the Creator in the constitution of man, as embodied in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, as recognized and confirmed by our

Lord Jesus Christ, and as reappearing with new spiritual significance in the Lord's-day of the Christian Church.

“We aim to promote among Christians the sense of its divine authority, and the more conscientious observance of it against the influences which now prevail to secularize it.

“*Second.*—While the State cannot and should not enforce or interfere with the *religious* observance of the Sabbath, yet the weekly rest-day exists also as a *civil institution*, maintained by law and custom from the beginning of our history, and vitally related to the well-being of individuals and of society, and to the stability of our free institutions.

“We aim to promote among our fellow-citizens of all classes such a true understanding of its value to themselves, to their families, and to the State, as will lead them to resist whatever tends to deprive them of it, and to sustain the just laws which protect their right to it.

“We, therefore, as representatives of the evangelical churches of Massachusetts, affirm the foregoing principles, and pledge ourselves more faithfully to teach and observe the religious Sabbath, and more watchfully and strenuously to maintain against all encroachments the civil Sabbath, as a principal cause of the intelligence, freedom, security, and happiness of our beloved Commonwealth.”\*

The Springfield Convention comprised the evangelical churches west of Worcester county. Its sessions were held Oct. 15 and 16, in State-street Baptist Church. . . . The convention was “Notable in the number and reputation of the clergymen present.” . . . President J. H. Seelye, D. D., of Amherst College; made an extemporaneous opening address, and

---

\* Sabbath Essays, p. 430.

papers were read successively by Rev. Messrs. Atterbury, Thomas, Bacon, Gordon, Peck, Smyth, King and Love. The Springfield committee considered their meeting a grand success.

The Eastern convention met at Boston the next week, Oct. 21 and 22. Eleven hundred letters were sent ; but many churches were unrepresented.

The sessions of this convention occupied two days and evenings. The "Statement of Principles" was adopted unanimously, as it had been at Springfield, by rising vote.

It was also resolved,—

"That a committee of thirteen be appointed as the State Standing Committee on Sabbath Observance, whose duty it shall be to procure the appointment of a similar committee in each town of the Commonwealth, which, together with the central committee, shall constitute a Sabbath League, to take such measures from time to time as shall seem to them necessary and feasible for the better maintenance of the Lord's-day."

This committee soon issued the following :

"CIRCULAR."

"The 'Committee of Thirteen,' who publish this document, were appointed by the Boston Sabbath Convention, Oct. 22, 1879, to be known as the 'State Standing Committee on the Observance of the Sabbath' and the head center of a State Sabbath League to be duly formed.

"As a basis of operation and co-operation, they awaited the discussion in January, 1880, before the 'Evangelical Ministers' Association of Boston and Vicinity' of the question, 'What is just, wise and humane to insist upon, at present, in the execution

of our Sunday laws?' The points presented, by a committee, of which Judge E. H. Bennett, of Boston University, was chairman, were unanimously endorsed by the Association, by a standing vote of some three hundred ministers present.

"We present them to the public in a slightly modified form, as our basis of operation.

"We do not, hereby, imply desire for change in our Sunday laws; we only give prominence and emphasis to the points indicated.

"We invite co-operation on this basis; we solicit the attention of fair-minded citizens to our wholesome laws securing their right to one day of rest in seven; we urge violators of Sunday laws to observe these just demands; we request magistrates and officials to execute these laws."

"SIX POINTS:"

*"Basis of Operation and Co-operation."*

"I. Under General Statutes, Chapter 84. sections 1 and 2, the absolute legal right of every employe of corporation or individual to the rest of the entire Lord's-day. We desire to call the attention of employes throughout the State to their legal right to a Sabbath free from call, order or command of employer, corporate or individual, and free from liability to discharge or diminution of wages for non-performance of Sunday work.

"We call the attention of railroads, manufactories and other corporations to the fact that in demanding Sunday labor they infringe law, oppress labor, and demand and expect what they have no legal right to require, work when the law secures rest to men in their employ.

"II. Under c. 84, s. 2, the stopping of all Sunday passenger trains, except from considerations of necessity and charity.

“ Under c. 84, s. 2, the stopping of all excursion trains whatever.

“ Under c. 84, s. 2, the stopping of all freight trains whatever within the limits of the Commonwealth in whatsoever place they may happen to be at sunrise of the Lord's-day.

“ Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of all work in railroad shops.

“ Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of all railroad work in making repairs, building bridges, etc, on Sunday.

“ III. Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of the Sunday issue of papers, magazines, etc.

“ Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of the sale, by publishers, newsboys, store keepers or carriers, of papers, magazines, etc.

“ IV. Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of all sales of merchandise on the Lord's-day; including wares, fruits, confectionery, cigars, tobacco and intoxicating liquors; excepting for necessity and charity, medicines, and until nine o'clock A. M., milk, bread, and other cooked eatables.

“ V. Under c. 84, s. 4, the stopping of all Sunday evening entertainments except 'concerts of sacred music.'

“ VI. Under c. 84, s. 1, the stopping of all games of ball or other sports in streets of the town or fields of the country.”

Up to the present date we have not been able to learn that this committee has accomplished any definite results. The topics discussed at these conventions covered a wide range. They form the fullest and most able presentation of the question from the Puritan stand-point which has been made during this century. The effect of the conventions on the public mind seems to have been very slight. Sun-

day desecration has gone on in a steadily increasing ratio.

The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union* of July 10, 1884, speaks as follows :

“ If you seek for Boston society now, you will find it scattered along the coast from Mount Desert to Cape Cod ; in the mountains, at hotels and boarding-houses, and on farms ; in ocean steamers and foreign lands. Yet there is a large population left, the large class that holds society together by its daily toil, and which can snatch but a week or two for an outing. Large numbers of this class go into the country or down the harbor on Sundays ; the horse-cars into suburban places being compelled to transport unusual numbers. Some of the routes run two cars at a time. In groves, by lake-sides, along the coasts, many thousands are abroad breathing the fresh air and roaming in nature. Those in city-returning cars have beautiful bouquets and sprigs of fern and foliage. It is noticeable, also, that many country people come into the city on Sunday ; some attend church ; others roam in the public garden, or the Common, and frequent places that they know, and whither their affiliations draw them. I am not now moralizing or philosophizing, but stating facts. Driving on Sunday is very common ; families who worship in elegant churches drive in the afternoon, many of them while the larger numbers who drive for recreation, fearless of God and disregarding man, swell the numbers to troops on the fashionable highways. Say what you may on the Sunday question, the strictly Puritan Sunday does not belong to the Boston of today.”

“ SABBATH COMMITTEES.”

“ Sabbath Committees ” are now organized in the following cities : Minneapolis and St. Paul, in Min-

nesota, Chicago, Ill., Cleveland, Ohio, Louisville, Ky., Philadelphia, Pa., Baltimore, Md., Boston, Mass., and in a few smaller cities, and an "Alliance" for the State of New Jersey. The most vigorous of these is the New York Committee. Concerning its aims and work, we extract the following statements from its Documents :

"OBJECTS AND POLICY OF THE COMMITTEE."

"The New York Sabbath Committee, while recognizing the paramount importance of the religious observance of the Lord's-day, have to do with the day of rest chiefly as a civil institution, established by national custom and law and vitally connected with the preservation of our free institutions and the rights and liberties of all classes. They stand here on ground on which all American Christians, without distinction of denomination or party, are in substantial agreement. They disclaim all compulsion in matters of conscience, all wish to make men religious by law. They recognize the separation of Church and State, and the freedom of religion which our government assures, as a blessing beyond all price, to be most jealously guarded. But they regard it also as the right and duty of the State to protect by law the good health and morals and social order of the community; and also to secure to the Christian people, who constitute its large majority, the enjoyment of their right to undisturbed worship.

"On these grounds, from the very beginning of our history, the Sabbath has been maintained by appropriate legislation. The State separates Sunday from all other days of the week as a day of rest and quiet. It puts the hand of its powerful protection between the laborer and that exacting spirit of gain, which would otherwise compel him to the weary round of

seven days of weekly toil ; and so secures to him at least one day for the rest of his body, for the improvement of his mind and heart, and home intercourse.

“ The Committee aim to secure the enforcement of just and wise laws by which the day is protected, to oppose unfavorable legislation and other hostile influences, and by the use of the press, the circulation of documents, addresses, sermons, and by other prudent and practicable means, to enlighten the public sentiment and to preserve to all classes, so far as possible, the benefits of the Sunday rest.” \*

Religiously considered, the above is by far too low a standard. Still, no higher ground can be taken, so long as “ Sabbath Reform ” is defined as being a better enforcement of the Sunday law, for the protection of “ the good health and morals and social order of the community.” As a moral and religious power, such a platform is of little account. It does not touch the real issue of Sabbath-keeping, and of permanent reform. As an element of agitation, its immediate effect, if the platform be carried out, is more widely felt, since it comes in contact with the habits and choices of the irreligious, more than a merely religious discussion would. On the other hand, this low-ground issue tends to delay the final and more important question, viz., whether Sunday has any ground for claiming to be the Sabbath.

Document No. 48, of the publications of the New York Committee, contains a review of the work of that Committee from its organization, 1857 to 1883,

---

\* Document No. 44, Report of 1877-1879.



a period of twenty-five years. The platform on which its work has been prosecuted is set forth as follows :

“ While the Committee held most fully the divine obligation and paramount importance of the religious observance of the Lord’s-day, it felt itself called to deal chiefly with the observance of Sunday as a civil institution, established and protected by custom and law. It sought to discriminate carefully between the Sabbath as a religious and as a civil institution, and jealously to respect the just limitations of the civil power in maintaining the observance of the rest-day. Recognizing the object of our Sunday laws to be the protection of the sacred rights of rest and worship, the Committee aimed to secure the wise enforcement of existing laws, the enactment of such additional laws as might seem necessary to the end in view, and the prevention of hostile legislation. It sought by private remonstrance and influence to prevent such occasions of Sunday desecration as could be better met in this way than by legal means. It aimed to enlighten the public mind as to the value of the Sunday rest by means of public meetings and addresses, by the public press both secular and religious, and by the issue of carefully prepared documents. It sought to aid pastors and others interested in studying this question, and to encourage the formation of similar associations. It aimed to keep the one issue distinct from every other question of reform, and to decline impracticable measures. It sought to accomplish its ends, so far as possible, through the proper officers of the law, and to avoid giving needless prominence to its own agency. In fine, it endeavored to carry on its work on such just and broad grounds as to secure the support of all good citizens.

“ These principles have governed the Committee from the beginning to the present time. The results of the work thus conducted have been all, and more than

all, that could reasonably have been expected. Only a brief summary of the most important of these results can here be given.

“In matters of legislation, the Committee prepared, and was largely instrumental in securing the passage of, the Metropolitan Excise law of 1866, the most effective liquor law ever enacted in this State ; which, enforced as it was from 1866 to 1870, diminished arrests for drunkenness and disorder from a previous average of ten to twenty per cent. more arrests on Sundays than on other days, to an average of forty per cent. less on Sundays than on week days ; and which brought to the city from license fees an annual revenue of one million dollars in place of the fifteen or twenty thousand dollars a year previously received. After its repeal under the Tweed regime, the Committee, in 1873, secured important amendments to the Excise law, which have given to this law whatever effectiveness it has, and which have been enforced in other parts of the State, if not in this city. The Committee drafted and secured the enactment of the Sunday theatre law of 1860, to suppress the numerous low-class Sunday theatres and similar entertainments which were becoming fruitful sources of vice and disorder ; and the Processions law of 1873, to regulate and put under police control processions and parades on week days, and to abate the evil of noisy parades on Sunday.

“The Committee also proposed certain modifications of the Sunday statutes as embodied in the new Penal Code, of which mention is made on a subsequent page of this Report.

“The Committee has also carefully watched the course of legislation, and has frequently and with success opposed bills containing provisions hostile to the Sunday observance.

“A most important part of the Committee’s work has been to secure, so far as practicable, the enforce-

ment of existing laws. The action of the Committee here has been for the most part unobtrusive, but vigilant and effective. Threatened violations have been brought to the notice of the police authorities. In some instances it has been necessary to employ special counsel, but usually the committee has accomplished its ends wholly through the proper officers of the law. Occasionally it has been found expedient to evoke some special expression of public sentiment, as for instance, when obstructions were thrown in the way of the police in enforcing the Sunday theatre law, by means of judicial injunctions, under cover of which, in plain violation of law, it was attempted for several weeks to carry on Sunday theatrical exhibitions. The response in such cases on the part of the better classes of our citizens has ever been prompt and decisive in sustaining the officers of the law in its impartial enforcement.

“ In addition to the enforcement of the special laws above referred to, the Committee brought about the suppression of the noisy crying of newspapers on Sunday, and has secured the suppression of other occasional disturbances of the peace and good order of the day. By private remonstrance with persons concerned therein, the Committee has frequently been able to prevent public and unnecessary work on Sunday.

“ In connection with the action of the Committee under the Excise and Sunday theatre laws, important decisions have been rendered by the courts sustaining the constitutionality of these laws.

“ But its efforts have extended beyond this city. It was in response to an appeal from this Committee, communicated by an influential delegation, that the late President Lincoln issued in 1862 his memorable order for the observance of Sunday by the army and navy during our Civil War. The Committee bore an important part in securing the closing on Sunday of

our Centennial Exhibition, and in behalf of the public recognition of the Lord's day in the American department of the international expositions at Vienna and Paris; and especially in securing the official recognition of the Sunday rest on the part of the representatives of our Government at the International Electrical Exposition at Paris in 1881.

“The Committee has held numerous conventions and conferences in various places throughout the country. Meetings have been held under its auspices in this and other cities, with special reference to workmen and their interest in the Sunday rest. At the instigation of the Committee numerous sermons upon the various aspects of the Sunday question have been preached in this city and elsewhere, many of which have been printed and widely distributed. Several German mass-meetings in this city and Brooklyn have been held, enlisting a large number of our German fellow-citizens in sustaining the American habit of Sunday observance. Important help has been given to pastors and others interested in the discussion of the various aspects of the Sunday question, throughout the country, by correspondence and documents. The formation of similar associations in other States has been aided. Large use has been made of the secular and religious press, and many articles have been prepared and have appeared in the editorial columns of these papers, which have produced, there is reason to believe, no small effect on public opinion. The Committee has collected a rare and valuable library of works on the Sabbath, including a careful collection of discussions and facts from the current journals.

“Another important department of the Committee's work has been the preparation and publication of original documents. Some of these have been printed in German, and some in French and in other foreign languages. Of these documents the Committee has

issued upwards of five hundred thousand copies, containing six million pages, besides many thousands of leaflets, circulars and other papers. These documents have been widely distributed. Several of them have been republished in Germany. Thirty thousand copies of a carefully prepared sketch of the American Sunday observance, in French, were distributed in France by special request of the friends of the cause there. Of some of the documents, many thousand copies have been reprinted and distributed by other agencies. The Committee has also printed and distributed gratuitously to pastors of leading denominations throughout our county ten thousand copies of 'Gilfillan on the Sabbath,' an able work of 650 pages."\*

“SUNDAY LIQUOR SELLING.”

“There has been more outward respect paid to the prohibition against liquor selling on Sunday than during some previous years. The closing of the front doors and the less open and defiant display of the traffic have resulted in a diminished number of Sunday arrests, although the traffic has been largely carried on without hindrance through side doors and back entrances. Other agencies than those of the Committee have been active in enforcing the provisions of the excise law.”

“THE SUNDAY SECTIONS OF THE PENAL CODE.”

“With the exception of the Sunday provision of the excise law, and the theatre and processions laws above referred to, which have been enacted within the past few years, the laws touching the observance of Sunday have been expressed in a general statute, which has come down to us substantially unchanged from the last century, and under it, and the still earlier

---

\* Document 45, pp. 2-6.

colonial laws, labor, traffic, public sports, etc., on Sunday have been forbidden from the beginning. This statute, however, contained certain provisions, like the one against traveling, which have long been obsolete; and its penalties were entirely inadequate to secure the enforcement of the law, whenever resisted. When, therefore, the codifying of our criminal laws was undertaken, the Committee welcomed the opportunity to suggest some slight changes in the Sunday law, and these were approved and found a place in the penal code, which was finally enacted by the legislature in 1882, and took effect December 1st of last year. The Committee deemed it wise, so far as was possible, to adhere to the phraseology of the early statutes, relying upon the good sense of the community, the judicious action of the police authorities and, the reasonable construction to be applied by the courts, for such an enforcement of the law, as would meet general approval. But the imprudent zeal of some who aimed at a too rigid interpretation of the law, seconded by others whose purpose was to bring it into disrepute, led to actions which caused grave anxiety to the Committee, and justified the fear, that strenuous efforts would be made to repeal or seriously to modify the Sunday provisions. The course pursued by the courts, in applying a practical and moderate interpretation, and later the prudent course pursued by the police, relieved somewhat the apprehensions of the Committee. But, at the time, great irritation of feeling existed. The feeling spread in some measure to other cities in the State. Plans were laid and steps taken to bring such pressure upon the legislature, as would secure the prompt repeal, or radical modification of these sections of the code.

The Committee took measures to counteract these efforts. Correspondence and personal intercourse were had with leading men in different parts of the

State. Soon, in this city, as elsewhere, the facts of the case became better understood. Several of the leading journals and some influential citizens and legal authorities explained and defended the Sunday sections of the code, and corrected misapprehensions.

“Immediately upon the assembling of the legislature, bills were introduced in both houses practically nullifying the Sunday laws, and were strenuously urged by a strong and organized lobby, representing the liquor, tobacco, and other dealers interested in Sunday trading. The Committee by its representatives was repeatedly heard before the committees of the legislature in defense of the laws. Prominent citizens here and elsewhere throughout the State rendered valuable aid. Similar associations in other cities actively co-operated. Numerous petitions were presented from working-men and tradesmen, as well as other citizens, against relaxing the protection, which the Sunday statutes give to the right of weekly rest.

“After a long struggle and abundant discussions in both houses of the legislature, a few changes were made in the Sunday sections of the code, the most important of which permits the selling of segars, fruit and confectionery during all the hours of Sunday. In other respects, the provisions of the code remain unimpaired.”

#### “SUNDAY RAILWAY WORK.”

“The rapid increase of Sunday labor on our railways has engaged the anxious attention of the Committee, as of thoughtful men all over our country, presenting, as it does, what is perhaps the chief source of peril to the observance of Sunday.

“A leading railway journal, *The Railway Age*, of Chicago, has recently discussed the question with great candor and intelligence, and has also done a most important service by securing the opinions of a number of prominent railway managers as to the

practicability and desirableness of reducing Sunday traffic and work. These opinions nearly all concur as to the great importance of the Sunday rest to the employes, as well as to the community at large, and of restricting Sunday work in some measure. But some of them doubt the practicability of doing much in this direction, because of the demand of the business community for the speediest transportation of freight, and because of the rivalry of competing lines.

“ On the 19th of April last, the president of the Louisville, New Albany & Chicago R. R. Co., Bennett H. Young, Esq., issued an order forbidding the running of any trains on Sunday on his road, except those carrying United States mails, and two months later, in a communication to *The Railway Age*, he gives the grounds for his action. He says, that there are in the railway service of this country, it is estimated, five hundred thousand persons, and that it is probable that more than one-half of these are required at some time to do Sunday service. The result of thus requiring two hundred and fifty thousand persons to violate the day, simply to make money for the corporations, is not only a monstrous wrong against their religious and family rights, but it is an incalculable injury to society at large. He adds, that, so far, the results of the experiment on his road are more than satisfactory, and no injury or loss has resulted to his company from the enforcement of his Sunday order.”\*

We have given considerable space to the New York Committee in order that the reader may see the methods pursued, and judge somewhat as to the influence of the Committee as an agitating power. We think it is doing as much as all other similar or-

---

\* Document 45, pp. 8-12.



ganizations together to agitate the question of Sunday observance. The forgoing extracts show the Sunday question at its best in New York City. The important facts which do not appear in the report are: In spite of all the Committee has done, the work of Sunday desecration, in and about New York, increases every year. The liquor traffic is satisfied with the "side door" system for Sunday. Pleasure seeking has turned its tides out of the city, until Coney Island and its compeers are thronged on every Sunday that is not uncomfortably cold or positively stormy. In 1884, Sunday afternoon concerts were inaugurated in Central Park, against the protests of the Sabbath Committee. When the summer was past, the elevated roads reduced their fare to half price throughout the day on Sunday, in order to keep the tide of Sunday travel up to high-water mark. Some feeble attempts were made, unsuccessfully, to prevent the Park concerts in 1885. Such opposition as the New York Committee has been able to make, except on a few minor points, seems to have helped to swell the current of Sunday desecration rather than to decrease it.

#### MARYLAND ASSOCIATION.

Next to the New York Committee in vigor and effective work, is the "Sabbath Association of Maryland," which has its headquarters in Baltimore. The reports for 1879 and 1880 show that the interest in the Sunday question, in and around Baltimore, is steadily and significantly increasing. During 1879,

the friends of Sunday succeeded in restraining "Sunday excursions," and similar encroachments upon the religious character of the day, by judicial and police agencies. The report of the Sabbath Association for that year closes as follows :

"CONCLUSION."

"While, therefore, we have much to be grateful for, there are ominous clouds investing the horizon, and indicating an approaching storm. The opposition is not merely local, but it is a great coalition of liquor dealers and liberalists throughout the land, not only to '*destroy the Sabbath, but Christianity with it.*' In Baltimore there is an unblushing effrontery manifested in the frequent holding of meetings, in ward organizations, in pledging candidates for office, etc., with the proclaimed purposes to emasculate our Sunday laws. Shall they accomplish their infamous objects? Shall they be allowed to break down the hedge that prevents our Eden-planted garden from becoming a common—a morass—reeking with moral miasma and pollution? There is an inflexible law, that zeal and industry shall triumph over indolence and apathy. Works without faith demonstrate more than faith without works. While the enemy is vigilant, active, liberal, how many of those regarding themselves as friends of the Sabbath are excusing their inertia, with pleas of "*no danger*" or quibbles as to the *precise* grounds or *extent* of the moral obligations of the Sabbath, and fear of being over zealous, or charged with puritanism or some other unpopular attribute? Or, while admitting the importance of the cause, they leave it for others to spend time, labor and means upon it. 'The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light,' and, seeming not to expect effects without causes, will get the advantage of those

who practically ignore that relation. The great question is: What shall Sunday be? Divided between labor and dissipation? Increasing vice crime, pauperism, oppressive taxes, etc.? Or a day of rest and quiet, promoting virtue, liberty, morality, religion and universal good? Honoring its author and blessing the people? Unless those who *do care* to have it perpetuated to posterity do somewhat *more* than *wish* it, their wishes will avail naught. If there be not energy enough to keep the Sabbath, it will depart, and who shall say when it will return? Has it returned to France since the law for its observance was, in the reign of terror, overthrown. Has there been anything but *unrest* there, since they voted away the God-given weekly rest?" \*

The efforts which were made in 1879, seem to have aroused and united the elements which oppose the "Orthodox" view of Sunday, for the report of 1880 shows that the efforts to enforce the law were in a large degree futile. The report sums up the matter under the head of "Judicial Decision" in these words :

"The cases of Jersey Cottrell of the steamer Cockade, and Geo. W. Stearns, fined also for working on Sunday, last summer, were reversed on appeal; because the *warrants* issued were not *summonses in debt*, which the court decided they should have been. So then all parties were freed—the one running the excursion train to camp-meeting on Sunday, under the decision that going there was a necessary means of salvation, and the others, because arrested under the wrong form. Such proceedings can only encourage those who are opposed to the Sabbath. And when a steam-boat was advertised last summer to

---

\* Document 45, pp. 11, 12.

make Sunday excursions, without the pretext of carrying the mail, and information of the fact was conveyed to the Board of Police, they replied, that under the judge's decision they had determined to make no arrests for Sunday excursions."

On the other hand the same report opens as follows :

"THE GRAND EVENT."

"Of course the great event of year, to the Sabbath cause here, was the defeat of the bill in the Legislature, to damage the State Sunday law. Only one legislative term in the last twelve years has passed without the introduction of one or more bills with that intent; but never before were the plans so long and confidently laid, so artfully managed, so extensively, assiduously, and probably so expensively prosecuted, as in this instance. But notwithstanding the deleterious results of the late war, upon the Sabbath—the accessions to our population of those from countries where it is ignored, their deplorable success in degrading the Sabbath in other large cities, the withholding of help by professed friends—and the efforts of certain preachers, to shift the grounds of Sabbath obligations—still we have occasion to thank God and take courage, that the Sunday law of our State abides unscathed and her metropolis holds pre-eminence for its quiet observance. And if all its professed friends would nobly combine in its behalf, most of the existing grievances might be speedily ameliorated."

The details are then given showing how the case was managed by each side, and the results stated in these words :

"Mr. Hayes, having become chairman of the House Committee on the "modification" bill, arranged to have your Committee heard on the 5th of March

The interview appeared to be a very effective one. No report was made to the House, till the 24th, and then a bill was offered far more moderate in its proposed changes than two that had been previously drawn up. Still Mr. Hayes vigorously opposed it, and had action upon it deferred to a subsequent day. It was then, however, passed to a second reading. When this was had, it passed to a third and final reading in the House with indications that it would succeed. To insure this, its advocates called it up prematurely and used every means to effect its passage—demanding the previous question and preventing debate. But with all, it failed by eight votes of receiving a constitutional majority, and the question was settled for the present, to the peace of the community, the honor of God and the credit of the Legislature. When our President received the intelligence, he almost involuntarily exclaimed, “What hath God wrought!” But how many thousands, who would have suffered through the passage of the iniquitous measure, were ignorant of their peril and unmoved at the escape!”

The report of 1882 shows but little change in the general status of the question in Baltimore. “Sunday excursions” and Sunday papers seem to have increased. Efforts to lessen the character of the Sunday law in general had been defeated. The report closes with a general glance at the field in the following words:

#### CHEERING FACTS.

“It was declared of old ‘when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Lord will raise up a standard against him.’ And against the advancing tide of Sabbath desecration, it is truly gratifying to see increasing laborers and organizations. Within a year there

have been originated or revived the Sabbath Associations of Syracuse, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Chicago and Detroit. Two valuable conferences of workers in the cause have been held at Pittsburg. The former was attended by your Secretary, the latter occurred during the season of the Md. General Assembly, when it was not thought best for him to leave. Able papers by eminent and earnest friends of the cause were read, and their publication in the *International Reporter* forms an interesting and useful document. Both the conferences were held under the auspices of the 'International Sabbath Association' (comprehending the United States and Canada), whose energetic and indefatigable secretary, Rev. Yates Hickey, has also labored in the establishment of the Associations above mentioned. Our own Secretary was solicited to act as an associate secretary for this and adjoining States, and the Committee agreed to the same, so far as it would not interfere with our particular work. While our special field is our own State, we have matters to deal with that are affected by public sentiment in surrounding States, so that whatever influence we may exert in promoting interest for the Sabbath in them, must naturally react favorably on our own."

The state of the Sunday questions in localities where there are no committees, or less vigorous ones, is outlined in the report of the New York Committee for 1882-1883, as follows:

"SUNDAY IN OTHER PARTS OF THE STATE."

"In Brooklyn, Albany, Utica, Buffalo, Newburgh, Long Island City, and other places, organizations have been started to secure a better enforcement of the Sunday laws, especially those pertaining to the sale of liquor on that day. These movements have received such co-operation as the Committee

has been able to give. Some of these organizations took an active part in the contests in the legislature during the past winter."

\* \* \* \* \*

"THE SUNDAY QUESTION IN OTHER STATES."

"Elsewhere throughout the country, during the past two years, the Sunday question has engaged unusual attention.

"In Massachusetts, early in the past summer, the announcement of a Sunday passenger train over the Housatonic railroad, from Bridgeport to Pittsfield, aroused immediate and strong opposition on the part of the dwellers in the quiet villages along the route, the mill owners, the summer boarders, etc. At a public hearing before the board of railroad commissioners of the State, without whose permission the train could not be run, so vigorous a protest was made against the disturbance that the proposed train would occasion, with its inroad of Sunday excursionists, and the inducements to drinking and dissipation, that the commissioners decided unanimously against the train.

"In the legislature of New Jersey, last year, a bill to modify the Sunday laws in favor of liquor dealers was defeated. Early in the past winter, theatrical performances on Sunday in the city of Newark, which for a long time had been tolerated, were suppressed by the police. The immense overflow of Germans and others from New York into Jersey City, Hoboken and the neighboring towns, is the occasion of a very large Sunday business in the saloons of those places. Very recently efforts had been made with some success for the enforcement of the law in closing these places on Sunday.

"Louisiana was for a long time the only state which had no Sunday law. A few years since a law was passed by the legislature giving power to the several

counties or parishes to enact ordinances restricting Sunday traffic and several counties passed such ordinances, with very successful results. Recently, however, the law has been declared unconstitutional by the supreme court. A year ago a movement was started in New Orleans in favor of Sunday observance. A large number of ministers and laymen, representing the various religious denominations, met to confer on the subject, among whom were representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and the principal Jewish rabbi of the city. It was agreed to organize a league on a basis so broad as to unite all, whatever might be their opinions concerning the religious obligation and use of the day, in efforts to discourage all unnecessary servile labor on Sunday, and all such public amusements as involved the servile labor of others. Officers and an executive committee were chosen, comprising prominent laymen and clergymen of different denominations, Protestant and Catholic. Inspired by the formation of this league, a number of the retail clerks of the city organized themselves into an association for urging upon the Legislature the passing of a Sunday closing law.

“In Chicago the public desecration of the Lord’s-day has greatly increased within the last two or three years, and without any effective effort to resist it. The drinking saloons and nearly all the theatres are regularly open on Sunday, and the day is used for constructing and repairing railway tracks and similar work. A movement was started last year among some of the churches for the purpose of closing the theatres on Sunday. But it does not appear that anything was accomplished by it.

“In California within the past year, after an exciting contest, the friends of the Lord’s-day have met with what would seem a disastrous defeat, but which, it is hoped, may ultimately result in good. A



Sunday law of the State of several years' standing prohibited the keeping open on Sunday of any store, workshop, bar, saloon, banking-house, or other place of business for the purpose of transacting business therein, under penalty of a fine of from five to fifty dollars. The supreme court of the State, on an appeal, affirmed the constitutionality of the law. The opinion of the court, in which a majority of the judges concurred, said :

“ ‘Regarding the matter from a purely secular stand-point, the law is a proper and salutary one. It imposes no restraint upon the conscience of any member of the community ; it exacts from no person the performance of any religious rites or ceremonies ; it prescribes no religious faith or belief. . . Sunday laws leave a man's religious belief and practices as free as the air he breathes. They only forbid the carrying on of certain kinds of business on a certain day of the week, and the day selected in deference to the feelings and wishes of a large majority of the community is the day commonly denominated the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday.’

“ Encouraged by this decision, a movement was started for the better enforcement of this law, which to a large extent had long been a dead letter. The liquor dealers and others interested in Sunday traffic, constituting a very large and powerful class of the community, aided by the German *Turn Verein*. and an association of free-thinkers, for the purpose of resisting this movement organized a so-called ‘League of Freedom,’ the members of which pledged themselves both to disregard the law, and to support no candidate for the legislature who was not pledged to vote for its repeal. The public journals of the State were largely under their influence. An attempt was made in San Francisco to enforce the law. The Ministerial Union of that city, representing some fifty churches, presented an address of

dignity, calmness and strength to the mayor and other officials, setting forth the justness of the cause, the suffering of the people, the majesty of law, and the peril that was threatened by those who were conspiring to resist it. The chiefs of police of San Francisco, Sacramento and other cities gave notice of their intention to enforce the law. But the members of the league threw their doors open defiantly. On the first day five hundred arrests were made in San Francisco for violations of the law, of which four-fifths were for selling liquor, and the names of those arrested showed that more than three-fourths were foreign-born. The offenders were admitted to bail and the trial deferred. An election was impending, and the question was carried to the conventions of the two great political parties. The Democratic convention adopted a resolution strongly denouncing the Sunday laws, and demanding their repeal. The Republican party, with a great show of enthusiasm, passed a resolution favoring the observing of Sunday as a day of rest and recreation, and the maintenance of the present, or similar, laws providing for the suspension of all unnecessary business on Sunday. The Democratic party succeeded at the polls. A bill repealing the Sunday law was passed by large majorities in the legislature, and was signed by Governor Stoneman, who, in his previous message, had recommended this repeal.

“The Legislature of Ohio, in April, 1883, enacted a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday, and requiring the closing on that day of all places where such liquor is sold. The passage of this law was preceded by a popular agitation and discussion of this question throughout the State, such as rarely occurs. The enforcement of the law was attended with excellent results in diminishing Sunday arrests. But Cincinnati and one or two other cities in the State, where there is a large for-

eign population, owing to their opposition and that of the liquor dealers, the law has been allowed to become a dead letter. The question has become an important element in the political contests in this State and the result is not yet determined. \*

“In Missouri, in compliance with the public demand for some more stringent restriction of the liquor traffic, a law was passed by the last legislature establishing higher license fees, and re-enacting the prohibition of the traffic on Sunday, which for a long time had been practically disregarded. The taking effect of this new statute in July caused much excitement in St. Louis and one or two other cities. The law was at once enforced and with marked results. Many of the liquor dealers openly defied the law, and a large number of arrests were made. It was attempted in some instances to secure the rigid enforcement of all other Sunday laws, for the purpose of bringing them into odium, but after a few weeks the operation of the law in St. Louis was suspended by one of the city courts, on the ground that a previous statute, which had not been repealed gave the city certain privileges, which exempted it from the provisions of the law in question. It is thought, however, that this decision will be overruled by higher courts. Governor Crittenden has firmly sustained the law. The defiant action of the liquor dealers has awakened strong feelings of indignation among the better class of people throughout the State. A large meeting of citizens of St. Louis passed resolutions approving of the Sunday clauses of the law, deprecating the recent adverse decisions, and approving the course of the governor in the matter. A Workingmen’s Sabbath-day Rest Association has been organized in St. Louis.

---

\* In 1884, the Scott law was declared unconstitutional and “free rum and no Sunday” became legal, as well as actual throughout Ohio.

“In Milwaukee, where an unusually large proportion of the population is foreign-born, the laws protecting the Sunday rest, and especially those forbidding the sale of liquor on Sunday, have been practically disregarded for several years past. A movement made last fall to secure a better enforcement of these laws was met by bitter opposition on the part of the brewers and saloon keepers, and it was attempted to ‘boycott’ the merchants who favored reform.”\*

The foregoing from the report of the New York Committee presents the Sunday question in the most favorable light possible. We do not care to add more unfavorable facts in this place. The report shows that Sunday, as a Sabbath, is already a thing of the past, and that as a holiday, it is here to stay. The “Philadelphia Sabbath Association,” a local society which expends its efforts mainly in missionary work among canal men, presented its forty-third annual report in March, 1884. It shows nothing of importance in the matter of agitation. Its brief report closes as follows :

“From our experience and observation in the work over which we have been placed, in the providence of God, it seems to us :

“1. That convictions are deepening upon the minds of Christians that the obligations of the fourth commandment are binding upon us. The churches are feeling none too soon that the blessed heritage of the Lord’s-day is in danger of being destroyed. The tide of Sabbath desecration *must* be stayed or the most fearful results will follow. We are glad to know that Christians are stirred up to prayer for the

---

\* Document 49, pp. 15-17.

better observance of the Sabbath. The union meetings recently held in Association Hall on Wednesday afternoon, and continued from week to week, is an evidence of the pulsating of Christian hearts and their trust in God for final victory. It may be that a great public meeting of the people, without distinction of sect, party or denomination, may be called for in the near future, at which the Christian sentiment of this great city may be properly voiced.

“2. The inauguration of a new administration of our municipal government is deemed a fitting time for a united effort in favor of the closing on the Sabbath of all liquor saloons, which have been so long and persistently open in defiance of all law, human and divine, daring the mayor and other officers of the peace to molest them or make them afraid.

“3. The lessons that come to us from a great Western city that had discarded the Bible from its public schools and virtually had no Sabbath are not to be disregarded. Riot, ruin, outlawry, arson and murder are the results of Bible ostracism and Sabbath desecration. It becomes a question that Americans must look full in the face. Shall the rights of God in his claim on the one-seventh of our time for rest and worship, and the rights of humanity to a cessation from toil and labor, ‘for the ease of creation,’ be respected, or shall our laws and ordinances be trampled under foot by liquor sellers, communists and other enemies of American liberties?”

\* \* \* \* \*

Closely allied to the work of these “Sabbath Committees” is the “National Reform Movement,” which took form at a convention in Cincinnati in 1872. The aims of this movement are set forth in the constitution of the Association, as follows :

“The object of this Society shall be to maintain

existing Christian features in the American government, and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This movement has many supporters, and is vigorously represented by its organ, *The Christian Statesman*, of Philadelphia. The need of a better enforcement of the Sunday laws is a prominent feature in its columns. The Subject of Sunday mails was much discussed at the meeting of the National Reform Association in the spring of 1885, and it was resolved to make a special point in that direction during the year. The *Statesman* also announced that it would henceforth make the Sabbath question a prominent feature in its work. In the autumn of 1884, and the spring of 1885, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States, created a Sabbath-reform department in their work. These latest influences of agitation are steadily at work at the date of this writing.

In addition to these organized efforts, there is an an increasing attention paid to the Sabbath question, by the representative Christian bodies, conferences, synods, assemblies, and the like. Such are some of the influences at work among those who are the advocates of Sunday as the Sabbath. Everything indicates that these will increase, rather than decrease, their efforts at agitation.

## “ANTI-SABBATH CONVENTIONS.”

The efforts in favor of the Puritanic observance of Sunday, during the fourth decade of the present century, awakened a religious opposition which took form in an “Anti-Sabbath Convention,” which was held in Boston in March, 1848. It was convened under the call of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Theodore Parker, Chas. K. Whipple and others. The report of its proceedings makes a volume of 168 pages. This convention took the ground that there is no holy time under the gospel. That the Sabbath perished with Judaism, or remains only as a part of it. That civil law has no province in ordering any observance of time as a religious or semi-religious duty. The call closed with these words:

“We are aware that we shall inevitably be accused, by the chief priests, scribes and pharisees of the present time, as was Jesus by the same class in his age, as not of God, because we do not keep the Sabbath-day: but we are persuaded, that to expose the popular delusion which prevails on this subject is to advance the cause of pure Christianity to promote true and acceptable worship, and inculcate strict moral and religious accountability, in all the concerns of life, on all days of the week alike. If we are ‘infidels,’ or ‘heretics’ for this belief, we are content to stand in the same condemnation, on this point, with Tyndale, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Roger Williams, John Milton, Penn, Fox, Priestly, Belsham, Paley, Wl itly, Archbishop Whatley and a host of others who are everywhere lauded by the various sects with which they are identified as among the brightest ornaments of the Christian church, and

who are essentially agreed with us in the opinion that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution." \*

Many resolutions were discussed and adopted, among which are the following :

"2. *Resolved*, That the penal enactments of the State legislature, compelling the observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, are despotic, unconstitutional and ought to be immediately abrogated, and that the interference of the State, in matters of religious faith and ceremonies, is a usurpation which cannot be justified."

"12. *Resolved*, That as the duty of observing the first day of the week is not enjoined either in the second chapter of Genesis, or the twentieth chapter of Exodus, or in any other portion of the Old Testament, any reference to the Jewish Scriptures, in support of such observance, is not only impertinent, but condemnatory of the present general practice ; for the old Hebrew injunction runs: 'The *seventh* day is the Sabbath.' "

"20. *Resolved*, That with the observance of the first day of the week simply as a day of bodily rest, in the present deplorable condition of the laboring classes, we have no controversy. On the contrary, we regard it as an indispensable relaxation, both for men and animals, who are severely taxed six days out of seven ; but we deny that this excessive toil and imperfect rest are in accordance with physiological law, or the design of the universal Father in the creation of man, or that they are the highest attainable state of the human race ; and we would remove from the minds of all every superstitious notion as to the peculiar sanctity of the day."

This convention was very sharply criticised and

---

\* Proceedings, etc., p. 8.



condemned by the "Religious Press" of the country. Those who planned it and took part represented much ability and much of the spirit and power of reform in other directions, especially in the matter of slavery. The report of its proceedings made a permanent addition to the Sabbath literature of that time as well as of the present, and it must be reckoned among the significant elements in the Sabbath question in America. The doctrines put forth by it have far more adherents now, than they had then.

"HOW SHALL WE KEEP SUNDAY?"

The agitation of the Sunday question in connection with the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia in 1876, gave rise to a certain pamphlet of 100 pages. It was issued by the "Free Religious Association," Boston. The full title is: "How Shall We Keep Sunday?" An answer in Four Parts:

1. Sunday in the Bible.
2. Sunday in Church History.
3. Sunday in the Massachusetts Law.
4. The Working Man's Sunday.

By Charles K. Whipple, Minot J. Savage, Charles E. Pratt, Wm. C. Gannett, respectively.

These papers were "delivered at a convention of the Free Religious Association, called specially to consider the question, 'How Shall We Keep Sunday.'" Efforts were made to induce men holding the "Orthodox" view to present it to this convention but without success. The views presented rest upon the "No-Sabbath" platform, with the idea

that Sunday should be used for "rest, recreation or religious service," as men may choose, "only let the true grounds of such observance be understood, and let not sectarians impose their church rules upon the community under the pretense that they are laws of God." The historic paper concerning the Sunday laws of Massachusetts gives many interesting facts, and quotes a list of cases of unjust punishment under the law. It is the latest contribution to the Sabbath literature of the present time, from the liberal wing of the church.

#### THE SABBATH PROPER.

The efforts and doctrines of those Christians who observe the seventh day may be classed as a third element of agitation, from the religious stand-point.

#### SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS.

The Seventh-day Baptists are by far the oldest sect among those Christians who do not accept the Sunday. They have had an organized existence in America since 1671. In England they have had a denominational existence for a still longer period, and claim to have an unorganized, but yet an unbroken existence, through all the centuries backward to the time when Sunday usurped the place of the Sabbath in the Christian church. At first they could find no place for existence in America except in the land of Roger Williams. Their growth has been slow and their numbers are yet less than ten thousand "communicants." They represent a population of twenty-five thousand more or less. Their

doctrines are essentially the same as those held by the "Regular Baptists," except on the Sabbath question. On that point they teach that the Law of God as contained in the Decalogue is eternal and universal, both as to its letter, and its spirit; therefore the Seventh-day is the only Sabbath. That under the gospel it should be observed with Christian freedom and not Judaic strictness, but that the change which Christ taught was a change in the spirit and manner of observance and not in the day to be observed. They believe that in the on-coming issue the Sunday will inevitably return to its native place as a holiday, and that the Christian church will be left Sabbathless, unless it returns to the Seventh-day which alone has divine authority. Their work has been more that of seed sowing than of political, or other forms of agitation, partaking more of the grace of patient waiting, than of the expectation of immediate success. They are steadily enlarging their missionary and Sabbath-reform efforts. The religious features of the question are most discussed by them.

They believe that the present Sunday laws are unjust in the disabilities which they place upon Sabbath-keepers. But since the majority claim the right to thus infringe upon the rights of the minority, they have thus far accepted the situation, under protest, waiting patiently the time of their vindication. They began publishing their views as early as 1819. In April, 1882, they began the publication of a monthly devoted to Sabbath reform, an 8 page

paper called the *Outlook*. It started with a circulation of 50,000, mainly among clergymen ; which was well sustained for two years. At the opening of the third volume, it was enlarged to 32 pages and changed to a quarterly under the title of *The Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly*. Its effect as a means of spreading truth and agitating the public mind has been very great. Its influence is increasing steadily among the most thoughtful of the friends of Sabbath reform.

A very significant result of its influence appeared in a pamphlet of 44 pages in June, 1883, wherein twenty-nine pages are devoted to the Sabbath question, mainly to a review of the *Outlook*. The title is as follows : "The Two Great Questions of the Day." "The doctrine of the church as to the authority of, 1. The Lord's-day. 2. The Holy Scriptures." In the prefatory notice is the following :

"It will be observed that the discussion of the first of these questions is mainly an examination of what has appeared in the *Outlook*, as that has been of late sent through the post office to our clergy ; of the other as it has been treated for some months past by the *Churchman* (New York)."

The opening pages detail how the One Hundredth Annual Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland was agitated concerning the question of Sunday observance, at its session in Baltimore, May 30 to June 1, 1883. The author then pays his respects to the *Outlook* as follows :

"It has been said that to apply the fourth com-

mandment to Sunday, by maintaining that the holy day of the week was transferred from the seventh to the first day, was a Puritan invention. I am not so sure but that we are indebted for this very brilliant discovery to the small but very zealous sect of 'Seventh-day Baptist,' who are themselves in some respects the most complete development of Puritanism that we have. Many who read this will have been for some time past receiving a well printed and well written little paper called the *Outlook*, devoted most honestly, in some respects ably, to promoting the keeping of the fourth commandment. I very soon saw that the hope and purpose of it was to convince all the Christians of this nation, 1st, that the Lord's-day had no real religious authority; and then to slip into the 'aching void,' which all thoughtful Christians would at once feel and fear—the seventh day, simply the *Sabbath*, as the Jews keep it.

"And they did their work very ingeniously, according to their fixed notions, conclusively. Evidently many with other previous opinions were surprised, disconcerted, 'demoralized' by the argument, and if not quite surrendering and re-enlisting at once with their captors, 'did not know what to say.'"

"In what follows I shall take the arguments of the *Outlook* to represent the notion controverted, because they have undoubtedly at this time, more general currency and greater effect upon opinion among those who guide the opinions of others than anything else in this day and land. I am sure that many of my faithful brethren of the clergy have been more or less persuaded or at least confused by them." \*

The work of the Seventh-day Baptists, in the mat-

---

\* Pamphlet by Rev. Thomas S. Bacon, D. D., Point of Rocks, Md.

ter of agitation, is certain to increase as the years go by.

#### THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

The Seventh-day Adventists date from the year 1844. The Advent church at Washington, N. H., received the knowledge of the Sabbath from two isolated Seventh-day Baptists. In 1845, those Adventists who had become observers of the Sabbath, began publishing the truth by means of the printed page; the idea that the acceptance of Sabbath was one characteristic of the true church in the last days was rapidly adopted by those who, though disappointed in 1844, still held to the belief that the coming of Christ was near at hand. Under the inspiration of this faith, the Seventh-day Adventists have pushed the knowledge of their views with great earnestness, and success. As an element of agitation their power is proportionately much greater than their age, and is steadily increasing.

#### WHISKY, BEER, AND SUNDAY.

Among the non-religious elements of agitation, in the near future, a large place must be assigned to whisky, beer, and general holidayism. These influences are closely allied, and, though professing different aims, are strong abettors of each other. They are not especially interested in the religious features of the question, but are very sensitive to any effort to enforce the existing Sunday laws. These influences will continue to increase the agitation, for the following reasons:

(a) Sunday holidayism, as opposed to Sunday Sabbathism, is rapidly increasing among all classes. The holiday is the natural ally of all forms of the liquor traffic. It is probable that what has been demonstrated in many cases, is true as a rule, viz., that the "Sunday sales *form one half* of the receipts for the entire week." Here is a mighty financial reason why the liquor interest should stand in deadly opposition to the execution of the Sunday laws. Add to this the social and convivial interests and habits, and we have combined influences, which have grown strong for many years, while public opinion has quietly applauded, or indifferently slept. Meanwhile these same liquor interests have taken possession of the political machinery of the country, so that the execution of existing laws, or the enactment of more stringent ones, is practically impossible. But the long-suffering public is beginning to see whither things are drifting, and an open struggle between the civil law and the liquor power comes nearer every day. The question of the Sunday liquor law will play a prominent part in the coming agitation.

(b) A possible conflict between the beer and the whisky interests adds a complication, which, if made actual, would intensify the agitation. As the probability of universal prohibition increases, the beer interest will undoubtedly press its already popular claim, that beer is "a temperance drink," and seek to join in an effort to legislate against distilled liquors,

in consideration of a more open field for beer ; to gain this, beer would consent to eliminate " Brass Bands " and noise from Sunday, but would insist on free sale, " in a quiet way." Whether such an unnatural state of things shall occur or not, the beer interest, for some time past, has contemplated a Sunday-law conflict, as one of the probable things. Its claims of great reserved strength, may be boastful, and we venture no opinion as to the number of votes it could rally, for the repeal of the law against Sunday selling. It is however apparent, from the results of the conflict in California, that if the laws are urged or executed, so as to interfere with the general sale of beer on Sunday, a sharp agitation will result. That conflict will force the consideration of the question whether the present laws do not give great advantage to the liquor interests, by enabling them to checkmate just effort against the saloons, by counter movements against legitimate business which the law tacitly permits. Thus it is evident that nothing but the apathy of the temperance men, in the matter of the Sunday liquor laws, can prevent a wide spread, and exasperating agitation.

In 1880, at Hartford, Conn., F. W. Salem published a book, entitled

**" BEER, ITS HISTORY AND ITS ECONOMIC VALUE AS A NATIONAL BEVERAGE."**

Chapter XII. of this book opens with the conclusion that the habitual use of beer has been conclusively shown to reduce drunkenness and crime by,



giving a mild stimulant, in place of the fiery distilled liquors. Having thus concluded, the author goes on to say :

“There is another subject which we approach with some reluctance, knowing that however carefully our words may be weighed, there is a large number of estimable individuals throughout the country, and particularly in the Eastern States, to whom they will probably give offense. We allude to what is called the Sunday question, and the topic is treated here because in this country beer drinking is, in the common mind, intimately associated with the German Americans and their custom of spending part of Sunday in recreation in a beer garden. The fact that they do so has been more than once used as an argument against them, and against the use of beer, as if there were any real connection between the character of the drink and such a custom on the part of its greatest consumers, even supposing the custom to be actually harmful or immoral. As such a feeling exists, however, it seems worth while to call attention to the fact that what is known as the New England Sunday is not an essential part of Christianity, as so many honestly suppose, but something that in the comparison with Christianity is new and local. We need hardly say that in the early days of the church it was distinctly taught that the time of the Jewish Sabbath was past, and for several hundred years this view was generally held.” . . .

Here follow several quotations from the New Testament, adduced to support the statement that the law of the Decalogue was done away in Christ, being replaced by the commandment to love God and man; the author insisting that “love is the fulfilling of the law,” and that “Jesus himself taught the disregard

of the Sabbath as a day of ceasing from labor or recreation: ”

“The first legal enactment requiring the observance of Sunday as a Sabbath, was foisted upon the Christian world, A. D. 321, by Constantine the Great, a heartless tyrant, who had caused seven members of his family to be put to death in cold blood, that he might obtain political and religious supremacy ! He embraced Christianity because the pagan priests and pontiffs could not grant him absolution, and would not fraternize with such a murderous monster ! Hence he became the father of the so-called Sunday laws. Even Constantine’s decree did not interdict recreation nor the tillage of the soil. In general, through the Christian world, the day was a holiday such as it is now on the continent of Europe. There the hours of service in the churches fall usually in the morning, and are strictly observed, while the rest of the day is universally given to enjoyment. Let those, however, who are accustomed to cry out at the notion of a Continental Sunday, remember that they are themselves the innovaters, and let them, too, examine the following passage from the writings of men whose names must command respect, and not one of whom would speak in such a matter without mature consideration.”

Then come quotations from Archbishop Whately, Milton, Melancthon, Calvin, Luther, and Grotius, with the statement that “ Tyndale, Erasmus, Paley, McKnight and a host of other Christian authorities, were and are of the same opinion regarding Sabbath observance.” Of course the quotations are all favorable to No-sabbathism. A letter from Benjamin Franklin to Jared Ingersoll, of New Haven, Conn., under date of Dec. 11, 1762, is also introduced

to show that Franklin favored the Sunday, as he had seen it while traveling in Flanders, rather than as it existed in New England, the letter closing in these words, "which would almost make one suspect that the Deity is not so angry at that offense as a New England justice." Having thus sought to fortify his position, Mr. Salem proceeds :

"A correspondent of the New York *Staats Zeitung*, (Nov. 1, 1876), writes as follows: 'The Emperor of Germany has made a contribution to the discussion of the Sunday question that is very much to the point. It is an address to the Prussian Synod, which had recently objected to the holding of a review on Sunday, and reads thus: "He who instituted the Sabbath has declared that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. The puritanic and Calvinistic conception of the Sabbath, as a day of penance and repentance has always been foreign to the feeling and taste of the German people.'

"These words of the Emperor will receive the hearty assent of every German American, and priests and pietists may as well understand that Germans in America will struggle as long for their free Sunday as Germans in their old home have for a free German Rhine. They have conquered back the "Sacred stream" and something more into the bargain, and we here shall have no less success in securing a free cheerful Sunday, if we remain united and true to our principles.

"England formerly held the same views that then and since have prevailed on the Continent, but gradually the liberty of the day was restricted and its character wholly changed.'"

Here follow several pages of quotations from Eng-

lish Statutes, from 1278 A. D. forward, showing how the Sunday in England was gradually changed from the Continental to the Semi-Puritan type, closing with the following :

“ In 1676, was enacted the well-known ‘ Lord’s-day Act,’ of 29, Car. II., Chap. 7, which prohibits generally all work, labor and business on Sunday, except works of necessity and charity, and which, with more or less modification, forms the basis of all Sunday laws now extant in the United States.” . . . “ As an historical matter the question is not very abstruse and the truth is well enough known to scholars everywhere; should there not then be charity for honest convictions ? ”

Mr. Salem then gives a history of the efforts, pro and con, relative to the Sunday laws, in Newark, N. J , in 1879, and concludes with these words :

“ The matter made a great excitement and called out many bitter paragraphs on both sides, but chiefly among the more narrow-minded and pharisaical of (the) so-called religious press. We have no space nor disposition to go into the details of their criticism, even for the sake of illustrating how far misrepresentation and inuendo may be made to stand in place of careful statement and sound argument. The case has been spoken of because it is in some sense typical, because it represents the course of public thought and feeling, and the change which even within two or three generations has come over the rigid enactments of puritan early settlers. These Puritans did much good but it was all tempered and shadowed by an austere severity that has no merit in itself and that crushes out much the better part of life, and obscures many a truth that in itself is clear as noonday. The mind of the people has changed. It is time that

the law should be changed also. The *Christian Union* has said, 'The sooner the issue is made in Chicago between a whole Sabbath and none at all, the sooner the Christian element in the community will win the victory it will deserve. Half a Sabbath is hardly worth fighting for.' We say that the best rule for observing the day is that which gives the greatest amount of harmless freedom and enjoyment to the greatest number, each according to his own judgment and conscience. Our foreign element is very large and has its own beliefs and traditions, as dear and as implicitly held as those of any one whose training and practice have been after the strictest Sabbatarian pattern. . . .

"We close as we began, with the words which seem to us to indicate the only practical road to real temperance and record again our motto

"BEER AGAINST WHISKY."\*

The extent of the "Beer" influence on the coming history of the Sunday question in America, cannot be easily measured. The use of beer is a permanent element in the observance of Sunday. Those interested in its manufacture, sale and use, are banded together. The "Beer Brewers Association" of the United States is a strong and widely extended organization. It held its first congress in 1862. Since that time each annual congress has been marked by an increase in the work of enlarging and consolidating its influence. The friends of beer do not hesitate to claim for it exemption from all Sunday restrictions. The pecuniary interests represented by it are very great. Mr. Salem's history, referred

---

\* History of Beer, etc., chap. 12, pp. 156-165.

to above, gives figures in detail and the following summary :

‘After careful investigation of the most trustworthy *data* we find that there are more than *three hundred million* dollars invested in breweries, malt-houses and other adjuncts of the manufacture of beer in the United States. The direct investment, however, is not the only thing to be considered. A business of this magnitude furnishes occupation not merely to vast numbers of laborers, but also to thousands of men who follow some profession or trade, such as architects, civil engineers, masons, carpenters, coopers, copper-smiths, wagon and harness-makers, and the like ’\*’

Considered in the light of the present facts, as productive of results in the near future, the “Beer Interest” alone, promises to be a more important factor in the question of Sunday and Sunday laws, than any other one secular element, not excepting the “Railroad interest.” We, therefore, feel justified in occupying some more space with it in order to give the reader a full view of the case.. The *Brewers’ Gazette*, New York, for April 15, 1873, Vol. 3, No. 4, has the following :

“By far the larger proportion of the inhabitants of the United States are of foreign extraction, who, having adopted this country, have become entitled to all the privileges of citizenship. The habits and customs of their various nationalities are strong upon them, and they are untrammelled by the Puritanical prejudices which are a distinguishing characteristic of the so-called temperance party ; therefore when their rights and privileges are tampered with, and their

---

\* Hist. of Beer, etc., pp. 76, 77.

social habits subjected to legislative interference, the result will be dangerous in the extreme. \* Politico-theological enthusiasts will have a tremendous battle to fight, and the war will be carried into the enemy's country with a vengeance."

Then follow certain statements concerning a bill then recently before the Assembly of the State of New York, which sought to obtain freedom for lager beer from all "Sunday and excise laws," together with the arguments of Jacob Worth, Member from Kings County, in favor of the bill. In that argument the third proposition was as follows :

"Lager beer is the habitual beverage of that extensive proportion of the citizens of the United States, who are recognized alike for their social geniality and peaceable industry ; therefore it ought not to be subject to prohibitory or Sunday laws, antagonistic to the national habits of those citizens."

In support of this proposition, the following, among other things, was said :

"There is an argument which, we believe, is as powerful as any that can be adduced, why Sunday restrictions should be removed in the matter of malt liquors. It must be borne in mind that the industrious classes, after a week of toil, are peculiarly inclined for relaxation and enjoyment on the seventh day, the only day in the week they can legally claim for leisure, and, on such a day, they invariably provide themselves with drink, as well as meat, suitable for the occasion. Whether it is not better, then, to encourage them in the consumption of a mild and sober beverage, such as is lager beer, than, by restrictive and prohibitory measures, force them to store in their houses ardent spirits, which are more particularly liable to abuse. They cannot keep beer, it

becomes stale and flat; but they can keep spirits. Under these circumstances, then, we contend, it is most desirable to exempt lager beer from Sunday restriction.

“ Whilst respecting the religious feelings of those who look upon the institution of the Seventh-day (Sunday?) as peculiarly sacred, the citizens of the United States who claim the right to enjoy themselves after their national manner prefer to incline to the creed that ‘ the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath ;’ and until some better way is shown them by reason and argument, not by petty tyranny or force, they will continue so to enjoy themselves. To seek to prevent them is poor policy on the part of the Prohibitionists ; for beer will continue to be drank on Sunday, as well as Monday while the world lasts. ” \*

“ The Thirteenth Annual Congress of the Chief Association of the Brewers of the United States ” was held at Cleveland in June, 1873. The reports and addresses on that occasion were full, and in some points, very outspoken and severe upon those phases of the beer question which are affected by the Sunday laws. ‘ The “ Puritan ” element is arraigned in no measured terms. Among other things it said of them :

“ The so-called Temperance and Sunday laws are their chief weapons, and especially directed against the immigrants and their descendents not of English Puritanical stock. They are even now preparing to have their Puritanical creed made the State religion of the whole country. Restless as they are, they will go from one step to another, and religious per-

---

\* *Brewers' Gazette*, 1873, pp. 81-84.



secutions will soon commence to be again inaugurated by them." . . .

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, says the Constitution of the United States. The same applies to State legislatures; otherwise Brigham Young would be justified, by local option or otherwise, to force others, not his followers, to go into the polygamy business and show obedience to his sort of religion. The Puritans have just as little right to insist upon the strict observance of their Puritanical Sabbath." . . . "The Israelite cannot force us into the observance of his Sabbath, and we have no more right to compel him to observe our Sunday. Religious liberty is one of the cardinal principles underlying this government. There is only one country in the world where Sunday is observed as here, and that is Scotland. The consequences have indeed been most dismal to the population of that little country. Formerly the working-class considered the Sunday a holiday, and, after the arduous labors of the week, a day of recreation for body and mind. They enjoyed themselves in the circle of their families on Sunday, in open air, at a glass of ale and beer. Now, after the Sunday laws, similar to ours, have been established the Scotch workman goes on Saturday evening to the gin and whisky houses, and returns from there not only drunk, but with a supply of the needful in a bottle or jug under his arm for the next day—the Puritanical Sabbath."\*

After detailing the disadvantages under which the beer business is placed by temperance legislation, Louis Schade, attorney for the association, added the following:

"That state of affairs cannot last any longer.

---

\* *Brewers' Gazette* for June, 1873. p. 153.

is a question with you of 'to be or not to be.' You have to give up passive resistance and take the offensive. Your opponents will not stop until they have destroyed you. In one State they have already succeeded in accomplishing it. You are in the right, and, therefore, if you do not want to be regarded as cowards, you must fight. There is no peace, no compromise possible with fanatics and corrupt hypocrites." . . .

"Shall we submit to that tyranny any longer? It is in our power to put a stop to that contemptible state of servitude immediately, if we only will be united. It is not a question about lager beer, as the Puritans sneeringly assert; it is a question of civil and religious liberty. We are not standing alone in that great struggle. The Irish and all other foreign born citizens will be with us. They cannot separate themselves from us as they are in the same ship with us. For the Puritans hate them as bitterly as us. Many of the free-minded native citizens will join us, and the Southern people, trampled down by the iron yoke of Puritanical tyranny, will pray for our success. The immigrants will never forget that in 1855, when those Puritans were attempting to enslave and disfranchise them, the Southern people came to their rescue. The following table will show that it is an easy task to free the country of rampant hypocrisy, bigotry and corruption." . . .

"It will be seen that the foreign born citizens and their children are strong enough in every one of those States (fifteen in number) to turn the scale in favor of either one or the other of the contending parties. In the most of those States it can even be done by the German vote alone. It is, therefore, for the liberal people but necessary to be united and in earnest to give the death blow to Puritanical tyranny."

"The future is ours. The enormous influx of immigration will, in a few years, overreach the Puritanical element in every State in the Union. The

present exceptional and anomalous state of affairs cannot last. The dark scenes of the times of the Connecticut blue laws cannot reappear. Let us organize! Let it be our duty to not rest or sleep until the Goddess of Liberty can again show her face unveiled on this continent." \*

The "tables" referred to by Mr. Schade were arranged in view of the "majorities in the election of 1868, and the number of foreigners and their children in various States in 1870." If the tables thus made gave ground for the threats contained in the words quoted above, surely the enormous influx of foreigners between 1870 and 1885 has been such as to add double meaning to the thought that any persistent effort to enforce the present Sunday laws, would result in making their repeal a direct issue. The "balance of power" between the parties will probably keep the issue out of national politics for a time. But the issue must be made soon, or late, or else the Sunday laws must be allowed to sink out of sight, dead and buried. Much more might be added from similar speeches, resolutions, etc., uttered from year to year up to date. But enough has been given to indicate that this "liberal element," this "lager beer question" has already placed a new factor in the Sabbath reform problem in America, which factor will bear no unimportant part in the final solution.

#### RAILROADS.

The facts which crowd portions of this chapter show

---

\*Ib., pp. 155-157.

that the money-king has come to the front rapidly as an actor in the drama of agitation. Business and pleasure combine to seek his alliance and to give him aid. Both these demand "boats and trains," and stockholders and employes are not opposed to "turning an honest penny," in the service of the king. It is easy to evade the letter of the law under the plea of "necessity," and so it has come to pass that the tide of Sunday business swells enormously, year after year. The "Sunday newspapers" have come in a like a flood, and covet the lightnings of heaven to aid in their circulation. Steam, at a mile a minute, is slow for them. Thus do the elements of agitation rush to the front, and tower to the skies. Many of the better, and all of the worst elements of the land are linked together in the work of disregarding Sunday. Unless the churches make some defense, far more effective than they have yet done, business, pleasure and dissipation will take the field, without resistance. If the friends of the Sunday do rally, for a definite struggle, the agitation will be increased in the ratio of their earnestness. Whatever results may follow, the question can never go back to its former status of quiet and comparative unimportance. The "Sunday Question" has come to stay.

## CHAPTER XXX.

# THE VERDICT OF HISTORY.

History is more than the chronological arrangement of events. It is always an organic process, in which principles and ideas, causes and results, move forward in a vital development. Such a development is not necessarily improvement. Human choices, in the domain of man's agency, introduce discord by disobedience, and produce temporary deflections in the general current. But under all disturbances of the surface, eternal truths are working on towards specific and legitimate results. This ongoing of the ideas and purposes of God is the basis of all real history. This is not fatalism nor arbitrary decree, but rather an all-embracing plan which gives full place and free play to human choices, within the limits of human knowledge and power. The ultimate fiat of God in this plan is this: No human choice or disobedience shall be permitted to make shipwreck of the general and ultimate good for which all things are created. So far as we can see, evil choices and persistent disobedience do bring individual ruin. But God is ever working above and through all these conflicts, vindicating truth, compelling justice.

and ordering all things for the greatest good of his creation. Therefore it is that startling developments appear along the line of history, wherein errors and evils are suddenly overwhelmed in their own ruin. When God speaks thus, men are humbled or destroyed. These results, epochs, are the verdict of God. They are an expression of the will of the Most High concerning creeds, methods and deeds. These are the voice of God. Whoever heeds them stands with God. Whoever disregards them defies God. These verdicts are final, unalterable. Christ recognized them when he said: "By their fruits ye shall know them." And again: "On whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." All efforts to evade or set aside these verdicts are foolish and futile. When men will not accept them, God often permits them to make a second trial that they may be taught salutary lessons by finding the verdict reaffirmed more decisively than before. Happy are they who, recognizing the true philosophy of history, heed its verdicts, and are not found fighting against God.

The facts embodied in the preceding pages seem clearly to justify the following conclusions as being the verdict of history.

First verdict    **MEN MUST HAVE A SABBATH.**

The first essential departure from the Sabbath law, as laid down in the Decalogue, appears in the No-sabbathism that found its earliest exponent in Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century of

the Christian Era. Perhaps a liberal construction of the Pauline theory concerning the observance of days, and the reaction from the false Sabbathism of the Hebrews, had some influence in the development of this great error. But the most potent element, aided by exaggerated notions of "freedom under the gospel," was the pagan influence which came into the church with the converts from paganism. Under these circumstances the church drifted rapidly toward the great apostasy. This No-sabbathism said: "There is no sacred time under the gospel. He keeps a continual Sabbath who lives holy each day." From the middle of the second century forward, this theory was taught by the leading Fathers. But the hearts of the people were truer to the Sabbath idea than the theories of the leaders were, and while polemicists and philosophers taught that there was no sacred time, and, while hatred for Judaism was degrading and rendering unpopular the Sabbath, semi-religious fasts and festivals increased, in answer to this unconscious demand for the sacred time. The Sun's day had been a leading weekly pagan festival for many centuries. After the middle of the second century, Sunday gradually assumed the character of a joyful festival in the church, in honor of the supposed resurrection of Christ on that day. In the same way, Wednesday and Friday became fasts in memory of his sufferings. Sunday as a joyful festival, gradually assumed pre-eminence over the fasts and the Sabbath, and, as all converts from paganism were accustomed to honor it as the Sun's day, it formed

a common ground where the two elements, paganism and apostatizing Christianity met. This gradual elevation of Sunday was not due to any Sabbatic character, such as the Sabbath possessed. Pagan Rome had scores of religious and semi-religious festivals, which the civil law made as sacred from labor as Constantine's first edict, of A. D. 321, made the "Venerable day of the Sun." The law of the soul's need is illustrated in all the succeeding centuries. When the Sabbath had been driven out from the great body of the church, and the night of the middle ages shut down, fasts and festivals increased until the church was burdened as with a crushing weight. It was the abnormal hungering of souls in the darkness which brooded over a Sabbathless church. All these facts conspire to prove that humanity demands some form of sacred time. The No-sabbath theory cannot drive out this inherent demand. Humanity feels the need and obeys its behests, instinctively. If this obedience be imperfect and perverted, the proof of need is not the less absolute. This universal expression of human need is history's verdict: *Men must have a Sabbath.*

In this we have spoken mainly of man's spiritual and religious needs. Not deeming it necessary to discuss the physical necessity for the Sabbath, which is acknowledged by all, even No-sabbathists.

Second verdict. *A Sabbath cannot be maintained without Divine Authority.*

The history of the Sabbath under Judaism is the first testimony on this point. The Sabbath law is



especially hedged by divine authority, and rests on divine example. Nothing less could have established it, or enforced its observance. Sabbath desecration was a prevailing sin among the Jews, hence the restrictions which at last grew about it in false formalism, until its true character was almost lost. Under the same demand for a real or a supposed divine authority, the multitude of holy days which grew up, from the fourth century forward, and which crushed the church from the seventh to the fifteenth century, were without adequate power over the people until the church succeeded in assuming divine authority, and thus spoke to the people as God. The people finally accepted the voice of church as the voice of God, and each day named by the church came to be deemed as divinely ordered. It does not weaken this conclusion to say that those were times of ignorant credulity, for even this ignorant credulity did not yield willing obedience without the influence of an authority recognized as divine, and supported by many signs and pretended miracles. Without the introduction of this element of divine authority, there is no doubt but that the fruitage of No-sabbathism would have been absolute chaos and, in the end, the entire destruction of the Sabbatic idea. The demand for divine authority is as necessary to the continued existence of the Sabbath idea, as the Sabbath idea is necessary to the demands of the soul-life and religious culture of humanity.

This conclusion is supported with equal power by

the the facts of history since the "Reformation." Those parts of Protestant Christendom which have held to No-sabbathism long enough to bear ripened fruit have virtually lost the Sabbath idea as well as the Sabbath-day, while Roman Catholic countries have been for centuries without any essential Sabbath. A holiday for rest, recreation and debauchery is, in no Biblical or religious sense, a Sabbath. Thus history shows that when the divine element is eliminated from the Sabbath question, or when the false claims of divine power on the part of the church are set aside by increasing intelligence, the day and the idea are both lost; and people sink into social and physical dissipation according to the state of civilization in any given locality.

Third verdict. *All compromise between the Sabbath and No-sabbathism is weak and ephemeral.*

The circumstances under which the Puritan compromise between the Sabbath and the Sunday was undertaken were strongly marked. The English-speaking church was thoroughly aroused on the question of reform. The second stage of reformation had been reached. Men stood face to face with the question: "Which is the ultimate authority, God's Word or the church?" In the presence of such a question the Sabbath became prominent at once. Puritanism answered: "God's Word is the ultimate authority." Reform answered quickly, "What then of the fourth commandment and the Sabbath?" Trained for centuries under a system which was intensely anti-Jewish the leaders said:

“ We cannot go back to the Sabbath; that would be a return to Judaism.” Pondering a while concerning the dilemma, Puritanism said: “ I see it. The law is binding, but the day is not. We can transfer the law from the seventh day to the first day, and all will be well. We can take this much liberty on general principles. Under the white heat of reform this theory was accepted and acted upon at once. Strongly supported by civil laws the Sunday became rigidly Sabbatic, so far as the Puritans were concerned, and offensively unpopular with the non-Puritanic. The struggle was soon transferred to America, where Puritanism had a free field with every possible advantage. The State first existed, practically, only in the church. It was more than union; it was absorption or generation of the State and church. The experiment has gone forward for nearly three centuries since its inception in Europe. The result is that few representative men can now be found among the leaders of thought who attempt to defend the Sunday as the Sabbath, from the Puritan stand-point. Even the most orthodox now admit, or virtually teach No-sabbathism, and defend Sunday only on sanitary grounds, moral and physical. Meanwhile the Sunday has lost its Sabbatic character in a very large degree throughout the land, and with the great majority of the people. And since the church has continued to assert the theory that the Sabbath—Seventh-day—is Jewish, the No-sabbath element has regained the field. Thus the weak, through well-meant, compromise is dead. If

any regard is paid to the verdict of history on the question of compromises in general, and of this Puritan-Sunday compromise in particular, no compromise will be attempted in the future. If there shall be any specific issue in the coming years it will be between Sunday as a holiday, and the Seventh-day, in a Christian, rather than a Jewish dress. If holidayism does not overwhelm all, so that there can be no conflict, the battle of the future will be between the only divinely appointed Sabbath and none at all. God's verdict concerning the evil and weakness of compromises is as clear and unmistakable in the death of the Puritan Sunday, as it was in the matter of American slavery, when he wrote the verdict in blood on an hundred battle fields. If there be any Sabbath in the future, it will not be the weak offspring of compromise.

Fourth verdict. *The general results of Civil Legislation have been evil.*

Christ clearly stated, and often repeated the truth: "My kingdom is not of this world." He taught that his gospel was to be the great transforming power in the world, but that it was not to rely upon worldly measures or civil government for its advancement and support. He made no appeal to king or senate, sought no favors from governors or princes; he did not even complete an organization of his immediate followers. He enunciated the great truths of the gospel, and left them to germinate and bear fruit through their own inherent power. Religion belongs to the realm of soul-life. Its founda-

tion rests on love to God, and hence, obedience. Outward restraints cannot beget that love. In regulating the relations of men to each other, civil law has its province. It also has a mission in the realm of morals which lies in these human relations. In the matter of duties towards God, under a system of religion like the gospel, civil law has no place. Any attempt to thus determine duty or prescribe action must degrade the system and the worshiper. True religious impulses exist only in the realm of the soul's relations to God. Civil law can neither create nor destroy such impulses. If, however, it shall interfere, making itself the standard and the ultimate appeal, grave evils follow. The true standard is practically set aside even though it be claimed that the civil law is founded on the divine. The lower, human standard, takes the place of the higher and divine one, thus casting out the element of direct divine authority. This weakens the whole question and makes the issue simply that of obedience or disobedience to the civil law. This destroys true religion.

A second evil follows. Religious questions and duties are thus made to play a part in politics, and are subjected to the schemes and manipulations of selfishness and trickery. In all politico-religious movements that which is essentially religious is soon obscured or lost. In so far as it does remain it is usually a partisan or sectarian element. Being thus brought into the arena of political strife, of plots and

counter-plots, degeneration and spiritual decay are rapid and fatal.

These evils are apparent in all departments, and all stages of politico-religious agitation, and in all enforced civil legislation concerning religious matters. The question of the Sabbath and of Sabbath-keeping has been perverted from the time that Constantine began his legislation, which was essentially pagan, to the present hour. Indeed, all union of church and State, direct or indirect, is born of paganism or Judaism, and not of Christianity. Enforced Sunday-keeping under ecclesiastico-civil regulations, of whatever form, has not been true Sabbath-keeping. Had the matter been left free from interference by the State, and left, like the question of personal repentance, conversion, baptism, or the partaking of the Lord's Supper, upon grounds wholly religious and personal between God's people and himself, the case would have been far better, and the problem much nearer solution than it now is.

The commander of a regiment during the late war, who ordered sixteen men to be detailed for baptism, because in a religious revival in a neighboring regiment, eight men had been baptized as a religious duty, is a fair illustration of the folly of attempting to make men religious by civil law. The question of Sabbath-keeping is purely a religious one between the church and God, and it must eventually be settled on that ground. For fifteen centuries the church and the State have been trying to settle it as an ecclesiastical matter. The result has been almost

an entire destruction of the true idea of the Sabbath, and of Sabbath-keeping. The province of the civil law in protecting conscience will be noticed further on. But we do not hesitate to repeat, that thus far history records its verdict that civil legislation concerning the Sabbath question has been productive of far more evil than good, that it has delayed the solution of the question, and the demand of the hour is, to the civil law, hands off. Let the church settle the question with God and its own experience.

This position is further supported by the fact that Sunday laws are wholly inconsistent with the theory of No-sabbathism, which is now the prevailing theory, both in the church and out of it. If there be no sacred time under the gospel by divine appointment, all efforts to create such time are illogical and foolish. Human law can create holidays, but has no power to make a Sabbath. If the popular theory be correct, God leaves each man to choose when and how he shall Sabbatize. By this theory the New Testament gives greater freedom in the matter of Sabbath-keeping than it does in the matter of baptism and the Lord's Supper. This being true the civil law has no province in the case except to protect each man in following his convictions of duty, as in case of baptism, or other religious ordinances and ceremonies. It may simply stand by and see that no man prevents his fellow from doing what he deems it his duty to do. While it thus protects others from interfering it must not interfere nor dictate. If any law be demanded, or admissible, it must be a general

one applying to all days alike, forbidding disturbance or interference at any and all times in the matter of worshipping and Sabbatizing. Here the law must stop. It may not say that any man shall rest or worship, or shall not rest or worship. No civil law can determine when a man needs rest, nor how much; nor when, nor how he desires to worship. Both questions are beyond its province. It is assumed that man needs periodic rest as often as one day in seven. But this assumption is based upon, or borrowed from, the Sabbath law, and if that law be done away as a Jewish code, surely our civil law has no right to galvanize it into life and falsely apply it to another specific day.

When pressed by logic, the champions of modern Puritanism, as represented by the publications of the New York Sabbath Committee and similar documents, "beg the question" by claiming that the Sunday laws do not attempt to enforce a religious observance of that day. This effort to show that the Sunday laws are not religious indicates that their supporters are conscious that legislation concerning religious duties is illogical and evil, and that the verdict of history is against it. Document 41, in the list of publications of the New York Sabbath Committee, is devoted especially to this question, being entitled, "Sunday Laws and Sunday Liberty." The document contradicts itself. The general facts are first stated as follows:

"Our Sunday laws grew out of the observance of the Lord's-day, which the earliest colonists brought



with them to these shores, and which was deeply rooted in their religious convictions.”

“In all the original States of the Union, laws protecting and regulating the observance of the first day of the week were among the earliest enacted. As new States were formed, the example was followed, till now in every State of the Union, as well as by the Federal government, the weekly rest-day is recognized by law.”

According to the above, the Sunday laws were the direct product of religious observance of Sunday as the Sabbath of the Decalogue, by implication and transfer, “which was deep-rooted in the religious convictions” of the men who framed those laws. It needs no argument to show that the laws were, therefore, essentially religious and would not have been enacted except for men’s religious convictions. The document might have added that they were developed at a time when the church was mistress of the State, when religion dictated all legislation. But the next paragraph acknowledges the fact still further in the following words :

“The Sunday laws, occasionally modified to meet the changing conditions of society, and differing in some details in the different States, are yet alike in their chief features, from Maine to California. They forbid on Sunday common labor and traffic, public and noisy amusements, and whatever is likely to disturb the quiet and good order of the day. They make Sunday a non-legal day, so that ordinary processes of courts are not served, and contracts made on Sunday are void. The courts and legislatures do not sit ; the public business is suspended. In brief, Sunday is taken out of the number of ordinary week

days and, so far as possible, made free from secular engagements and disturbances."

What is the distinction between "secular" and the opposite? Why do common labor and traffic and public and noisy amusements disturb the quiet and good order of Sunday more than of Monday, if not on religious grounds? If a game of base ball is improper, and must be prevented by law on Sunday, for civil reasons, why not on Monday? What good interest of the commonwealth is jeopardized by the building of a house on Sunday, which is not equally jeopardized by the same act on Monday? Gambling houses and whisky shops are dangerous to the commonwealth on every day. They are no more dangerous on Sunday than on other days except as the Sunday laws enforce idleness, and so leave thousands of men to be tempted to ruin, who, if allowed to pursue their ordinary avocations would not thus be tempted. For, however much Puritan-Sunday-lawism may be startled by the fact, the effect of the Sunday laws upon the irreligious is to lead them into temptation, according to their social status and surroundings. If a man observes the day in a truly religious spirit, he is safe and is benefitted. To be consistent with the claims of modern Puritanism, the law should leave such a man free to follow his conscience, prohibiting on that day nothing which it does not prohibit on all days.

The next paragraph in this document continues the plea that, "These laws do not compel a religious observance of Sunday." Technically that is true,

simply because they cannot. They come as near to it as they can by demanding cessation from labor, which is the outward expression of a religious conviction.

The whole question is again opened so as to condemn Sunday legislation, in this same paragraph, in these words :

“It is true that the great majority of Americans hold the first day of the week as set apart by God, and to be kept holy to him. They know well that in its religious observance lie its best use and benefit; and that when religious regard for it ceases, no human laws can prevent its becoming, as in many parts of Europe, a day of dissipation to some, of common drudgery to others.”

It is true indeed that “when religious regard for it ceases, no human law can prevent” its decay. Since 321 A. D., the European church has made the question of Sunday-keeping a matter of civil legislation. Under such a system its non-Sabbatic character has been gradually inevitable. It is now a day of “dissipation” or “drudging,” because civil legislation and false theories have driven the religious element out of the question. The same result appears in America, where Sunday observance grows less and less religious, every year. There is but one solution of the problem and that will be found in remanding the question to the Bible and the church, as a purely religious one. On that ground it must stand or fall. So long as the civil law continues to usurp and pervert, the case will grow worse and worse.

Many good people are misled and prevented from seeing the true verdict of history by arguments like the following, with which the paragraph in Document 41 closes:

“The laws of the State and the requirement of religion may, in some instances, coincide. Thus each forbids murder, stealing, incest. But the law forbids these, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relations of men to God.”

This argument is faulty, in that it confounds facts. Certain religious duties exist wholly in the realm of man's relation to God, as an individual. Others spring from the relations which men sustain to each other. These last, God requires, and civil law may rightfully enforce them. “Murder, stealing, incest,” etc., belong to the latter class. But because the law of God and the law of man coincide in these points, it does not follow that the civil law may interfere in man's relation to God. Laws against profane swearing have long been a “dead letter,” since they have neither force nor meaning when applied to a crime which is against God, and which men will not refrain from unless they love God. California might pass a law forbidding all heathen forms of worship among the Chinese, and compelling them to go to church, but it would not make the Chinamen Christians, and it would be in violation of the fundamental principles of the gospel. Sunday laws are equally so, as far as they refer to the religious character of the day. The same would be true of civil

legislation concerning the seventh, or any other, day as a Sabbath. Only evil can follow when the civil law attempts to regulate the duties which individual men owe to God. The Jews were in religious and political childhood. The theocracy was necessary because of their weakness. Systems of ecclesiastico-civil legislation, which might have been best for the Jews, have no place in the nineteenth century of the gospel. The longer they are retained the greater evil will be wrought.

## MAJORITY ARGUMENT.

Men seek to evade this verdict of history, by claiming that Sunday laws are just and beneficial, because they protect the majority from being disturbed in their religious duties, and hence the minority must yield, uncomplaining. This is sophistry. There can be no majority in matters of conscience toward God. In such things it is indeed true that "One with God is a majority." He is king who is loyal to God and to his own convictions of duty. But if the argument be correct the civil law should order a census of each locality, and whenever a majority should vote against keeping Sunday, the law should order it not to be kept. This is practical and pertinent in the case of Jews and Seventh-day Christians, and in not a few localities if the principle claimed in support of the Sunday laws were carried out, the Sabbath would be protected, and Sunday left unhelped, or placed in the patronized minority as the Sabbath now is. Neither is it true that all should be

compelled to rest in order that worshipers be undisturbed. Jews and Sabbath-keeping Christians (and Friends, on Wednesday) have always been obliged to worship, in city or country, with no safeguards, except protection from direct assault upon their congregations. All ordinary merriment and labor go on around them, their homes and churches. They may have sometimes been annoyed but they have not been made irreligious, nor driven from fealty to what they deem a religious duty. On the contrary, the Seventh-day Christians have steadily increased in America for more than two hundred years, in spite of disabilities and proscription.

The truth is, there is a lingering taint of the "Inquisition" in the idea that any question of religion or conscience is to be controlled by the majority. Republicanism and Christianity agree that the laws ought to be so modified as to grant protection to all worshiping assemblies alike, on whatever day they may be held, and whether attended by few or many. If Sunday shall remain as a civil holiday, it should have no pre-eminence over other civil holidays. The settlement of the Sabbath question will be delayed in proportion as the civil law insists on keeping Sunday in its present place, and the religious character of Sunday will be lessened in the same degree. The advocates of the Sunday Sabbath seem to be afraid to meet the issue squarely on Biblical grounds, for fear that the Sabbath will be accepted as the only divine appointment, or else that all ideas of a Sabbath will be put aside. Such fears are of little

avail. Truth must triumph. Verdicts of history may be delayed while men experiment, but nothing is clearer than that all religious questions must be settled on religious grounds, just as all scientific questions insist on settlement upon scientific grounds, though creed-makers and ignorance protest never so earnestly. The sooner the church cuts loose from the civil laws concerning Sunday and all similar questions, the better will it be for all concerned.

## SUNDAY AND TEMPERANCE.

The temperance question is also a complicating factor in the matter of Sunday legislation. The State has the right to prohibit liquor selling in behalf of good order and prosperity. It has a right to increase the safeguards on civil holidays, when men are more in danger because of leisure. But a system of "prohibition" on Sundays, and license, which is *protection* rather than restraint, on other days, is illogical and unjust. Liquor selling and its attendant evils are always detrimental to the citizen and the State, and should be prohibited on all days. If Sunday leisure demands special protection let it be granted. But let the State take care that it do not increase the evil by enforcing abstinence from labor on the part of the irreligious, thus creating the leisure through which much of the dissipation comes. As the case now stands the Sunday restrictions are of comparatively little value since the machinery by which the business is propelled during the week, and up to midnight on "Saturday," cannot be stopped on

Sunday. It may be a little "slowed down" by the back-door process, but it does not stop. And even if it be stopped, those who are planning for the coming leisure can easily supply the necessary stimulants in such quantities as will insure broils and rioting on Sunday.

The highest ideal cannot be attained at once; but the duty of the hour, in the light of experience, is to sever all connection between the questions of temperance and of Sunday-keeping, leaving each to stand upon its own merits. Giving us prohibition instead of license, and a settlement of the Sunday question on Biblical and religious grounds. If the settlement of the question on such grounds shall restore the Seventh-day Sabbath, or, on the other hand, give two or more days or parts of days for worship in each week, no matter if it be a settlement based on truth, and free from interference by the civil law. Take the question of Sabbath reform out of politics out of the realm of caucusing and plotting, and let the church settle it as it would any other religious issue. For, we repeat, if the day ought to be kept by divine authority the civil law cannot strengthen that authority, and by a false application it may weaken and destroy it, and if he who does not rest out of regard to the Lord, does not truly Sabbatize, his resting is only an empty form, or a blasphemous pretence. Under the working of the civil law as the prominent element of authority, Sunday has tended and must tend to holiday-



ism; and with the masses, towards debauchery. No question is settled until it is settled right.

It remains for the people of the United States to hasten the solution of the problem of Sabbath reform by placing the question on its true basis, or to delay the solution and insure the decline of Sunday-sabbathism by continuing to appeal to the civil law. God is patient and waits long while men make mistakes and repeat follies, but when he has written repeated verdicts in history, those who heed are wise. Let it be remembered that all compromise is either weak or wicked, often both. "By their fruits ye shall know them." And when fifteen centuries of the civil-law system have given us the "Mediaeval Sunday," with its false formalism, its forged miracles and endless superstition; the "Continental Sunday," with its holidayism and revelry; and now the "Puritan Sunday," virtually dead because of unfounded assumptions and the weakness of compromise; it is time that other seed be sown, in hope of a different harvest. A system that has hitherto borne thorns cannot be expected to produce grapes hereafter.

It is well known that the anti-Sunday lawelement, as represented in pleasure seeking, money making and liquor selling, claims to hold the "balance of power" and the ability to repeal the Sunday law, if the issue should be made. This may be "bravado" only, but the facts are, that for many years these have all defied or ignored the laws. Pulpits and religious organizations protest, and some minor currents of Sunday desecration are temporarily checked. Taken as

a whole the No-sabbath tide gathers force and gains in extent with each year, The verdict of the past is, that with the present public opinion, the Sunday laws cannot be enforced. They find little place in the conscience of the American people. A new foundation for Sabbath reform must be sought. It can only be found in the source from whence the Sabbath first came, divine authority. If the church believes that any divine authority does exist, it should be brought forward and made the main issue at once. Delay is weakness. No-sabbathism appeals to all the lower elements of society: Pleasure and avarice and debauchery, and every lustful vice hail it. It puts God's law and God's self away from human life. It sets a premium on religious indifference and open sin. The words of the prophet come to the American church with terrible force, while the issues of these years confront us:

“If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words:

Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”\*

Happy is he who is not found fighting against God in order to sustain his own theories and choices; truth is not in numbers or in age, but in conformity with the law of God.

---

\* Isa. 58: 13, 14.

## GENERAL INDEX.

---

NOTE.—A dash following the page number indicates that the subject is continued for an indefinite number of pages.

### A

	PAGE.
<i>Abyssinian Church.</i>	
Has always kept the Sabbath,	222-228
<i>Acts, Book of.</i>	
Is an inspired history of the early church,	21
Shows habitual observance of the Sabbath,	24-27
First day of the week, mentioned in, but <i>once</i> ,	28
<i>Adey, Webb.</i>	
Arraigned for working on Sunday,	389
<i>Adventists, Seventh-day.</i>	
Origin and doctrines,	400-
As agitators of the Sabbath question,	504
<i>Agitation.</i>	
Concerning Sunday question, in the United States,	463-
<i>Albigenses.</i>	
Kept the Sabbath,	205

*Allix.*

Statements concerning the Waldenses, 211

*America.*

Sunday in, Colonial Period, 341—

Sabbath in, 392—

*Anabaptists.*

Some, observed the Sabbath, 317

*Anatolius.*

His Chronology of Easter, 125

*Ancient Syrian Documents.*

Claim that the Apostles ordered that  
Christians "Pray toward the East," 181

Also : Services to be held on Sunday, 181

Also : Services to be held on Wednesday,  
182

Also : On the Sabbath, 182

Also : To keep the Festival of the  
Epiphany, 182

*Andrews, Bishop.*

Speech against Thraske, a Seventh-day  
Baptist, 322—

He coins the phrase, *Dominicum Ser-*  
*vasti*, in that speech, 52—

*Andrews, Rev. J. N.*

Statements concerning Tertullian, 94

*Anti-Sabbath Convention.*

Held in Boston 1848 A. D., 497

Called by Garrison, Parker and Whip-  
ple, 497

Declared Sunday laws unconstitution-  
al, 498

The keeping of Sunday unscriptural,	498
Favored Sunday as a rest-day on humanitarian grounds,	498
Was condemned by the religious press,	499
<i>Apology.</i>	
Of Justin Martyr,	71
<i>Apostolic Fathers.</i>	
General character of,	33
<i>Archelaus, Bishop.</i>	
Concerning the abolition of the Sabbath,	123
<i>Argument, Majority.</i>	
Sophistical,	535
Inconsistent and unjust,	535, 536
<i>Armenian Church.</i>	
Keeps the Sabbath.	229-232
<i>Athanasius.</i>	
Says little concerning the Sabbath or the Sunday,"	153
<i>Atterbury, Rev. W. W.</i>	
Author of "Statement of Principles Concerning Sunday,	467
<i>Atwood, Rev. E. S.</i>	
Statements concerning American Sabbath,	417—
Concerning Sunday laws,	420
Concerning their impotence,	424
Concerning personal liberty and Sunday,	425
Concerning the apathy of the church in the matter of Sunday observance,	426

*Augsburg Confession.*

Its teachings concerning Sunday, 253

*Augustine.*

Sabbath to be observed spiritually by  
ceasing from sin, 157

Sabbath abolished with circumcision  
and sacrifices, 158

Not the author of *De Tempore*, 159

Speaks of public worship on the Sab-  
bath in the fifth century, 183

## B

*Backus.*

History of New England, records the  
fact of correspondence between Roger  
Williams and others, and Seventh-  
day Baptists, relative to the Sabbath, 394, 5

*Bailey, Rev. James.*

History of the Seventh-day Baptist Gen-  
eral Conference, quoted, 397, 398

*Bampfield, Rev. Francis.*

A Seventh-day Baptist author from  
1672-1677 A. D., 332

His sufferings and imprisonment, 335—

His death in prison, 335

*Bampfield, Thomas.*

A Seventh-day Baptist author from  
1692-1694 A. D., 336

His books answered, by Prof. Wallis, 336

*Baptists, Seventh-day.*

Organized in England, 1650 A. D., 339—

At Newport, R. I., 1671 A. D.,	393
Near Philadelphia, Pa., about 1700 A. D.,	397
In Northern N. J., 1705 A. D.,	399
Work in agitating Sabbath question,	500—
<i>Baptists, Regular.</i>	
Creed concerning Sunday,	414
<i>Barnabas.</i>	
Epistle of, a forgery,	36-39
Testimony of Neander,	36
Of Mosheim,	37
Of Eusebius,	37-38
Of Prof. Hackett, Milner, Kitto and Domville,	38
Of Killen, Coleman and Schaff,	39
What it says concerning Sunday,	40
This quotation, often "garbled,"	41
<i>Baronius.</i>	
Roman Catholic Annalist,	58
He defines <i>Dominicum</i> as meaning the "Mass,"	59
<i>Baur.</i>	
Concerning Ignatian Epistles,	47
<i>Beer.</i>	
Relation to Sunday observance,	504
Its history, etc.,	506
"Against Whisky,"	511
<i>Benedict, Rev. David.</i>	
Testifies to Sabbath-keeping among the Waldenses.	207, 211

*Berkshire, England.*

Seventh-day Baptist church in, 340

*Beza.*

Exposition of the fourth commandment, 266

*Bible, The.*

Is the ultimate authority concerning the Sabbath, 5

*Bingham, Rev. Joseph.*

On Sabbath observance in the Church of England, 131

On Sunday Edict of Constantine, 143

On the *Ferix* of pagan Rome, 160

*“Blue Laws,”*

390

*Bonham.*

Repels the charge of sinfulness for working on Sunday, becomes the founder of the third Seventh-day Baptist Church in America, 398

*Boston, Mass.*

Sunday laws enacted at, in 1654 A. D., 350

In 1658 A. D., 351

In 1665 A. D., 352

In 1667 and 1668 A. D., 353

In 1663 and 1677 A. D., 355

In 1679 A. D., 356

Disregard for in 1879 A. D., 418-429

In 1884 A. D., 472

In 1885 A. D., 448



- Bohemian Sabbath-keepers.* 213, 320  
 Progenitors of English Seventh-day  
 Baptists, 318
- Bownde, Nicholas.*  
 Author of the "Puritan Sabbath"  
 theory, 296-302  
 Theory unknown until 1595 A. D., 296
- Braintree, England.*  
 Seventh-day Baptist Church at, 340
- Brerewood, Rev. Edward.*  
 Testimony concerning the observance  
 of the Sabbath in the early church, 130
- Brewers' Association.* 511  
 Annual Congress of, on Sunday laws, 514-17
- Brewers' Gazette,* concerning Sunday  
 laws, 512-14
- Brooks.*  
 "Lives of Puritans," quoted, 327
- Bryant, Stephen.*  
 Arrested for violating Sunday, 389
- Bryennios.*  
 On the "Teaching of the Apostles," 64-67
- Buchanan, Rev. Claudius.*  
 Statements concerning the Sabbath in  
 Armenia, 231  
 Text of his book tampered with, 232  
 Testimony concerning Syrian Chris-  
 tians, 237
- Bullinger.*  
 Exposition of Rev. 1: 10, 265—

- Bunsen.*  
 On Ignatian Epistles, 48
- Burdick, Rev. Henry.*  
 Pastor of the first Seventh-day Baptist  
 Church in America. 393
- Bureau of Statistics, Mass.*  
 Important facts concerning Sunday la-  
 bor in 1885 A. D., 448
- Bythinian Christians.*  
 And the " Stated day," 50

## C

- Culamy, Edward.*  
 Statements concerning the arrest of  
 Bampfield, Seventh-day Baptist, 333
- Calvin, John.*  
 His views concerning the Sabbath, 258—  
 Exegesis of Deut , 261  
 Exegesis of 1 Cor. 1 : 16 and Acts 20 :  
 7, 263  
 He did not teach the " Puritan theory," 263, 4
- Canons of the Apostles.*  
 Recognize both the Sabbath and the  
 Lord's-day, 180
- Carlow, Rev. Geo.*  
 An English Seventh-day Baptist author  
 of 1724 A. D., 336  
 His writings republished in the United  
 States in 1802 and in 1847 A. D., 337
- Carthage, Synod of.*  
 Concerning Sunday and fast days, 169

- Catholic Church, Roman.*  
 Creed concerning Sunday, 405
- Cavaliers of Va.*  
 Enacted the first Sunday Law in America, 386
- Cave, William, D. D.*  
 Testimony concerning the Sabbath in the early church, 132
- Caudrey, Daniel.*  
 Writer in defense of the Puritan Sunday theory in 1652 A. D., 328
- Chalons, Council of.*  
 Edict concerning Sunday, 193
- Chambers Cyclopaedia.*  
 Concerning Bohemian Sabbath-keepers, 320
- Chamberlain, Peter.*  
 Prominent Seventh-day Baptist and Royal Physician, of London, 395
- Chester, Mrs.*  
 Imprisoned for keeping the Sabbath, 321
- Chersey, England.*  
 Seventh-day Baptist Church at, 340
- Chicago.*  
 Sunday observance in, 428
- China.*  
 Sabbath in, as early as the seventh century, 240—
- Christ.*  
 And the Sabbath, 6  
 Was accustomed to preach on the Sabbath, 10

Performed works of mercy on the Sabbath,	11
Corrected abuses concerning the Sabbath,	14
Confirmed the Sabbath,	15
“ <i>Christian Sabbath.</i> ”	
This term not used by Origen,	100
<i>Christians.</i>	
First Assemblies of, on Sunday,	71
<i>Christians of St. Thomas.</i>	
Kept the Sabbath,	237
<i>Chrysostom.</i>	
Teaches No-sabbathism,	154
Recognizes the observance of the Sabbath late in the fourth century,	183
<i>Church Councils.</i>	
Decrees concerning Sunday,	167
“ <i>Clear View Wanted.</i> ”	
Concerning Sunday,	458-462
<i>Clement of Alexandria.</i>	
Notions concerning the “eighth day,”	98
Views concerning the Sabbath,	96
<i>Clement of Rome.</i>	
Does not refer to Sunday,	34
<i>Clothaire.</i>	
King of France, his Sunday edict,	187
<i>Coleman, Rev. Lyman.</i>	
Concerning the Sabbath among the Armenians,	229
Among the Nestorians,	233
Concerning Barnabas,	39

Concerning Ignatius,	47
Concerning the observance of Wednesday and Friday,	112
Concerning the observance of the Sabbath and the Sunday,	129
<i>Colony of Conn.</i>	
First Sunday law, 1650-53 A. D.,	367
General law of 1668 A. D.,	368
Amended in 1669 A. D.,	369
Enforcement of in 1684 A. D.,	370
Additional laws, 1715, 1721 A. D.,	371
<i>Common Law.</i>	
New England Colonial, founded on the Jewish law,	342
<i>Committee, New York Sabbath.</i>	
Organized 1857 A. D.,	466
Objects and policy,	473—
Documents of, quoted,	475—
<i>Compromise.</i>	
None possible between the Sabbath and No-sabbathism,	524—
<i>Congress, Brewers'.</i>	
Opposed to Sunday laws,	514—
<i>Constantine the Great.</i>	
Character in general,	138—
Drawn toward Christianity, through policy,	138
Adopted Christianity as a superstition,	139
An especial patron of the sun-god,	141
Was a selfish murderer,	140
His Sunday edict, a <i>heathen document</i> ,	141-143

- It mentions the day only as "The Venerable day of the Sun," 141
- Such Legislation common under former emperors. 144-146
- Conventions, Sabbath, in the United States.*
- In New York, 1828 A. D., 464
- At Cincinnati, in 1840 A. D., 464
- At Rochester in 1842 A. D., 464
- At Baltimore, Harrisburg (Va.) and Saratoga Springs, in 1844 A. D., 465
- At Frankfort, Ky., in 1846 A. D., 465
- (Anti) at Boston in 1848 A. D., 465
- National, at Saratoga Springs, in 1863 A. D., 466
- At Boston and Springfield, Mass., in 1879 A. D., 467, 468
- Constitutions of the Apostles.* 173
- Continental Reformers.*
- Were in general No-sabbathists, 250—
- Cottrell.*
- Arrested under Sunday laws of Md., 485
- Cox, Robert.*
- Concerning the origin of the Seventh-day Baptists, 213
- Doubts the authenticity of Origen's Twenty-third Homily on Numbers, 99
- Concerning Sunday at the close of the third century and the unfounded claims made by Eusebius, 150, 151

Speaks highly of Brabourne,	324
Considers Cornthwaite the ablest writer among English Seventh-day Baptists,	339
<i>Cranmer, Bishop.</i>	
Views on the Sabbath,	276
<i>Creeds of Churches.</i>	
Sunday in,	405
<i>Cripplegate Church.</i>	
Seventh-day Baptist, London, Eng.,	340
<i>Cyprian.</i>	
Pupil of Tertullian,	103
Notions concerning circumcision and the "eighth day,"	103, 104
<i>Cyril.</i>	
Teaches No-sabbathism,	153

## D

<i>Dark Ages.</i>	
Sunday during,	185—
Observance of Sunday deeply supersti- tious,	186
In France,	187, 192
In England,	187, 193
In Burgundy,	189, 193
Sunday disregarded by many kings and prominent men,	190
Many other festivals associated with Sunday,	191
Orders of Pope Leo IV.,	195
Under the Saxon Heptarchy,	196

- Blasphemous miracles claimed against  
 those who desecrated Sunday, 197-202  
 The Sabbath during, 205—  
 Kept by the Waldenses, during, 215—  
 See 205-219
- David, Rev. Ebenezer.*  
 Seventh-day Baptist chaplain in the  
 Revolutionary War, 394
- David, Rev. Enoch.*  
 Early Seventh-day Baptist preacher in  
 Pa., 398
- “*Decay of Sunday observance among  
 Christians,*” 453—
- Dellon.*  
 The Inquisition and the Sabbath, 238—
- De Vignaux.*  
 On the character of the Waldenses, 215
- Dialogue with Trypho.*  
 The fountain of Patristic No-sabbath-  
 ism, 74  
 Teaches the utter abolition of the Sab-  
 bath, under the gospel, 73
- Domville, Sir William.*  
 Thinks Barnabas' epistle a forgery, 38  
 Shows *Dominicum Servasti* a falsehood, 54-57  
 Shows that Ignatius to the Magnesians  
 is interpolated to make it refer to  
 Sunday, 45  
 Shows that Irenæus does not contain  
 the passage concerning Sunday, usu-  
 ally attributed to him, 81



*Dunham, Rev. Edmund.*

First pastor of third Seventh-day Baptist Church in America, 399

*Dwight, Timothy, D. D.*

Misquotes Irenæus, 81

*Dionysius.*

Does not call Sunday the Sabbath, nor say, "We have kept it holy," 78, 79

*Documents.*

Of New York Sabbath Committee, quoted, 475—

Ancient Syrian, recognize both Sabbath and Sunday, 181

*Dodge, William E.*

Concerning Sunday railroading and steam-boating, 434

Concerning Sunday in great cities, 437

Christians must not hold stock in Sunday-breaking corporations, 439

*Dominicum Servasti.*

Term never used in connection with Martyrdom, 51—

Was coined by Bishop Andrews in 1618 A. D., 57

*Dominicum.*

Defined by Baronius, 59

## E

*Eastern Church.*

The "Mother Church" of Christianity, 220

Has always kept the Sabbath, 226

<i>Ecclesiastical Canons.</i>	
Of the Apostles,	180
<i>Eccol impadius.</i>	
Concerning the Waldenses,	215
<i>Edward VI.</i>	
Sunday during the reign of,	273
<i>Edgar.</i>	
Sunday law of,	196
<i>Edwards, President.</i>	
Concerning the Waldenses,	209
Speaks in high praise of them,	210
<i>Edwards, Justin, D. D.</i>	
Misquotes Irenæus,	81—
<i>Egbert.</i>	
Sunday laws of,	194
<i>Elagabalus, Emperor.</i>	
Exalted Sunday worship in Rome,	116
Was himself a priest of the sun.	116
<i>Elvira, Synod of.</i>	
Decree concerning Sunday,	168
<i>Elizabeth, Queen.</i>	
Sunday observance under her reign,	280—
<i>Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature.</i>	
Shows how "Ignatius to the Magne-	
sians," is interpolated, to make it re-	
fer to Sunday,	42-44
<i>Britanica</i> , on Church Councils,	167
<i>Religious Knowledge</i> , on Epistle of Bar-	
nabas,	39
<i>Enforcement.</i>	
Of Sunday laws in New England,	388—

- England, Church of.*  
 Doctrines concerning Sunday. 289
- English Reformation.*  
 Sunday in, 273  
 Sabbath question became prominent in, 273  
 Teachings of representative men, Tyndale, Fryth, Cranmer, etc., 274-283
- Ephesus.*  
 Paul observed the Sabbath at, 27
- Episcopal Church, Protestant.*  
 Creed of, concerning Sunday, 408
- Epistles of N. T.*  
 They mention the first day of the week  
*but once,* 30
- Epistle of Barnabas.*  
 Is a forgery, 36
- Erasmus.*  
 Testimony concerning Bohemian Sabbath-keepers, 313
- Essays, Sabbath.*  
 Quoted, 464, 466, 467-471
- Ethelred.*  
 Sunday Laws of, 196
- Ethiopian Christians.*  
 Observed the Sabbath, 326
- Europe.*  
 Sabbath-keepers in, 317—
- Eusebius.*  
 Unwarrantable claims in his comments  
 on the ninety-second Psalm 150

*Eustace, Abbott.*

His forged decretals concerning Sunday, 197—

## F

*Famous Falsehood.*

“*Dominicum Servasti?*” 51

*Felt.*

Ecclesiastical History of New England, quoted, 396

“*First Day of the Week.*”

Only one mentioned in the Gospels, 16

Mentioned but *once*, in the Book of Acts. .

Mentioned but *once* in all the Epistles, 30

*Fisher, Edward.*

Seventh-day Baptist author of (about) 1650 A. D., 329

*Fortes ue, E. F. K.*

Says the Armenians keep the Sabbath, 236

*Forgery.*

Epistle of Barnabas is a, 86

*Fourth Century.*

Marked epoch in the Sabbath question, 119—

*France.*

Protestant Reformation and Sunday in, 269

*Friday.*

Made a fast and worship day, 108

*Fuller, Church History.*

Quoted, 327

## G

*Geddes, Michael.*

- Testimony concerning the Sabbath, in  
the Abyssinian church, 226

*Gentile Christians.*

- The Sabbath among, 120

*German Reformation.*

- Sunday in, 249—

*Germans, The.*

- And Sunday saloons, 489

*Germany.*

- Its contribution to Sunday question, 509

*Gibbon, Edward.*

- Testimony concerning the Sabbath in  
Abyssinia, 225

*Giesler, J. C. I.*

- Concerning Nestorians in China, 242

- Concerning Sabbath among early Chris-  
tians, 135

*Gilfillan, James.*

- Concerning the Sabbathism of the Eng-  
lish church, 291

- Makes unfounded claims concerning  
“*Dominicum Servasti*,” 51

- Perverts plain facts concerning this ex-  
pression, 58

*Gobat, Rev. Samuel.*

- Testimony concerning the Sabbath in  
the Abyssinian church, 222

- Shows how the Abyssinians fought for  
the privilege of observing it in the  
sixteenth century, 223, 224
- Gospels, The.*  
History of the Sabbath in, 5—  
Of John, written *after* the Revelation. 32
- Grant, Dr.*  
Testimony concerning the Sabbath  
among the Nestorian Christians. 233  
The text of his history corrupted, 234
- Grocenor, Prof. E. A.*  
Reports interview with Bryennios con-  
cerning the "Teaching of the Apos-  
'tles," 64
- Gully, W. S.*  
Testifies to high character of the Val-  
denses, 218
- Gurney, Rev. J. J.*  
Perverts the facts, concerning "*Domin-  
cum Sercasti.*" 52

## H

- Hallam, Henry.*  
Concerning Sunday in the English Re-  
formation, 291
- Hackett, Prof.*  
Believes Barnabas' epistle a forgery, 38
- Hase, Dr. Charles.*  
Testifies to the observance of the Sab-  
bath in the early church, 134

*Hefden.*

Imprisoned for Sabbath-keeping, 321

*Hefele, Right Rev. Charles Joseph.*

On the Ignatian Epistles, 48

General character of the church councils, 167

Concerning Council of Sardica, and attendance on Sunday service, 169

Concerning decree of Synod of Carthage, and church attendance on "Festivals," 169

Concerning decree of Council of Nice on standing in prayer on Sundays, and festival of Pentecost, 170

Concerning decree of Synod of Laodicea, on "Judaizing," and on reading the Gospels on the Sabbath, 170

Concerning communion, etc., on Sabbath and Sunday only, during Lent, because "on these days there was full and solemn service," 171

*Hermas.*

Does not mention Sunday, 35

*Heylyn, Peter.*

On the observance of Wednesday and Friday, 111

On the Sabbath in the early church, 129

On early Sunday laws, 161—

Says Sunday was not held as a *Sabbath* in the early church, 162

Sunday not a Sabbath in the Lutheran Reformation, 271

Concerning King James "Book of Sports,"	285
Concerning Beza's views on Sunday,	267--
Concerning Sunday at the close of the sixth century,	189—
Concerning the No-sabbathism of Zwingli,	257
Concerning Thraske and the Seventh-day Baptists,	323
<i>Hessey, James Augustus, D. C. L.</i>	
Concerning early Sunday laws,	163, 164
Sunday observance not based on fourth commandment,	165
Shows that "Christian Sabbath," was never used by Origen,	100
Concerning term "Lord's-day," in the early church,	106
Concerning No-sabbathism in England,	122—
Rejects the interpolation of "Lord's-day," in Ignatius to the Magnesians,	45
Concerning Scotch Sabbatarianism,	315
"Apostolic Constitutions," belong to fourth or fifth century,	174
Superstitious observance of Sunday during the Dark Ages,	186
Sabbath kept by the Nestorians,	283
Sunday in the German Reformation,	250
Zwingli a No-sabbathist,	257—
No-sabbath theories of the Continental Reformers,	260



Sunday under Queen Elizabeth's reign,	288
Church of England and Sunday,	282
<i>Hilgenfeld.</i>	
On "Teaching of the Apostles,"	63
On Ignatian Epistles,	47
<i>Hiscox, Rev. William.</i>	
First Seventh-day Baptist pastor in America,	393
<i>History.</i>	
Is an organic development	1—
Of "first day the week," in the Gos- pels,	16—
In Book of Acts,	28—
In the Epistles,	30
<i>Homily.</i>	
Origen's twenty-third on Numbers,	99
<i>Homilies.</i>	
Of Chrysostom on the Sabbath,	183
<i>Hoveden, Roger de.</i>	
On forged Sunday decretals,	197—
<i>Hubbard.</i>	
Correspondent of Roger Williams con- cerning the Sabbath,	395
<i>Hunt, Edward.</i>	
Arrested for shooting at deer on Sun- day,	389
<i>Hutchinson.</i>	
Concerning "death penalty," for dese- cration of Sunday in Mass.,	348

## I

- " *Ignatius to the Magnesians.*"  
     A forgery, 41—  
     Interpolated to make it refer to Sun-  
         day, 42—  
*Independent, The.*  
     Quoted on Sunday labor in Mass., 448  
 " *Injunctions*" of Queen Elizabeth.  
     Concerning Sunday. 280  
*Insurrection, Ti-Ping*  
     And the Sabbath. 244  
*Irenæus.*  
     He is often misquoted, 81—  
     He does not refer to Sunday, 81  
     His authentic words concerning the Sab-  
         bath. 85

## J

- James I.*  
     " *Book of Sports,*" and Sunday, 285—  
*Jortin, Ch. Historian.*  
     Concerning the Waldenses, 209  
*Justin Martyr.*  
     The first writer who mentions assem-  
         blies of Christians on Sunday, 71—  
     Also the first to teach No-sabbathism, 72—  
     Notions concerning circumcision and  
         Sunday, 74

## K

- Kullen, Rev. Doctor.*  
     On Ignatian Epistles, 47

Considers Barnabas a forgery,	38
<i>Kitto, Encyclopedia Biblical Literature.</i>	
Considers Barnabas a forgery,	38
<i>Kaye, Bishop.</i>	
Concerning Sunday in time of Tertul- lian,	92
Concerning Clement of Alexandria's views on Sunday,	96
On the date of Marcion,	124

## L

<i>Laus, Sunday.</i>	
Of the Colony of Rhode Island,	376—
Were executed in the Colonies,	388—
Status of, in New England in 1879 A. D.,	440
<i>Labor Bureau.</i>	
Statistics of Sunday labor in Massachu- setts in 1885 A. D. ,	448—
<i>Legislation, Sunday.</i>	
General effect of to <i>de Sabbatize.</i>	526
<i>" Lord's-day."</i>	
Evidence that the term in Rev. 1 : 10 does not apply to Sunday,	31
Distinct from the Sabbath,	106
Observance of, in time of Queen Eliza- beth,	283
<i>Luther, Martin.</i>	
His " Larger Catechism " and Sunday,	250
He taught No-sabbathism,	252
Considered Christians free from the ten commandments,	253

## M

- Macon, Council of.*  
 Decree concerning Sunday, 189
- Magnesians.*  
 Ignatian Epistle to, a forgery, 42—
- Mullalieu, W. F., D. D.*  
 Concerning desecration of Sunday in  
 Massachusetts, 429
- Martyrs, Acts of.*  
 Do not contain the question, *Domini-  
 cum Serrasti*, 54—
- "*Maryland Sabbath Association*," 483  
 On Sunday observance in Baltimore, 484—  
 On Sunday legislation in Maryland, 486, 487
- Massachusetts Bay Colony.*  
 Sunday in, 347—
- Massachusetts.*  
 State Sunday law of 1782 A. D., 361—  
 Bureau of Statistics, on Sunday La-  
 bor in 1885 A. D., 448
- Melito of Sardis.*  
 Reputed book on the "Lord's-day" an  
 imperfect and uncertain title, 79
- Methodist Episcopal Church.*  
 Creed of, concerning Sunday, 413—
- Millman, Dean.*  
 Pagan character of Constantine's Sun-  
 day edict, 143, 144
- Mill Yard Church.*  
 Seventh-day Baptist, London, Eng., 340

- Milner, Rev. Isaac.*  
Deems Barnabas' Epistle not genuine, 38
- Milwaukee.*  
Sunday laws disregarded in, 494
- Missouri.*  
Legislation concerning Sunday, 493
- Morer.*  
Concerning Sunday in the sixth century, 192—  
In Burgundy in the seventh century, 193  
In England in the eighth century, 194  
Superstitious punishment for breaking Sunday, 195  
Sunday under Alfred the Great, 196
- Mosheim, John Lawrence, D. D.*  
Rejects Epistle of Barnabas, 37  
Testifies to Sabbath observance by the Waldenses, 217
- Mossie, J. W.*  
Concerning Armenian Christians, 230
- Mumford, Stephen.*  
First Seventh-day Baptist in America, 1664 A. D., 392

## N

- Natton, Eng.*  
Seventh-day Baptist Church at, 340
- N. ale, History Eastern Church.*  
On the place of the Sabbath in the Armenian Calendar, 285

*Neale, Edward V.*

Shows the origin of Sunday Legislation  
to be from pagan Rome, 144—

*Neale, Rev. Daniel.*

Concerning English Reformation under  
Elizabeth, 273

On the Lord's-day at the same period, 288

Concerning the "Book of Sports," 287

Influence of the Civil War of the Eng-  
lish Reformation on morals and rel-  
igion, 305

Concerning the "Lord's-day" under  
the Cromwellian rule, 308—

*Neander.*

Biography of Tertullian, 87

Concerning the observance of Wednes-  
day and Friday, 112

Concerning the Sabbath in the early  
church, 135

*Nestorian Christians.*

They keep the Sabbath, 233—

Were in China at an early date, 242—

*New Haven Colony.*

Sunday in, 365

Code of 1656 A. D., 366

*New Netherlands Colony.*

First Sunday law in 1647 A. D., 380

Additional laws in 1673 A. D., 380

First law under English occupancy,  
1695 A. D., 381

First law under State government of

New York in 1778 A. D.,	382
<i>Newport, R. I.</i>	
Sunday Laws enacted at, in 1673,	376
In 1679 A. D.,	378
<i>Niebhur.</i>	
On unchristian deeds of Constantine.	148
<i>Noble, Rev. Abel.</i>	
Pastor of the second Seventh-day Baptist Church in America,	397
<i>No-sabbathism.</i>	
Contemporaneous with the introduction of Sunday,	70—
Asserted by Justin Martyr,	72—
Development of,	78—
Strongly asserted by Tertullian,	87—
O	
<i>Ockford, James.</i>	
Seventh-day Baptist author of 1642 A. D.,	328
Answered by Cawdrey and Palmer, by order of the government,	329
<i>Origen.</i>	
Born 185 A. D., died 253 A. D.,	99
Does not use the term, "Christian Sabbath,"	100
Teaches extreme No-sabbathism,	102
<i>Origin.</i>	
Of "Puritan Sunday" in 1695 A. D.,	296—
Of Civil legislation concerning Sunday, 321 A. D.,	138

Of Seventh-day Baptists in America, 1671 A. D.,	392
Of Seventh-day Adventists, since 1844 A. D.,	400
<i>Outlook, and Sabbath Quarterly.</i>	
Quoted,	63, 69
Reviewed by Dr. Bacon,	502, 503
Wide-spread influence of,	503

## P

<i>Pagitt, Ephraim.</i>	
Herisiography, quoted,	54, 322
<i>Papias.</i>	
Makes no reference to Sunday,	36
<i>Parliament, Cromwellian,</i>	
And the observance of Sunday,	304, 306, 308, 310
<i>Paul the Apostle.</i>	
Observed the Sabbath at Salamis,	21
At Antioch, with both Jews and Greeks,	23
Discusses the resurrection of Christ, but no word concerning Sunday,	24, 26
Observed the Sabbath for a long time at Iconium,	24
Also at Philippi and Thessalonica,	25
At Corinth, <i>continually,</i>	26
At Ephesus for two years,	27
<i>Pennsylvania.</i>	
First Sunday laws,	384
Little changed since 1794 A. D.,	385
Make no exceptions in favor of Sabbath- keepers,	386



*Perrin.*

Says the Vaudois kept the Sabbath. 214

*Photius.*

Enumerates the festivals of the church  
in 858 A. D., 191

*Picards.*

Kept the Sabbath in Bohemia, 213

*Pliny's letter to Trajan,* 49

"Stated day" mentioned, probably the  
Sabbath, 51

*Plymouth Records.*

Quoted, 342-346

*Polycarp, Epistle of.*

Silent concerning Sunday, 36

*Purchase.*

Testimony concerning the Sabbath  
among the Waldenses, 216

*"Puritan Sunday."*

Unknown until close of sixteenth cen-  
tury—1595 A. D., 296

Only two passages of Scripture quoted  
by Bownde, in support of it, 301

Development of, in America, 341

## Q

*Quakers.*

Their views concerning Sunday, 314

Kethian, many embraced the Sabbath, 397

*Quotations.*

Garbled, 41, 84, 232

## R

*Railroads.*

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| Influence of, in agitating Sunday question, | 517 |
| Sunday work on,                             | 481 |
| Statistics concerning,                      | 482 |

*Reasons.*

- |                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| First given for assembling on Sunday, | 71 |
|---------------------------------------|----|

*Religious Knowledge, Cyclopædia of.*

- |                                  |    |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Rejects the Epistle of Barnabas, | 39 |
|----------------------------------|----|

*Report Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics.*

- |                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| On Sunday Labor, | 448 |
|------------------|-----|

*"Restoration, The."*

- |                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Sunday observance in England during, | 311— |
|--------------------------------------|------|

*Revolution, The Ti-Ping.*

- |   |      |
|---|------|
| Inaugurated the observance of the Sabbath in China, | 244— |
|---|------|

*Rhode Island.*

- |                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| Colonial Sunday laws of, | 376— |
|--------------------------|------|

*Ritschel.*

- |                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Opinion concerning Ignatian Epistles, | 48 |
|---------------------------------------|----|

*Roman Catholicism.*

- |                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| Creed concerning Sunday, | 405— |
|--------------------------|------|

*Roman Heathen Cult.*

- |   |      |
|---|------|
| Formed the basis of Sunday legislation, | 138— |
|---|------|

## S

*Sabbath Question.*

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Importance of, | 3 |
|----------------|---|

*Sabbath, The.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| History of, in the Gospels, in Matt. 12 : |  |
|---|--|

- 1-13, in Mark 2 : 23-28, in Luke 6 :  
 1-11, in Mark 1 : 21-26, in Luke 4 :  
 30-35, in Luke 4 : 14-22, in Mark 6 :  
 2, in Luke 13 : 10-17, in John 5 : 5-  
 18, and 7 : 19-24, and 9 : 1-16, 5-15
- In the Book of Acts 13 : 5, 14-48, and  
 14 : 1-3, and 16 : 12-15, and 17 : 1-4,  
 16-19, and 18 : 4, 11, 18-21, and 19 :  
 8-10, 21-27
- Justin Martyr's theory concerning, 72
- Its relation to circumcision, Tertullian's  
 theory, 88
- Meaningless fancies concerning, 96—
- Retained a strong hold on Gentile  
 Christians, 120
- Remained in the church until driven  
 out by heathen influence, 122
- Not to keep it deemed a heresy, 122, 123
- Christ did not abolish it, 124
- Observed for several centuries, Cole-  
 man's testimony, 129
- Cave's testimony, 132
- Testimony of Hase, 134
- Testimony of Schaff, 134
- Testimony of Neander, 135
- Testimony of Giesler, 135
- Observed until fourth and fifth cent-  
 uries, 136
- Unsupported statements of Eusebius  
 concerning, 150
- Views of Cyril, Chrysostom, and Au-

gustine,	153-159
Its observance after the time of Constantine,	173-184
Its recognition in the Apostolic Constitutions,	175-184
Prayer to be used upon,	178
Recognized in the Canons of the Apostles,	180
In Syrian documents,	181, 182
Status in the West during the Dark Ages.	205-219
In the Eastern church,	220-248
In Abyssinia, testimony of Gobat,	222-225
Of Geddes,	226
Of Dean Stanley,	227
In Armenia, Coleman's testimony,	229
Buchanan's testimony,	231
Among the Nestorians, testimony of Coleman, Grant, Perkins, Neale and Fortescue,	233-236
Among the Christians of St. Thomas,	237-240
In ancient China, testimony from Book of Changes,	240
From Nestorian inscriptions,	242
In Ti-Ping Rebellion,	244-248
In Europe since the Reformation, testimony of Cox,	318, 324
Of Bishop White,	319
Of Chambers' Cyclopaedia,	320
Of Paggitt,	321
Of Fuller and Brooks,	337

Writers in defense of	324-329
Represented by Seventh-day Baptists in	
England,	339, 840
In America,	392-404
Christianity stands or falls with it,	484
“ Association of Philadelphia,”	494
Verdict of history concerning,	519—
Men must have,	520-522
Cannot exist without divine authority,	522-524
Cannot compromise with No-sabbath-	
ism,	524-526
Its appeal to the American church,	540
<i>Salem, F. W.</i>	
Publisher of “ History of Beer,” etc.,	506
Claims beer as a “ temperance drink,”	507
Opposes Sunday laws,	508
Quotes German Reformers against Sun-	
day,	508
Quotes English Sunday laws,	510
Reviews Sunday agitation in Newark,	
N. J.,	510, 511
Gives statistics concerning beer, etc.,	512
<i>Schade, Louis.</i>	
Attorney Brewers’ Association,	515
Appeals against Sunday laws,	516
Claims votes enough to repeal Sunday	
laws,	517
<i>Schaff, Philip, D. D.</i>	
Rejects the Epistle of Barnabas,	39
Says the Sabbath was observed in the	
early church,	134

Testifies to the unchristian character of Constantine the Great,	139
<i>Socrates.</i>	
Testimony concerning the Sabbath in the early church,	127
<i>Sozon en.</i>	
Testifies to Sabbath observance in the early church,	128
<i>Stromata</i>	
Of Clement teach No-sabbathism,	97-99
<i>Sunday.</i>	
First mentioned by Justin Martyr about 150 A. D.,	71
Its supposed relation to circumcision,	74
Not observed as a Sabbath,	76
A day of indulgence to the flesh,	90
Kneeling prohibited, because an expres- sion of sorrow,	91
Never confounded with the Sabbath by early writers,	106
Observance of, and the doctrine of No- sabbathism contemporaneous,	119
In the church councils,	167-171
During the Dark Ages,	185-204
Blasphemous forgeries concerning, about 1200 A. D.,	197-202
In the German Reformation,	249-256
Luther's opinions concerning,	250-253
In Augsburg Confession,	253-256
In the Swiss Reformation,	257
Opinions of Zwingli,	257, 258

Opinions of John Calvin,	259-264
Opinions of Bullinger,	265
Opinions of Beza and Bucer,	266-268
In French Reformation,	269
In the English Reformation,	273-294
Opinions of Tyndale,	274
Opinions of John Fryth,	275
Opinions of Bishop Cranmer,	276-280
“Injunctions” of Queen Elizabeth concerning,	280-282
Neale’s testimony concerning Puritan times,	283
“Book of Sports,” by King James,	285
In the “Savoy Conference,” 1661 A. D.,	288, 289
Doctrines of the Church of England concerning,	290 293
Development of the Puritan theory in England,	295-316
Announcement of the theory by Nicholas Bownde, in 1595 A. D.,	296-302
Civil legislation concerning, by the Puritans,	302-310
Under Charles the Second,	311-314
In Scotland,	315, 316
In America, Plymouth Colony,	342-347
In Massachusetts Bay Colony,	347-361
Early State Government of Mass.,	361-365
In New Haven Colony,	365-367
In Colony of Connecticut,	367-376
In Colony of Rhode Island,	376-378

In Colony of New Netherlands,	379-384
In Colony of Pennsylvania,	384-386
In Colony of Virginia,	386-388
In Creed of Roman Catholic Church,	405-408
In Creed of Protestant Episcopal Church,	408-410
In Westminster Confession,	412, 413
In Methodist Episcopal Creed,	413
In Creed of Baptists,	414, 15
Practical observance of, in United States,	417—
Testimony of Rev. E. S. Atwood,	417-427
Of Rev. Reuben Thomas,	428
Of Rev. W. F. Mallalieu,	429-434
Of Hon. William E. Dodge,	434-440
Of Walter Learned,	440-442
Of Julius H. Ward,	442-448
Of Mass. Bureau of Statistics of 1885,	448-453
Decay of observance among Chris- tians,	453-457
Better understanding of, needed,	458-462
Agitation concerning, by "Sabbath Conventions,"	463-472
By "Sabbath Committees,"	472—
Railroading on,	481
State of the question in Md.,	483-488
In Massachusetts,	489
In New Jersey,	489
In Louisiana,	489, 490
In Chicago,	490
In California,	490
In Ohio,	492



In Missouri,	493
In Milwaukee,	494
National Reform Movement as related to,	495, 496
<i>Sunday Laws.</i>	
Law of Constantine, 321 A. D., purely heathen as shown by the law itself,	141
Testimony of Bingham,	143
Of Millman,	143
Of E. V. Neale,	145
Subsequent laws were like heathen laws concerning other holidays. Bing- ham's testimony,	160
Heylyn's testimony,	161-163
Hessey's testimony,	163-166
During the Dark Ages, by Council of Macon, 585 A. D.,	186
By Clothiar, King of France,	187
Testimony of Hessey and Heylyn,	186-192
Of Clovis in 507 A. D.,	192
Of the Council of Orleans in 538 A. D.,	192—
First in England, under Ina, or Ino, in 692 A. D.,	193
Under Egbert, 747 A. D.,	194
Decrees of Synod at Rome, 853 A. D.,	195
Under Alfred the Great in 876 A. D.,	196
Lessen religious regard for Sunday,	526—
<i>Sun-worship in Rome,</i>	116-118

## T

<i>“Teaching of the Apostles.”</i>	
But few facts known concerning it,	60

- Claims neither date nor author, 60
- Consists of *two distinct* parts, an earlier  
and a later. 61-64
- Testimony of the *Andover Review*, 61
- Of Hilgenfeld, 63
- Of Bryennios, 64-67
- Temperance Legislation.*
- Complicates the matter concerning Sun-  
day laws, 587
- Tertullian.*
- Biography of, 87
- His notions concerning circumcision  
and the Sabbath, 88
- He calls Sunday a day "of indulgence  
to the flesh," 90
- Forbids kneeling on Sunday, because  
the day is joyous, 91
- Writings filled with inconsistencies, 94
- Teaches rank No-sabbathism, 75
- Teaches that the Sabbath is not abolish-  
ed, 124
- Thraske, John.*
- An early English Seventh-day Baptist  
who was tried by the "Star Chamber  
Court," in 1618 A. D., 53—
- Thraske, Mrs. John.*
- Died in prison for Sabbath-keeping, 322
- Ti Ping Rebellion.*
- Introduced the observance of the Sab-  
bath in China, 244-247

*Twisse, William, D. D.*

Testimony concerning "*Dominicum  
Servasti*," 53

Concerning Sabbath in early church, 130

*Tyndale.*

His opinions concerning the Sabbath, 274

## U

*Uhlhorn, Dr. Gerhard.*

On Ignatian Epistles, 48

Concerning the influx of "pagan Chris-  
tians," into the church at opening of  
the second century, 114, 115

On the worship of Mithras, Persian  
sun-god, at Rome, 116

On the character of Constantine the  
Great, 141

*Utter, Rev. Geo. B.*

Seventh-day Baptist historian of 1858  
A. D., 340

## W

*Waddington, Dean.*

Testifies to the excellent character of  
the Waldenses, 208

*Waldenses.*

Their history perverted by the Papal  
Church, 207

Existed as early as the fourth century, 208-209

Very numerous in the twelfth century, 210

Were familiar with the Bible, 211

- They kept the Sabbath, testimony of  
     Erasmus, 213  
 Testimony or Jones, 214  
 Testimony of Benedict, 215, 217  
 Testimony of Purchase, 216  
 Testimony of Mosheim, 217  
 Of Bishop White, 218
- Wallis, John, D. D.*  
 Wrote in reply to Bampfield a Seventh-day Baptist, 1692-94 A. D., 336  
 "Wanted, a clear view concerning Sunday," 458-462
- Wardner, N., D. D.*  
 Personal testimony concerning Ti-Ping Rebellion and the Sabbath, 247  
*Wednesday.*  
 Observance in early church, 108, 110  
 Testimony of Heylyn, 111  
 Of Coleman, 112  
 Of Neander, 112
- Westminster Confession.*  
 Doctrine concerning Sunday, 410
- White, Bishop Francis.*  
 Wrote against Seventh-day Baptists by Royal authority in 1635 A. D., 325, 326
- Whisky.*  
 Its relation to the Sunday question, 504  
 Possible conflict with beer, 505, 511
- Wilkinson, Prof. W. C.*  
 On "Decay of Sunday observance among Christians," 453-457

## Y

*Yeates.*

- Concerning Sabbath observance in Armenia. 230

## Z

*Zuga Zabo.*

- Concerning Sabbath in Abyssinia, 226

*Zicingli.*

- Views concerning the Sabbath, 257  
Notes on Col. 2 : 16, 258

1771.

CL  
56













