

SUNDAY NOT THE SABBATH: ALL DAYS ALIKE HOLY.

A CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE REV. DR. SUNDERLAND,
WM. HENRY BURR, AND OTHERS.

In the Washington *Daily Chronicle* of October 10, 1871, a sermon was published, two columns in length, with the following heading:

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

DISCOURSE BY DR. SUNDERLAND IN HIS CHURCH ON SUNDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 8, 1871—A NEW VIEW OF THE QUESTION—THE JEWISH WEEK SET ASIDE—THE CHRISTIAN WEEK ESTABLISHED—THE SABBATH IS ALWAYS "THE SEVENTH DAY" OF THE ESTABLISHED WEEK—AS REQUIRED BY THE MORAL OBLIGATION OF THE DECALOGUE.

The only portion of the discourse which it is necessary for the present purpose to reproduce is the following:

In Acts xiii, 14, it is stated that Paul and his company, having arrived at Antioch, "went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and sat down." The Sabbath day here mentioned was undoubtedly a "Jewish Sabbath." In the 44th verse it is said: "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." The Greek phrase for "the next Sabbath day," as our English translation has it in this verse, is: *to te erchomeno Sabbato*—that is, "on the approaching or coming Sabbath." This was likewise undoubtedly a "Jewish Sabbath," occurring after the six secular days which followed the Sabbath mentioned in the 14th verse. But what had occurred in the meantime in the synagogue and in the city? What had occurred between these two consecutive Jewish

Sabbaths? Some Gentiles, who had either witnessed or heard of the scene which had transpired, and who had become deeply interested in the declaration of Paul, besought that these words might be preached to them, (not, as in our own version, "the *next* Sabbath," but as in the original,) "on the *intervening* Sabbath," or "the Sabbath *between*." This was the request not of Jews, but of Gentiles, who paid no special regard to Jewish ordinances, and who were doubtless aware of the new institution and custom of the observance of "the Christian Sabbath" or "the Lord's day," and who here, for the want of better terms, described it as "the Sabbath between," or "the intervening Sabbath"—that is, the Sabbath coming between two Jewish Sabbaths. This was a matter of fact, and while the record is silent as to whether Paul complied with this request of the Gentiles—though in all probability he did—yet one thing is beyond dispute, if we read the account in the Greek, and that is, the Sabbath mentioned in the 42d verse *is not identical* with that mentioned in the 44th verse. The conclusion is inevitable—one was "a Christian Sabbath," the other was a "Jewish Sabbath."

On the next day a communication appeared in the *Chronicle*, as follows :

AN INTERESTING QUESTION—DR. SUNDERLAND'S POSITION ON "THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH" DISPUTED.

To the Editor of the Chronicle :

In the discourse of the Rev. Dr. Sunderland, which appeared in yesterday's *Chronicle*, he draws the "inevitable conclusion" that Paul preached to the Gentiles on a "Christian Sabbath," because in Acts xiii, 42, the Greek words "*to metazu sabbaton*" mean "on the Sabbath between," or "on the intervening Sabbath," and not "on the next Sabbath," as rendered in our Bibles. It is true that the marginal translation in our reference Bibles sustains [favors] the Doctor's view. But if he will examine one of the latest and best authorities, namely, the Greek Testament, by Henry Alford, D. D., of Cambridge, England, 1868, (which may be found at Ballantyne's book-store,) he will see that this marginal translation is not sustained. Therefore, unless we discard this latest standard authority, we cannot accept Dr. Sunderland's "inevitable conclusion." Moreover, his

admission that "the record is silent as to whether Paul did preach on a 'Sabbath between,'" must be taken in favor of the rendering in our Bibles, viz: "the next Sabbath" of the Jews.

The attempt to prove that Paul observed the so-called Christian Sabbath is futile. In Acts xx, 7, we read that on one occasion, when the disciples came together to break bread on the first day of the week, Paul preached to them, and the preaching and breaking of bread continued till daybreak, *i. e.*, about ten hours into the second day of the week, which began at sunset. But this breaking of bread was a daily occurrence at the first, (Acts ii, 46,) and therefore proves nothing as to the sanctity of any particular day. The proof, therefore, fails that Paul observed a Christian Sabbath. On the contrary, during a ministry of twenty years he constantly preached in the synagogues on the Jewish Sabbath, (Acts ix, 20; xiii, 14, 44; xiv, 1; xvii, 2, 10, 17; xviii, 4, 11, 19; xix, 18.)

If space were allowed me, I can prove that the following eminent Christian authorities are against the observance of both the Jewish and Christian Sabbath as a sacred day: Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Neander, Jeremy Taylor, and many others.

W. H. B

This brought out a reply from Dr. S., followed by a further correspondence, as reproduced below.

HAVE WE A CHRISTIAN SABBATH?—A PROPOSAL TO "W. H. B." FROM DR. SUNDERLAND.

To the Editor of the Chronicle:

It is easy to show the fallacy of the comments of "W. H. B." on my discourse in last Tuesday's *Chronicle*. But not "to make two bites of a cherry," and to save the daily journals of the city the burden of an extensive and gratuitous publication, I have this proposition to submit to "W. H. B.," (he must give his full name.) Let us correspond upon the subject privately at first, and when each has concluded what he wishes to say, let us then publish the whole correspondence in pamphlet form.

I would not propose this labor and expense did I not feel so deeply the importance of the truth in regard to the Christian Sabbath. It is high time the present generation should know whether we have left to us a Sabbath of divine authority and perpetual

obligation, or whether the whole Christian world has been hoodwinked and deceived by a stupendous imposition which has been palmed upon them without any Scriptural authority whatever.

I think I have a right to expect an affirmative reply to the above proposition, or in some way its equivalent.

B. SUNDERLAND.

REPLY OF "W. H. B." TO DR. SUNDERLAND.

Much as I desire to see the question of the Christian Sabbath discussed, I feel constrained to decline the proposition of Dr. Sunderland in yesterday's *Chronicle*. In the first place, my native modesty shrinks from the publicity of a controversy with so distinguished an antagonist. I prefer to withhold my full name altogether, especially as I take the unpopular side. I am an obscure layman; my antagonist is a distinguished clergyman. Unknown as I am to him now, I am quite certain that he would prefer a more equal adversary. In coming out to meet me he would feel as Goliath did when he saw the stripling David, while I could never acquire the courage and confidence of David, nor would I like, after all, to triumph, metaphorically speaking, as David did. Therefore I propose to offer a substitute; and with that view I have written to one who I believe will accept the challenge and do ample justice to my side of the question. I mean Parker Pillsbury, of Ohio. Should he not accept it there are several other men of distinction that I can name, some one of whom doubtless will be willing to discuss the question as fully as Dr. Sunderland desires.

Let us have light, and let truth prevail, though the heavens fall.

W. H. B.

THE DOCTOR READY FOR A SKIRMISH.

"W. H. B." declines my proposition. His "native modesty" is certainly a curious thing. It permits him, with an apparent show of learning, to dispute my position and to vaunt before the public what he could do if he only had "the space." At the same time, it hides his name, especially as he is "on the unpopular side." It suggests a comparison between himself and David, and yet disclaims any desire for a similar triumph. Beyond this, however, it prompts him to seek "a substitute," and to inform the public that he has written to Mr. Pillsbury.

Well, when Mr. Pillsbury is ready let me know, and I will commence the suggested correspondence at once. After we have finished we will have it all published in pamphlet form, if possible.

B. SUNDERLAND.

In the next issue of the same paper another writer makes the following strictures on Dr. Sunderland's discourse :

ANOTHER RICHMOND IN THE FIELD.

I have read with some curiosity Dr Sunderland's sermon on this subject, and, if I had been a firm believer before in the duty of keeping Sunday, I should have had my faith severely shaken finding that two columns of special pleading in fine print were necessary even to get up a showing of a case in favor of the obligation. I know I cannot have two columns to answer the reverend Doctor, but perhaps you will let me state a few propositions, which, I think, are clearer than his argument :

1. The observance of any day is not, in itself, a moral duty.
2. It can become a duty only by divine command.
3. There was such a divine command in reference to the seventh day.
4. There was a reason given for the observance of the seventh day, viz : that God rested on that day.
5. It is taught in the New Testament, and admitted by Dr. Sunderland, that there is no longer any obligation to keep the day originally appointed.
6. It would have been a very simple matter to make known any transfer of obligation from the seventh day to the first day of the week, in a plain command to that effect.
7. It is not pretended that there ever has been any such command.
8. The pretended obligation to keep Sunday is merely a matter of unfair inference, sustained by a tissue of sophistical special pleading, such as would drive any lawyer out of court.
9. The idea of attaching superlative importance to an observance wholly ceremonial, and as a duty wholly artificial, involving no moral principle whatever, is simply preposterous.

SIGMA.

The Doctor replies to the foregoing as follows :

FIGHTING IN AMBUSH—DR. SUNDERLAND'S COUNTER PROPOSITIONS.

While waiting for Mr. Pillsbury on the Sabbath question, it seems a new gun is opened from another ambush. Does it not look like a sign of conscious weakness in their cause for men to hide themselves behind some signature which keeps them from being known to the public? I must confess I don't like such opponents. My general rule is not to notice them. If a man is afraid or ashamed to let the public know who he is, I say he is not the man to conduct a public discussion on a subject of this kind.

I should not reply to "Sigma," were it not for the importance of meeting every objection which it is possible to urge against "the Christian Sabbath." I suggest, in answer to his communication, the following counter propositions :

1. The moral welfare of man is an object of prime consideration.

2. To divide and spend our time in such a manner as best to promote our moral welfare is a moral duty.

3. The Bible teaches (and all experience and observation confirm it) that spending one day in seven as a day of sacred rest is pre-eminently conducive to our moral welfare, and therefore it imposes the moral obligation to do so.

4. Keeping the seventh day of the established week becomes a duty by divine command, just as "Thou shalt not steal" becomes a duty by divine command.

5. There *is now* such a divine command in reference to the seventh day of the present established week, which command is accompanied by the reason that God set an example of such rest at the conclusion of the creation week.

6. It is taught in the New Testament, and maintained by me, that there is no longer any obligation to keep "the Jewish Sabbath," but that such obligation is now transferred to "the Christian Sabbath."

7. It is a *false issue* to assert that the question is upon transferring the obligation from the seventh to the first day of the Jewish week, and that there is no command for such transfer, when the whole "Jewish week" itself has been set aside and "the Christian week" has been established.

8. *Such an issue as the above*, sustained by no facts, and even by no pleadings, sophistical, special, general, or otherwise, worthy

of the name, would drive not only "lawyers" but "laymen" out of court.

9. The duty of observing and keeping the Sabbath day holy is not for the benefit of the day, but for the benefit of man himself. It is not, therefore, either "a ceremonial or artificial duty;" and when God commanded it as a part of the moral law, He was probably about as wise as the anti-Sabbatarian, Mr. "Sigma," who, it seems, does not even comprehend either the nature of the Sabbath or the first principles of morality.

B. SUNDERLAND.

And now another writer steps in with the following reply to the above:

A THIRD RICHMOND—THE ARGUMENT BECOMING CONTAGIOUS.

In reply to Dr. Sunderland's nine propositions, I observe, severally and consecutively, as follows:

1. Good health is the greatest of all earthly blessings.
2. The twenty-four hours of the day are best divided into three equal parts: eight hours for labor, eight for refreshment and sleep, and eight for the service of God and a distressed brother.
3. *Petitio Principii.*
4. "Thou shalt not steal" is *mala per se*; "Remember the Sabbath day" is *mala prohibita.*
5. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."
6. "Let no man judge you in keeping the Sabbath day."
7. "*False issue*" denied *in toto.* The question is upon the transfer.
8. Matter of private opinion as to the form of a special plea.
9. "Mr. Sigma does not comprehend either the nature of the Sabbath or the first principles of morality." The old dodging-place of the clergy when close run.

RICHMOND No. 3.

To this the Doctor puts in a rejoinder, the essential part of which is given below.

THE DOCTOR PRESSING ON—WHERE IS MR. PILLSBURY?—"RICHMOND NO. 3" DISPOSED OF.

As the argument of the anti-Sabbatarians (while waiting for Mr. Pillsbury) seems to be rather "*running emptyings,*" it is

hardly worth while to spend much time on "Richmond No. 3." However, his propositions may be answered in few words, as follows :

1. As "good health is the greatest earthly blessing," *virtue*, of course, will have to take a back seat.

2. *Obiter dictum*.

3. *Ipse dixit*.

4. An affirmative precept, *mala prohibita!* Ha! ha! ha! Hog-latin; up with the hog-latin! up with a baseless distinction!

5. "The Sabbath was made for man." Man continues and the Sabbath remains.

6. Misquotation and misapplication of Scripture.

7. The question *is not* upon the transfer from the seventh to the first day of the Jewish week.

8. Private opinion—a great responsibility.

9. Smart thing for men *in their holes* to talk about "the old dodging-place of the clergy."

Let us now attend to the matter of Dean Alford on Acts xiii, 42. The meaning of this text turns on the word *metaxu*. Alford says, "*to metaxu Sabbaton* appears by the usage of Luke to mean the next Sabbath day, not the 'following week.' This last rendering would hardly suit *eis*, which fixes a definite occasion."

Thus he merely conjectures that *metaxu* signifies here "*next*," and in the margin he makes two references to Josephus and one to Plutarch in support of his conjecture. Our answer is four-fold :

1. Alford, following many others in this error, did not understand the allusion of this passage, and consequently resorted to a conjecture wholly unnecessary.

2. The word *metaxu* has no such meaning in classic Greek, but invariably signifies that which intervenes or comes between.

3. There is no such usage of the word *metaxu* either in the writings of Luke or of any other part of the New Testament Greek. In fact, it is used only nine times, all told.

[In seven of the passages cited by Dr. S. the word is rendered "between," and in two, "meanwhile."]

Now, can any man tell me why the word *metaxu* in the New Testament Greek has an invariable signification—that of inter-

vening or coming between, and yet it must be used out of its accustomed import in this single text alone—that is, Acts xiii, 42? What authority has Alford or any other scholar to make such a departure from the established meaning of words?

4. My fourth point is that the references given by Alford do not sustain his conjecture, but show that just the opposite is the fact.

[Having considered and discussed the references, the Doctor continues :]

Thus we see that every reference made by Alford is against the sense of “*next*,” or “*following*” for the word *metaxu* in this passage. Beside this, neither Josephus nor Plutarch, both of whom wrote about a century *after* the New Testament was composed, can furnish authority for the usage of words by writers so long before them. The law of usage does not ascend.

Such being the case, I would say to Mr. “W. H. B.,” whosoever he may be, that we feel constrained on this text “to discard” Dr. Alford as “the latest standard authority,” and to hold to the old classic and New Testament usage of the word *metaxu* in the interpretation of this passage. Our English translators stand corrected here. They mistook the allusion of the passage and the learned Doctor of Cambridge has only followed in their footsteps.

B. SUNDERLAND.

IS DR. SUNDERLAND A ROMAN CATHOLIC?

And now comes in still another adversary, who insists that Dr. S., in taking the position he has assumed, has, “unknowingly, demolished the groundwork of Protestant belief, namely, the Bible, and practically indorsed that of the Catholic, namely, Tradition.” The obligation to keep holy the first day of the week, says the writer, “is nowhere stated to have been imposed, either by Christ or his apostles; nowhere recorded, or so much as alluded to in any one of the Gospels or Epistles.” The obligation rests “wholly and exclusively upon the authority of tradition.”

The Doctor replies to the above as follows :

THE CHARGE OF ROMANISM—THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES—SCRIPTURE
AND TRADITION.

Has Rip Van Winkle come again? The article of "M." in yesterday's paper takes us back to the dark ages. In those days *tradition* was a huge thing. The Bible was of but little account. Few people knew much about it.

When the Reformation rose the English Church combated the authority of *tradition* by affirming the article quoted by "M.," namely: "Holy Scripture containeth all things," &c. This was, and *is*, good Christian doctrine.

Our new Rip Van Winkle thinks he has me here. His trap is remarkably novel and ingenious. He begins by reiterating the old *false issue* about "changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the Jewish week." He says the warrant for this change is not to be found "in any one of the Gospels, or in any one of the Epistles;" but yet it is an article of Christian faith, and must, therefore, be founded on *tradition*.

And having come to this conclusion, he makes the astounding discovery that I have "unknowingly demolished the groundwork of Protestant belief!"

It is curious to see what makeshifts are adopted by the anti-Sabbatarians (while waiting for Mr. Pillsbury) to conceal their total discomfiture in the discussion of "the Christian Sabbath." Driven from one point they fly to another, if possible, still more irrelevant and untenable. Like Samson's foxes, tail to tail, they run in all directions and in no direction long.

B. SUNDERLAND.

In the same paper containing the above "W. H. B." comes out with the following essay:

"W. H. B." AT LAST SIGNS IN FULL—DAVID MEETS GOLIATH.

Not having heard from Mr. Pillsbury, whom I addressed at Toledo, Ohio, but who doubtless is now absent from that city, I will, with your permission, Mr. Editor, reply to Dr. Sunderland's defence of his position in regard to the proper rendering of *to metazu sabbaton*. But before doing so allow me to say that, while I protest against the injustice of his charge that I am "fighting in ambush"—while I insist that it is both customary and proper for an obscure writer to withhold his name from the public in sending contributions to the press, except where the public

interest demands it—and though I am not aware that I am known personally to a single editor in this city, I will, nevertheless, to use the elegant expression of my adversary, “come out of my hole” and disclose my full name.

There is another reason why I preferred in this case to remain anonymous; that reason may be inferred from the last sentence in Dr. S.’s reply to “Sigma,” who, he says, “it seems does not even comprehend either the nature of the Sabbath or the *first principles of morality*.” I have a private character which I hope to maintain, and I do not wish to have it brought before the public with any imputation of that sort upon it, which, in my estimation, is little short of a libel. That is a style of discussion that I wish to avoid.

The main point that I made against Dr. S.’s sermon was that his “inevitable conclusion” that Paul preached on a Christian Sabbath, between two Jewish Sabbaths, was at variance with the latest and best Christian standard authority, Dean Alford. This the Doctor admits, but he says that Dean Alford does not understand the allusion in the passage in question.

In order to present the question intelligibly let me give the two verses in Acts xiii:

Verse 42.—“And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.”

Verse 44.—“And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God.”

Dean Alford says that this rendering in verse 42, “the next Sabbath,” is correct; that it means the next Sabbath day, and not the “*following week*.” And he adds: “This last rendering would hardly suit *eis*, which fixes a definite occasion, *nor* verse 44, *which gives the result*.” The last clause was not quoted by Dr. S., nor the author’s note on verse 44, which is as follows: “Whether *erch* (*omeno*) or *ech* (*omeno*) be read, the sense will be ‘on the following [*] day,’ and not as Henrichs, ‘on the following week day.’”

Now, I submit to scholars and common-sense people whether Dean Alford’s rendering is not more probably correct than that

* The intelligent reader will here supply the word “Sabbath,” for verse 44 reads, *to te erchomeno Sabbato*—“the next Sabbath day.”

of Dr. Sunderland. This point is one on which the whole argument of Dr. S. hinges; if it fails his Christian Sabbath falls. If Paul did not then and there observe a Christian Sabbath, there was none at that time, and there is none now.

But I have not done with Christian authorities in support of the passage as given in our Bibles. I find it sustained by John Calvin, Adam Clarke, Matthew Henry, Thomas Scott, and Joseph Benson. I will not take the space to quote them all, but content myself with an extract from the last. Says Benson:

“In the intermediate Sabbath, *i. e.*, says Bengelius, ‘*the Sabbath that should occur in the remaining days about to be spent by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch.*’ But Grotius is confident that the reading ought to be ‘in the intermediate time between the two Sabbaths,’ or ‘in the course of the ensuing week;’ Mondays and Thursdays, or the second and fifth days of the week, being times in which the pious Jews were accustomed to meet together in the synagogue for the study of the law, in compliance, says Lightfoot, with the appointment of Isaiah. It seems, however, to be fully determined by ver. 44 that our version gives the true expression.”

Thus I have brought five Christian commentators against the rendering which Dr. S. gives. I do not know whether he claims originality of discovery or not. I am not aware, as yet, of any authority on his side except the marginal reading of our reference Bibles, and that is ambiguous. If Dr. S. is right, let him try and convince Christian scholars who accept the Lord’s day as a Christian Sabbath, but who reject this passage as proof of it; and then let him try to convert us anti-Sabbatarians.

As David chose five smooth stones from the brook, so have I cited five eminent commentators, any one of whom is fatal to Goliath.

WM. HENRY BURR.

GOLIATH THINKS DAVID HAS HIT HIMSELF.

We wait no longer for Mr. Pillsbury. “W. H. B.” comes out from his obscurity. I think Mr. Burr is not personally known to me, and he will excuse any omission of titles, as I do not know whether I should address him as judge, professor, general, colonel, major, or captain.

This is just what comes of men not doing right in the

first place. If he had announced himself he would have been saved the trouble of the protest in his first paragraph. As to the "little short of a libel" on "Sigma," there was the same difficulty. I had nothing to judge by but his propositions, and my conclusion, as I think, was perfectly logical from the premises.

Mr. Burr is deceived when he thinks that the argument for "the Christian Sabbath" rests solely on the meaning of Acts xiii, 42. This text is, in fact, but a subordinate incident in the general discussion. But when rightly understood, it does clearly confirm the truth of the Christian Sabbath. The *great argument* springs from another quarter.

Mr. Burr, it seems, relies on *the opinions* of distinguished Christian scholars, and expects to triumph through the overwhelming weight of great names. He will find before he gets to the end that this is a very precarious game, which two can play at.

His main point against me was that *metaxu*, (not *metazu*, as he writes it,) in Acts xiii, 42, does not mean *between* or *intervening*, but *next* or *following*. To support this position, he cited the authority of Alford. I have shown that Alford is totally mistaken. If he is mistaken, then all who agree with him are mistaken.

I am glad Mr. Burr calls my attention to Alford's note on verse 44, as it furnishes a new argument from his stand-point for my rendering of *metaxu* in verse 42. If, as Alford says, "the sense will be on the following day, and not as Heinrichs, on the following week-day," this shows conclusively it was "the Christian Sabbath," for if the day following the Jewish Sabbath "was not a week-day," then it was "the Christian Sabbath," as we know is now the fact.

Thank you, Mr. Burr! Truth always shines brighter the more it is rubbed!

He has not done, however, "with Christian authorities." He produces his five smooth stones, Calvin, Clarke, Henry, Scott, and Benson, but only slings one of them. The shot, however, by some singular freak, instead of hitting his adversary, twirls round and sinks into his own head! Quoting Benson, who quotes Grotius, who was the most learned man of his time, he distinctly proves the truth of my rendering of *metaxu*. Grotius insists that the reading should be "the intermediate Sabbath;"

that is, the Sabbath between two Jewish Sabbaths. So much for the quotation from Benson.

Four stones remain *unslung*.

“He is not aware of any authority on my side, except the marginal reading, which is ambiguous.” He had better go back to the old classic Greek, to the usage of the New Testament Greek itself, and to hundreds of authorities far more decisive of my rendering of *metaxu* in this passage than any he has yet produced against it.

But to do this I fear will require more time and space than can be devoted to the subject in the columns of the daily journals. And now that the gentleman appears in his own proper person, and Mr. Pillsbury is out of the question, I have the pleasure of renewing to Mr. Burr my original proposition. Let us correspond, privately at first, till we have concluded what we have to say, and then publish the correspondence in pamphlet form.

B. SUNDERLAND.

DAVID CUTS OFF GOLIATH'S HEAD.

Prostrate Goliath flounders. He speaks. It is David, he says, that is smitten. David thinks Goliath is blind, and in the death-struggle.

My adversary says that the weight of Christian authority is a game that two can play at. Just so. Play away, Doctor. You are plaintiff, I defendant. I demand a jury of your peers, all drawn from the Christian Church. I challenge now [none] for bias; and if I can't get a verdict for defendant, all the plaintiff can hope for is a disagreement; so that he loses his case any way.

The Doctor's Greek is good; not so his logic. First, he admits that Dean Alford is against him, and then claims that he is for him. This will be news to the Dean of Canterbury. Grotius, he says, is for him, because he insists on the reading, “the intermediate Sabbath.” Not so, Doctor. Surely, you did not intend to garble and pervert Grotius, who says, “in the intermediate *time between* the two Sabbaths,” specifying *Monday* and *Thursday*, (*not Sunday*,) which were the lecture days of the Jews.

My opponent having thus perverted both Alford and Grotius, let him try his hand at the other four authorities. It is unnecessary for me to quote them; they are clearly and strongly against him. And I will add that I have two more of the same sort,

namely, Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, who first made public in that city the existence of the Book of Acts in the year 400, and the late Albert Barnes. The earliest Christian commentator [upon the book of Acts] never dreamed of the rendering of the passage in question, revealed to Dr. Sunderland, and his brother Barnes, the latest commentator, died without the discovery.

Having slung the stone, I now proceed to cut off Goliath's head with his own two-edged sword. Eight years after the crucifixion the Gospel was first preached and the Christian Church established at Antioch, *in Syria*. (Acts xi, 19-26.) Four years later, Paul and Barnabas, being sent on a missionary tour, reached Antioch, *in Pisidia*, a sequestered town, remote from the sea, lying at the foot of impassable mountains, and distant about 330 miles in a straight line from the other place. There were a few Jews in this second Antioch, but not a Christian until Paul went there. How, then, could the Gentiles, who had never before heard of Christianity, have besought Paul to preach to them on the next *Christian Sabbath*?

Dear Doctor, is not this one of those passages "which they that be unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction?" I mean polemically, not literally.

Enough on this point. I have said that Paul, during a ministry of twenty years, constantly preached in the synagogues on the Jewish Sabbath. I now give the proof. Straightway after his conversion he began to preach in the synagogues, (Acts, ix, 20.) He did so at Antioch, in Pisidia, two Sabbath days in succession, (xiii, 14, 44,) then at Iconium, (xiv, 1,) then at Thessalonica, "as his manner was," three Sabbath days, (xvii, 2,) then at Berea, (ver. 10,) then at Athens, (ver. 17,) then at Corinth "every Sabbath," for a year and a half, (xviii, 4-11,) then at Ephesus, (ver. 19,) and again at the same place for "three months," (xix, 8.) During all this time I do not find the slightest evidence that Paul observed the first day of the week as a Sabbath.

I decline a private correspondence. In three or four articles of a quarter of a column each, I can say all I desire to on this subject. But if my opponent declines a further newspaper discussion, I rest my case here.

WM. HENRY BURR.

GOLIATH, THOUGH DEAD, YET SPEAKS.

Mr. Burr positively declines the private correspondence. I must, therefore, make short work of his last communication.

1. I quoted Grotius from memory. The original has *tempore* instead of *Sabbato*. I have no intention to misquote.

2. Can Mr. Burr say as much, when he has misrepresented Alford on verse 42, and misquoted him on verse 44?

3. Mr. Burr cannot be permitted to select a *jury* from *witnesses* whom we are going to put on the stand!

4. We will attend to these witnesses in due time. Alford is already discredited. Benson gets his quietus from Grotius, and the rest will follow as fast as we can reach them?

5. He praises my Greek. Of course, after his *blunder* in orthography I fully appreciate the compliment.

6. He says my logic, &c., "will be news to the Dean of Canterbury," (meaning Alford.) As the Dean is dead, the "news" will, of course, be penetrating.

7. He need not spend time on "the Jewish Sabbath," or to prove that the Apostles availed themselves of those occasions to preach the Gospel. Nobody denies this.

8. It is equally useless to enter upon any historical researches of the early Church to show that none of the Gentiles in Pisidia had ever heard of "the Christian Sabbath." Dozens of people might have been in Antioch on that very Sabbath who had recently come from Palestine.

9. The issue between us, mind, is the meaning of *metaxu*. He says it means *next*. I say it means *between*.

I will endeavor to be perfectly fair in examining the witnesses he produces on his side, and in presenting such witnesses as I may on my side. But it will take more time and space than can be usually given in the columns of a daily journal like the *Chronicle*. I therefore defer further observations to a future occasion.

B. SUNDERLAND.

DAVID ADDRESSES GOLIATH'S GHOST.

The ghost of Goliath appears. He says he quoted Grotius from memory! The passage, as given by Benson, was before his eyes. Why did he garble it?

In answer to my charge of misquoting, he says he did not intend to do so, and insinuates that I intended to misrepresent

and misquote Dean Alford. I neither intended it nor did it. The charge is false. I quoted from Alford what Dr. S. omitted.

In impannelling a jury of authorities I said, "I challenge none for bias." The word *none* was printed *now*. I don't want to "select" a jury. I will take them as they come.

I mistook a Greek letter for another almost exactly similar, and I was not aware that Dean Alford had died within a year. I acknowledge my mistakes; my opponent persists in his.

The lexicons say that *metaxu* means not only *between*, but *afterwards*.

Ghost of Goliath, *au revoir*.

WILLIAM HENRY BURR.

THE GHOST APPEARS AGAIN.

Mr. Burr sees a ghost! Quite likely! Men's minds do *wander* sometimes.

1. He says the passage as given by Benson was before my eyes, and wants to know why I *garbled* it? Does he know the primary meaning of *garble*? But let that pass. I would say to Mr. Burr, just in this connection, that Grotius wrote in Latin. I choose to read him in the original, not at second-hand. I made the proper correction in Latin without any reference to Benson. Is this *persisting* in a mistake?

2. Mr. Burr denies that he misrepresented and misquoted Alford, and disclaims the intention. I do not charge him with the intention; but that he did it I will show. His words are, "Alford says that this rendering in verse 42, 'the next Sabbath' is *correct*." Alford does not use the word *correct*. To ascribe it to him is what I call misrepresentation.

Again, on verse 44, he quotes Alford as saying, "the sense will be on the following day." Alford's words are, "the sense will be on the following Sabbath-day." This is what I call misquotation.

3. *Bias or no bias*, we cannot consent to have a jury made up of the *witnesses* in the case.

4. Lexicons at the best are only *secondary* authority. Certainly they cannot settle the meaning of *metaxu* in Acts xiii., 42.

I am preparing an article on the weight of authority as to the meaning of this text, which, when completed, I hope to have published in some form as a full expression of my views.

B. SUNDERLAND.

WHAT DAVID SAYS TO IT A SECOND TIME.

Dr. Sunderland did *not* make "the proper correction" of his misquotation of Grotius. The passage reads "*medio tempore inter duo Sabbata*"—"in the intermediate time between two Sabbaths." To make it read, "in the intermediate Sabbath," is *garbling*.

I did not "ascribe" the word "correct" to Alford, and Dr. Sunderland knows it. In the quotation, "the following Sabbath day," the word "Sabbath" is not to be found in Alford's latest edition, which I saw. I knew and Dr. Sunderland knew it ought to be there, and yet upon that omission he sought to make Alford stultify himself; and now, finding the word supplied in a former edition, with strange perversity he charges me with misquotation.

WM. HENRY BURR.

THE GHOST RETURNS A THIRD TIME.

1. Mr. Burr thinks I did not make the proper correction. Let us see. Quoting Grotius from memory, I made him read "the intermediate Sabbath," as though his words were *medio Sabbato*. Discovering the mistake, I corrected it by saying "the original has *tempore* instead of *Sabbata*." This would make it read, as it actually does, *medio tempore*.

But Mr. Burr hastens to tell us that the passage reads "*medio tempore inter duo Sabbata*." And he adds, to make it read "in the intermediate Sabbath" is *garbling*. He might as well accuse me of *garbling* because I did not quote the entire work of Grotius bodily.

2. Mr. Burr's words are, "Alford says that this rendering in verse 42, 'the next Sabbath,' is correct." If this is not ascribing to Alford the word "*correct*," will Mr. Burr tell us what it is?

3. How will Mr. Burr reconcile what he represents Alford as saying with what he quotes Grotius as saying in regard to the meaning of *metaxu*, in Acts xiii, 42.

4. I am inclined to think that Mr. Burr muddles himself and his foremost witness, Alford, by confessing that he quoted an error from an erroneous copy of Alford, knowing it to be such at the time! Isn't that being rather hard-pushed for testimony?

5. Now, Mr. Burr, see what you have done? By quoting from your erroneous edition of Alford you have led me into error in quoting the same thing after you, to make, from *your stand-*

point, an argument on my side. This is "stultifying" Alford with a vengeance! I have never seen the erroneous edition of which you speak. Is it at Ballantyne's?

B. SUNDERLAND.

A FINAL WORD BY DAVID.

Mr. Burr, deeming it unnecessary to reply to the foregoing, leaves his adversary to have the last word in the *Chronicle*. But in reproducing the controversy he submits the following final word:

"There is no God," (Ps. liii, 1;) "Trust in vanity and speak lies," (Is. lix, 4.) Who says that is garbling? Must I quote the whole Bible?

How "hard-pushed" the Doctor must have been for an argument when he eagerly seized upon so apparent an omission as that of the word "Sabbath," in Dean Alford's note on Acts xiii, 44, not only to make nonsense of the note, but to make the "Sabbath-day," mentioned in verse 44, mean the first day of the week, contrary to the Doctor's own admission in his discourse! (See page 1.)

HOW THE EARLY FATHERS, REFORMERS, AND OTHER
EMINENT CHRISTIAN WRITERS REGARDED
SUNDAY AND THE SABBATH.

In the *Daily Chronicle* of October 31, one day prior to the appearance of Dr. Sunderland's last article in the controversy with Mr. Burr, the Doctor uses this language in reply to an assertion by "J. R.," on the previous day, that there is no authority in history or Christianity for a special sacred day:

"Whoever will undertake deliberately to assert that there is no authority for the Christian Sabbath in history or Christianity is too far gone in self-complacent ignorance to be reasoned with."

And yet so eager was the Doctor at the outset to discuss the

question, that he challenged an anonymous writer, ("W. H. B.,") who clearly denied the authority for the Christian Sabbath, to a private controversy. (See page 3.) But letting that pass, let us see how the early Fathers, Reformers, and other eminent Christian writers regarded Sunday and the Sabbath, and whether the charge of "self-complacent ignorance" will apply to them.

JUSTIN MARTYR,

So called from his being believed to have suffered martyrdom about A. D. 163, was supposed to have been born A. D. 89. In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, the Jew, reported by himself, (*Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. ii,) the following passages referring to the Sabbath are gathered:

Trypho. "This is what we are most at a loss about: that you, professing to be pious and supposing yourself better than others, are not in any particular separate from them, and do not alter your mode of living from the nations, in that you observe no festivals or Sabbaths, and do not have the rite of circumcision."

Justin. "We do not trust through Moses or through the law, for then we would be the same as yourselves. . . . For the law, promulgated on Horeb, is now old and belongs to yourselves alone. . . . Now, law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has put an end to the previous one, and an eternal final law, namely, Christ, has been given to us; and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance. . . . The new law requires you to keep a perpetual Sabbath; and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you. . . . As if it were not the same God who existed in the times of Enoch and all the rest, who neither were circumcised after the flesh, nor observed Sabbaths, nor any other rites. . . . Do you see that the elements are not idle and keep no Sabbaths? . . . For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or of the observance of Sabbaths, feasts, and sacrifices, before Moses, no more need is there of them now, after that, according to the will of God, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, has been born without sin."

Trypho. "Why do you select and quote whatever you wish from the prophetic writings, but do not refer to those which expressly command the Sabbath to be observed?"

Justin. "I have passed them by, not because such prophecies were contrary to me, but because you have understood and do understand, that although God commands you by all the prophets to do the same things which He commanded Moses, it was on account of the hardness of your hearts and your ingratitude towards Him that He continually proclaims them. . . . Why did He not teach those who are called righteous and pleasing to Him, who lived before Moses and Abraham . . . and observed no Sabbaths, to keep these institutions?"

TERTULLIAN

Was presbyter of the Church of Carthage about A. D. 193, and died about A. D. 220. In his *Apology* addressed to the rulers of the Roman Empire, (*Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. xi, p. 85,) he says:

"But you, many of you, also, under pretence sometimes of worshipping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing from a far different reason than Sun-worship, we have some resemblance to those who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they, too, go far away from the Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant."

In his essay *On Idolatry* (*Ibid*, p. 162) are these words:

"By us, to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals, formerly beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New-year's and Mid-winter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented. . . . We are not apprehensive lest we seem to be *heathens!* If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for, to the *heathens* each festive day occurs but once annually: *you* have a festive day every eighth day."

In his address *To the Nations*, (*Ibid*, p. 449,) he thus speaks of Sunday:

"Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be

confessed, suppose that the Sun is the God of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray towards the East or because we make Sunday a day of festivity."

Lastly, in his *Answer to the Jews*, (*Ibid*, vol. xviii, chap. 4,) he maintains that the temporal, Jewish Sabbath is abrogated :

"It follows accordingly, that in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is being demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is being demonstrated to have been temporary. . . . We [Christians] understand that *we* still more ought to observe a Sabbath from all 'servile work' always, and not only every seventh day, but through all time. . . . For the Scriptures point to a Sabbath eternal and a Sabbath temporal."

EUSEBIUS,

The father of church history, who wrote about A. D. 315, in Book i, chap. 4, of his *Ecclesiastical History*, says :

"They [the patriarchs] did not therefore regard circumcision nor observe the Sabbath, neither do we ; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbols, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."

MARTIN LUTHER,

The father of the Reformation, is quoted by Mitchelet in his *Life of Luther*, (Book iv, chap. 2,) as follows :

"As regards the Sabbath or Sunday, there is no necessity for keeping it ; but if we do, it ought to be not on account of Moses' commandment, but because nature teaches us from time to time to take a day of rest."

The following quotation is also made from Luther, by Cole-ridge, in his *Table Talk*, article "Christian Sabbath :"

"Keep it for its use' sake both to body and soul. But if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake—if anywhere any one sets up its observance upon a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it—to do anything that shall reprove this encroachment on the Christian spirit of liberty."

In a hasty search of Luther's writings we have been unable to find either of the above passages; but their verity is not controverted, even by the Rev. James Gilfillan, of Scotland, the latest and perhaps most learned advocate of the Christian Sabbath, whose elaborate work on that subject has been recently reissued by the American Tract Society. And we have found in Luther's works enough to prove that he did cherish such views, as will appear from his instructions to Christians how to make use of Moses, a few sentences of which we here translate from *Lutheri Opera Latina*, Tom. iii, pp. 72-3:

“The whole of the law of Moses, in its promulgation, belongs to the Jews alone, and not to other nations, nor to us Christians. It was manifestly given to that people only, and they received it to be observed by them and their posterity to the exclusion of all other nations. . . . Nothing of it pertains to other nations, not even the words delivered from Mount Sinai. . . . I say this on account of certain ignorant and pernicious spirits, who, because the laws and polity of Moses were prescribed to the people of God, say it is necessary that we should observe the same. These new masters would teach us something more than the Gospel of Christ. . . . Their doctrines are fanatical, and foreign from the true understanding of the Gospel. Do not listen to them; rather let no mention of Moses be made at all. . . . We neither wish, nor ought we to acknowledge Moses as our legislator, nor has God so intended it. . . . When, therefore, you hear these men say, ‘Thus Moses wrote and commanded the people of God by Divine authority, and therefore these things are binding on us,’ you will answer them in a word: ‘What is Moses to us? We have nothing to do with his ministry or vocation’ . . . For if you concede that you are bound by one of his laws you cannot escape the observance of the whole. . . . Let Moses go; he is dead, and was buried long ago by God himself. . . . That the decalogue does not bind the Gentiles is shown by the very words of its promulgation, in Exodus xx, where God says, ‘I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage.’ Clearly he speaks and gives commandments to those whom he had

led out of Egypt. Therefore the words have no reference to other nations, nor to us, for we were not brought out of Egypt. . . . Here we might also show that the Sabbath in no way pertained to the Gentiles. It was not commanded to them nor observed by any of them. Even Paul and the Apostles, after the Gospel began to be preached and spread over the world, clearly released the people from the observance of the Sabbath. And even the prophets foretold that the time would come when the Jewish Sabbath would cease to exist. Thus Isaiah, in the last chapter, says that after Christ has come the distinction between the Sabbath and other days shall be removed, 'and there shall be month after month and Sabbath after Sabbath.'— [Douay version, Is. lxvi 23.]

PHILIP MELANCTHON,

The bosom friend of Luther, framed and presented the Augsburg Confession to the Assembly in 1530. In it (*Omnium Operum*, 1562, vol. i, p. 37,) are these words, which we translate from the Latin :

“They who think that the observance of the Lord’s day has been appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the Sabbath, as a necessary thing, do greatly err. The Scripture allows that the observance of the Sabbath has now become void, for it teaches that the Mosaic ceremonies are not needful after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to assign a certain day that the people might know when to come together, it seems that the Church did, for that purpose, appoint the Lord’s day, which day, for this cause also, seemed to have better pleased the Church, that in it men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance neither of the Sabbath nor of any other day is necessary.”

JOHN CALVIN,

The father of Presbyterianism, in Book ii, chap. 8, of his *Institutes*, concludes a long essay on the fourth commandment as follows :

“Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets who, in past ages, have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming

that nothing but the ceremonial part of this commandment (which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day) is 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 retaining 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.”

GROTIUS,

The distinguished Dutch jurist and theologian, was born A. D. 1583. In his *Annotations on the Old Testament* he thus comments on Exodus xx :

“ These things refute those who suppose that the first day of the week (that is, the Lord’s day) was substituted in place of the Sabbath; for no mention is ever made of such a thing, either by Christ or the Apostles; and when the Apostle Paul says, Christians are not to be condemned on account of Sabbaths, &c., (Col. ii, 16,) he shows that they were entirely free from that law; which liberty would be of no effect, if, the law remaining, the day merely were changed. Therefore the day of the Lord’s resurrection was not observed by Christians, any more than the Sabbath, from any precept of God, or of the Apostles, but by voluntary agreement of the liberty which had been given them.”

WILLIAM TYNDALE,

The distinguished English reformer and martyr, in his *Answer to Sir Thomas Moore’s Dialogue*, chap. 25, says :

“ As for the Sabbath, we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday or into any other day, as we see need; or make every tenth day a holy day only, if we see cause why. We may make two every week, if it were expedient, and not one enough to teach the people. Neither was there any cause to change it from Saturday than to put difference between us and the Jews, and lest we should become servants unto the day, after their superstition. Neither need we any holy day at all if the people might be taught without it.”

JOHN FRITH,

A cotemporary of Tyndale, and also a martyr, in his *Declaration of Baptism*, takes a similar view, as follows :

“ Our forefathers which were in the beginning of the Church did abrogate the Sabbath, to the extent that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and that they might know that neither the keeping of the Sabbath nor of any other day is necessary. . . . 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 in the stead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next day following, which was Sunday. And although they might have kept Saturday with the Jews as a thing indifferent, yet did they much better, and overset the day, to be a perpetual memorial that we are free and not bound to any day, but that we may do all lawful works to the pleasure of God and profit of our neighbor. We are in manner as superstitious in the Sunday as they were in the Saturday ; yea, are we much madder ; for the Jews have the word of God for their Saturday, since it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemn ; and we have not the word of God for us, but rather against us, for we keep not the seventh day as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God’s law.”

JOHN MILTON,

In his *Treatise on Christian Doctrines*, vol. ii, p. 331, says :

“ Since, then, the Sabbath was originally an ordinance of the Mosaic law, since it was given to the Israelites alone, and that for the express purpose of distinguishing them from other nations, it follows that if (as was shown in the former book) those who live under the Gospel are emancipated from the ordinances of the law in general, least of all can they be considered as bound by that of the Sabbath, which was the special cause of its institution.”

Again, on page 332 :

“ The law of the Sabbath being thus repealed, that no particular day of worship has been appointed in its place is evident from the same Apostle, (Rom. xiv, 5.)”

And on page 339 he concludes :

“First, that under the gospel no one day is appointed for divine worship in preference to another, except such as the Church may set apart, of its own authority, for the voluntary assembling of its members; . . . and, secondly, that this may conveniently take place once every seven days, particularly on the first day of the week. . . . I perceive also that several of the best divines, as Bucer, Calvin, Peter Martyr, Musculus, Ursinus, Gomarus, and others, concur in the opinions above expressed.”

PETER HEYLYN,

Chaplain to Charles I and Charles II, as cited by Bannerman in his *Modern Sabbath Examined*, (London, 1832, p. 139,) discourses as follows :

“It was left to God’s people to pitch on the first day of the week or any other, as the public use might require; for there was no divine command that *it* particularly should be sanctified, as there was concerning the Jewish Sabbath. And though this day was taken up and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercises, yet for three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it nor rest from labor or from worldly business required upon it. And when it seemed good unto Christian princes to lay restraints upon their people, yet at first it was not general, but only this: that certain men in certain places should lay aside their ordinary works to attend to God’s service in the church; those engaged in employments that 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 following times, when the princes and prelates endeavored to restrain them from that also, it was not brought about without much struggling and opposition of the people; more than a thousand years being past after Christ’s ascension before the Lord’s day had attained that state in which it now standeth. . . . In all this time, in twelve hundred years, we find no Sabbath.”

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY,

In his *Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*, (Andover edition, p. 160,) says :

“ Throughout the whole liturgy and rubric the word *Sabbath* never once occurs. Our reformers, there is every reason to believe, concurred in taking the same view of the obligation of the fourth commandment as is set forth in the catechism extant under the name of Archbishop Cranmer, published in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI: ‘ The Jews in the Old Testament were commanded to keep the Sabbath day; and they observed every seventh day, called the Sabbath or Satterday. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses’ law.’ ”

Again, on page 163 :

“ We find, in short, the most ample evidence of the observance of the Lord’s day as a Christian festival by the Apostles and their immediate converts, whose example has been followed by all Christian churches down to this day; but that in so doing they conceived themselves to be observing a precept of the Levitical law, that they taught the doctrine of a transfer of the Sabbath from one day to another, we find not only no evidence, but every conceivable evidence to the contrary.”

JEREMY TAYLOR

Treats of the Sabbath at great length. We subjoin a few passages from vol. xii, of his *Whole Works* :

“ The Christians for a long time together did keep their conventions upon the Sabbath, in which some portions of the law were read. . . . At first they kept both days, with this only difference: that though they kept the Sabbath, yet it was after the Christian, that is, after the spiritual manner. . . . They did it without any opinion of essential obligation and without the Jewish rest. . . . We find it affirmed by Balsamo, ‘ The Sabbath day and the Lord’s day were almost in all things made equal by the holy fathers.’ . . . The effect of which consideration is, that the Lord’s day did not succeed in the place of the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was wholly abrogated, and the Lord’s day was merely an ecclesiastical institution. . . . And the primitive Christians did all manner of works upon the Lord’s day, even in times of persecution, when they are the strictest observers of all the Divine commandments. But in this

they knew there was none; and therefore when Constantine, the Emperor, had made an edict against working upon the Lord's day, yet he excepts and still permitted to agriculture the labors of the husbandman whatsoever; for 'God regardeth not outward cessation from works more upon one day than another,' as St. Epiphanius disputes well against the Ebionites and Manichæans."

NEANDER,

The most profound Church historian, in vol. i, sec. 3, of his *General History of the Christian Religion and Church in the three first centuries*, (first edition,) thus speaks of Sunday:

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intention of the Apostles to establish a divine command in this respect; far from them and from the early Apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place, for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."

In the second edition, which the author issued in 1843, the foregoing passage is not found, nor indeed anything like it. The explanation of so remarkable an omission is given by the translator in his preface to the English edition, (Edinburgh, 1851-2,) as follows: "In this new edition the alterations are numerous and important. . . . These important changes, not here and there, but through the entire page and paragraphs, have made it necessary to translate nearly the whole of the first volume anew." That Neander did modify his views on the Sunday question appears not only from the radical changes made in the second edition of his *General Church History*, but from the following passages contained in his prior work, entitled, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, (Edinburgh, 1842, vol. i, p. 156:)

"According to the doctrine of the Apostle Paul, the Mosaic law in its whole extent had lost its value as such to Christians; . . . but whatever was binding as a law for the Christian life

must, as such, derive its authority from another quarter. Hence the transference of the Old Testament command of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the New Testament standing point was not admissible. . . . Thus all the days of the Christian life must be equally holy to the Lord. . . . He fears that his labors among them, [the Galatians,] to make them Christians, had been in vain, because they reckoned the observance of certain days as holy to be an essential part of religion. . . . We must deduce the religious observance of Sunday, not from the Jewish Christian churches, but from the peculiar circumstances of the Gentile Christians, and may account for the practice in the following manner: Where the circumstances of the churches did not allow of daily meetings for devotion, . . . although on the Christian standing point all days were to be considered as equally holy, in an equal manner devoted to the Lord, yet, on account of peculiar outward relations, such a distinction of a particular day was adopted for religious communion."

WILLIAM PALEY,

Author of standard works on *Natural Theology*, *Evidences of Christianity*, and *Moral and Political Philosophy*, in discussing the Sabbath question in the last mentioned work, chap. vii, says:

"St. Paul evidently appears to have considered the Sabbath as part of the Jewish ritual, and not obligatory on Christians as such." (Col. ii, 16, 17.)

And in regard to the first day of the week he speaks as follows:

"A cessation upon that day from labor beyond the time of attendance upon public worship is not intimated in any passage of the New Testament; nor did Christ or his Apostles deliver, that we know of, any command to their disciples for a discontinuance, upon that day, of the common affairs of their professions. . . . The opinion that Christ and his Apostles meant to retain the duties of the Jewish Sabbath, shifting only the day from the seventh to the first, seems to prevail without sufficient reason; nor does any evidence remain in the Scripture (of what, however, is not improbable) that the first day of the week was thus distinguished in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection."

ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

If the Christian Sabbath, so called, be of Divine appointment, to commemorate the resurrection of Christ, it must take its origin from that event. During the forty days thereafter that Jesus remained on earth, (Acts i, 3,) it is conceded that He gave no command to observe any day as a Sabbath. Did He then by His example indicate such an observance?

According to Matthew, He met the two Marys on the morning of the day of his resurrection, and bade them "go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me." (xxviii, 10.) "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them," (v. 16;) and after receiving from Him a command to teach and baptize, the narrative ends. Is it not very remarkable, if this was the first Christian Sabbath, that we find no intimation of it here, but on the contrary an order sent to the disciples, which they seem to have straightway obeyed, to set out on a journey of more than fifty miles? Only one meeting with the disciples after the resurrection is recorded, and that, being in a far off mountain, can hardly be supposed to have occurred on Sunday. In short, there is no intimation in Matthew's narrative that the risen Jesus met His disciples at all on the first day of the week.

According to Mark, the two Marys and Salome received the instruction to tell the disciples to meet Jesus in Galilee from the young man in a long, white garment. A little later in the day Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene alone, who went and told the disciples that He was alive, (xvi, 10;) afterward He appeared to two of His disciples as they went into the country, (v. 12;) and lastly, to the eleven as they sat at meat, (v. 14.) The three appearances seem to have occurred on the same day; and not only

is there no indication of the special observance of that day, but quite the contrary ; for two of the disciples were journeying into the country, an act entirely inconsistent with the keeping of a Sabbath, and Jesus appears to have kept them company. The meeting of the eleven at meat would seem to have been in the evening, (John xx, 19,) which, according to the Jewish division of time, was the beginning of another day. So there is no intimation in Mark's narrative of the observance of the first day of the week.

According to Luke, the two Marys, Joanna, and other women, having visited the empty sepulchre, went and told the fact to the eleven, (xxiv, 9.) Then that same day, as two of the disciples were going to the village of Emmaus, (v. 13,) a distance of seven and a half miles, Jesus drew near and walked with them ; and when they came to the village "He made as though He would have gone further," (v. 28,) but they constrained Him to take supper with them, the day being "far spent;" after which they returned to Jerusalem, where they met the rest of the eleven and others gathered together. But presently Jesus himself appeared among them, (v. 36.) Here we have the fact of Jesus and two of the disciples traveling a distance of fourteen miles, which is adverse to the recognition, even by Jesus himself, of the sacredness of the day. Nor did He meet the eleven disciples until late in the evening, which was the second day of the week ; for it is not to be supposed that the disciples, who were all Jews, had suddenly discarded the Jewish division of time, by which the day began at sunset. Moreover, there is nothing to show that this meeting of the disciples was extraordinary, or more than accidental. The two disciples appear to have returned from Emmaus on purpose to tell the rest that Jesus was alive, so that *their* attendance at least was accidental ; and in spite of the information that the other nine had received of the resurrection from these two, as well as from the women, His appearance among them was a surprise, and

with difficulty did He persuade them that He was not a spirit. Then He led them out to Bethany, (*v.* 50,) whence He was carried up into heaven. Luke, like Mark, mentions but this one meeting of Christ with His disciples, and every circumstance recorded is opposed to the recognition of the day of the resurrection as a Sabbath.

According to John, Jesus first appeared to Mary Magdalene, (*xx*, 14,) who went and told the disciples, (*v.* 18.) "Then the same day at evening," ten of the eleven disciples being assembled, Jesus came among them, (*v.* 19.) This meeting was not on the first but the second day of the week, as we have already seen, and the appearance of Jesus among the ten was a surprise. He convinced His incredulous disciples that He was alive; but they could not afterward convince the absent Thomas of the fact. So, "after eight days," when the eleven were assembled, Jesus appeared again among them, (*v.* 26,) apparently for the sole purpose of convincing Thomas. Admitting that "after eight days" means one week, which is disputed by learned theologians, it is certain that this second meeting, which is mentioned by John only, was, like the first, on the second day of the week. John mentions a third appearance of Jesus to the disciples when they were fishing, (*xxi*, 3, 4,) which of course could not have been on a Sabbath.

So, then, there is not the slightest testimony in any of the four Gospels to the observance of Sunday as a Sabbath. Surely, if the day was thenceforth to be hallowed, there must have been some intimation of it by at least one of the Evangelists; but on the contrary, every recorded circumstance is against it.

Here we might rest the case, for if Christ did not institute a Christian Sabbath, what authority had His Apostles, much less their successors, to do it? But waiving that objection, let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles and remaining books of the New Testament, and see if they contain any warrant for the sanctification of Sunday.

The first nineteen chapters of Acts contain no reference whatever to the first day of the week. On the other hand, we there have a history of twenty-five years of Paul's ministry, in which he constantly preached in the synagogues on the Sabbath-day of the Jews, showing that if he had any regard for one day as holier than another it was the seventh day. But there is no intimation even of this, and many passages in his epistles are clearly against the observance of any Sabbath. (Rom. xiv, 5; Gal. iv, 10; Col. ii, 16.)

The first and only mention of the first day of the week in Acts is in chap. xx, 7, where it is said the disciples came together on that day to break bread, and Paul, ready to depart on the morrow, preached to them till midnight; *i. e.*, six hours into the second day of the week. But after midnight they again broke bread, (*v.* 11,) and Paul talked till daybreak; *i. e.*, ten hours or more into the second day of the week. But if, as may be the fact, this meeting was on Saturday evening, which was the beginning of the Jewish first day, then it is certain that Paul, in taking his departure in the morning, traveled on Sunday. The fact of the disciples coming together to break bread on the first day of the week has no significance as to the sacredness of that day, because it was a daily practice, as we read in Acts ii, 46. So there is nothing in Acts xx, 7, to indicate the special observance of Sunday.

The last and only other mention of the first day of the week in the New Testament is in 1st Corinthians, xvi, 2, where every one is exhorted to lay by him in store on that day for a collection. Nothing further can be inferred from this than that on that particular day the Corinthian Christians, like the Galatians, were to lay by their contributions—reserved, perhaps, from the earnings of the past week.

The only mention of the "Lord's day" in the New Testament is in Revelations i, 10: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day."

Granting that by this was meant the first day of the week, and not a particular day of the year, (which was possible,) it proves nothing as to the sacredness of Sunday, especially as it was the custom in the early Christian church to meet on other days as well as Sunday for religious purposes. To establish this fact we produce Neander, author of the most profound and exhaustive history of the Christian church yet produced, who, in speaking of the observance of festive days in the first three centuries, (vol. i, second edition, p 402,) says:

“Sunday was distinguished as a day of joy. . . . The Friday of each week, this day in particular, and the Thursday, were specially consecrated to the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ and of the preparatory circumstances. On those days there were meetings for prayer and fasting till three o'clock in the afternoon. . . . Those Churches, however, which were composed of Jewish Christians, though they admitted with the rest the festival of Sunday, yet retained also the Sabbath.”

Again, in vol. iii, p. 398:

“Yet the most distinguished Church teachers of this period continue still to express the purely Christian idea of the relation of the festivals to the whole Christian life. . . . Thus Jerome asserts that, considered in a purely Christian point of view, all days are alike, and every day is for the Christian a Friday, . . . every day a Sunday. . . . Chrysostom delivered a discourse at Antioch, in which he showed that those who never attended church except on the principal festivals adopted the Jewish point of view; that on the other hand the Christian celebration of festivals was not necessarily restricted to certain times, but embraced the whole life. . . . In like manner the Church historian Socrates remarks that Christ and the Apostles, conformably to Christian freedom, gave no law respecting feasts, but left everything open here to the free expression of feelings. . . . Socrates mentions it as a peculiarity of the Alexandrian Church, that on Wednesday and Friday the Holy Scriptures were read in the Church and expounded by homilies; and in general the whole service conducted as on Sunday, the celebration of the communion excepted. This custom probably vanished by degrees in most of the Churches; only Friday continued to be consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion. The Emperor Constantine, as Sozomon relates, enacted a law that on Friday, as on Sunday, there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purpose of devotion. At Antioch the communion was celebrated on Friday as well as on Sunday. Also, at Constantinople, Friday was observed by the more serious Christians as a day of penitence and fasting, consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion, and the Sacrament of the Supper was distributed. . . . In several of the Eastern Churches the Sabbath was celebrated nearly after the same manner as Sunday.”

In Mosheim's *Church History* (cent. ii, part ii, ch. iv, sec. 8) the observance of four days of the week by the Christians of the second century is mentioned, namely: the first, the fourth, the sixth, and the seventh—the fourth being the day on which Christ was betrayed, and the sixth day on which he was crucified.

In Jeremy Taylor's treatise on the Sabbath (*Whole Works*, vol. xii,) he says that the primitive Christians continued to meet publicly on the Jewish Sabbath until the time of the Council of Laodicea, (A. D. 368,) when the observance of that day was expressly forbidden in these words: "Christians must not keep a rest Sabbath, but work upon that day, preferring the Lord's day before it. If they will rest on that day let them rest as Christians; but if they rest as Jews, let them be accursed."

It is needless to cumulate proof of the fact that the primitive Christians were accustomed to meet for religious purposes on other days beside Sunday. There can be no question of it. Indeed, if any day of the week was more generally used than another for Christian worship in the first three centuries it was the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath.

The "Lord's day" mentioned in Rev. i, 10, probably meant the "great day of God Almighty," (xvi, 14,) or "the great day of His wrath," (vi, 17,) and the proper rendering of the passage would be, "I was in spirit on the Lord's day," *i. e.*, the day of God's wrath. At all events it is mere conjecture that it meant Sunday, and it would be a better conjecture that it meant the old Sabbath. The date of the book of Revelation is given in the margin of our Bibles as A. D. 96, but modern criticism fixes it about A. D. 70. The earliest use of the expression "Lord's day" we have been able to find in the writings of the Fathers is in the *Miscellanies* of Clement of Alexandria, (B. v, p. 284; *Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. xii,) the date of which is assigned between A. D. 194 and 202. Eusebius, however, (B. iv, ch. 23,) quotes it from an epistle (not now extant) of Dionysius, who was

made bishop of Corinth, A. D. 170. Assuming that Eusebius quoted it correctly, we have but these two occurrences of it in the writings of the Fathers of the first two centuries, unless what is known as the long epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, which is generally regarded as spurious, was forged before the year 200. That epistle, which is an enlargement of the short one, contains these words :

“ Let us, therefore, no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness, . . . but let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner. . . . 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 days.” (Ch. ix.)

The short epistle, which, though questionable, is believed by some to be genuine, and therefore written about the end of the first century, also contains the expression “ Lord’s day ” in our translations, but *not in the original Greek*. In Archbishop Wake’s translation we read, “ No longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord’s day.” (Ch. iii, 3.) The Greek reads, *kata kuriaken zoen zontes*, and the rendering should be, “ living according to the Lord’s life.” This, too, makes far better sense of the whole passage, thus : “ No longer observing Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord’s life, in which also *our* life is sprung up,” &c.

It therefore appears that until about the close of the second century the expression “ Lord’s day ” occurs but barely once in any existing manuscript, namely, the Book of Revelations ; and it is presumptuous to assume that it meant a Christian Sabbath. Nor is the meaning of the expression as used by Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 194–202, any more certain ; for in repeating it (B. vii, ch. xii) he seems to regard any day as the Lord’s day. Furthermore, it is a remarkable fact that the most learned advocates of the Christian Sabbath, in applying Rev. i, 10, to Sunday, never refer to any writer earlier than the fourth century who quotes it. Hence there may be just ground for the suspicion that

the passage was interpolated in that Book about or prior to the time of Constantine.

Still it is conceded that Sunday had begun to be observed in a special manner about the middle of the second century. Justin Martyr, in his *Apology*, written about this time, speaks of the celebration of the "day of the Sun, because on this first day God made the world, and Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead." But no observance of Sunday is to be traced in any writer of the first century; and when the observance began, the laws of the Sabbath were not transferred to Sunday; nor were they so applied at all until, says Neander, "*perhaps* at the end of the second century a *false* application of this kind had begun to take place." (First Edition, vol. i, sec. 3.) The observance of the day seems to have grown up gradually from about A. D. 140 to A. D. 321, when the Emperor Constantine issued the following edict :

"Let all judges and people of the town and all the various trades be suspended on the venerable day of the Sun, [*die Solis.*] Those who live in the country, however, may freely and without fault attend to the cultivation of their fields, (since it often happens that no other day may be so suitable for sowing grain and planting the vine;) lest, with the loss of favorable opportunity, the commodities offered by Divine Providence should be destroyed." (*Cod. Justin.*, lib. iii, tit. 12, secs. 2, 3.)

In this edict the day is not called the "Lord's day," but "Sunday," or literally the "Sun's day," which was the Pagan designation. And not only did Constantine ordain the observance of Sunday, but also of Friday. Says Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, Book iv, chap. 18 :

"He commanded that through all the Roman empire they should forbear to do any work upon the Lord's day, and that they should reverence the day immediately before the Sabbath, in regard to our Saviour's memorable and divine actions performed on those days."

It is the Christian historian Eusebius, and not Constantine, who here uses the expression "Lord's day" Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome while Constantine was emperor, in order, as it is stated, to give more solemnity to the first day of the week,

changed its name from Sunday, which Constantine had given it, to the more imposing one of the "Lord's day." (*Lucius' Eccl. Hist.*, cent. v, p. 470.)

The Rev. James Gilfillan, in his able work on the Sabbath, indorsed and extensively distributed by the New York Sabbath Committee in 1865, concedes that "the Fathers of the first three centuries believed that the Jewish Sabbath-day had been set aside," (p. 377,) but labors to prove that they recognized the Divine appointment of the first day of the week, in place of the seventh, as a "day of rest and worship," citing several of the early Fathers. Let us take them up in their order, and see what they prove.

All that Clement of Rome (A. D. 68-97) says is, that "offerings and sacred services" were commanded by our Lord to be rendered "at appointed times and hours."

"Barnabus, disclaiming the old Sabbath-day," says Gilfillan, "declares the eighth day to be its acceptable substitute." The epistle of Barnabus is unquestionably spurious, and its date cannot be fixed earlier than A. D. 120. (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. i.) Here is what the writer of that epistle says:

"Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. 'And He rested on the seventh day.' This meaneth: when His Son, coming [again,] shall destroy the time of the wicked man and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall He truly rest on the seventh day. . . . Further, He says to them: 'Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure.' Ye perceive how He speaks. Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made. [namely, this,] when giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day; that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day, also, on which Jesus rose again from the dead, and, when He had manifested Himself, ascended into the heavens.'" (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. i, ch. xv)

Whatever the character of the observance of the eighth day may have been when this epistle was written, it is clear that it was not a day of rest, and the "joyfulness" of its observance

implies that it was a festive day. It was, therefore, by no means an "acceptable substitute," as Gilfillan asserts, for the "old Sabbath-day."

Justin Martyr (A. D. 140-165) is claimed as the next witness for the substitution of Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath, because he says that the Christians assembled for worship in his time on the day of the Sun, "because on this first day God made the world, and Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead." (*Apology*, ch. lxvii.) This is a most unfortunate passage to prove a Sabbath, for it denies all possible connection between Sunday and the fourth commandment. Nothing is said by Justin about observing Sunday as a day of rest in obedience to the law of the Decalogue, and we have already seen (p. 20) that he says there is no more need of Sabbaths now.

The testimony of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, is based on the statement of Eusebius (B. iv, ch. 26) that he wrote a book on the subject of the *Lord's day* in A. D. 170, or later. This is a mistranslation; in the original Greek it is *Kuriakes logos*—"Lord's discourse."

That of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, (A. D. 170 or later,) is, that Eusebius, in the fourth century, quotes him as having written, "We have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle." It is second-hand testimony, and amounts to little or nothing if true.

That of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, (A. D. 168-188,) is that he "appeals to the observance of the Lord's day as a custom in the churches." Eusebius, to whom reference is made, states no such thing in regard to Theophilus of Antioch, but he does speak of a Theophilus, Bishop of *Cesarea*, (A. D. 180-192,) who presided at a council which enacted "that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day." (B. v., ch. 23.) This is also second-hand testimony, and of little or no weight if true.

The testimony of Irenæus (A. D. 177-202) is in his saying that the "true sanctification of the Sabbath consists in doing works of mercy;" and that the commandments of the Decalogue "continue with us, extended and enlarged, not abolished." (B. iv, ch. 16.) But in the very next sentence Irenæus calls these commandments "laws of bondage," and adds: "These things, therefore, which were given for bondage and for a sign to them He cancelled by the new covenant of liberty. But He has increased and widened *those laws which are natural, and noble, and common to all.*" Furthermore, in section 1 of the same chapter, he quotes Exod. xxxi, 13, and Ezek. xx, 12, to prove that the Sabbath was a sign, and says: "The Sabbaths taught that we should continue, *day by day*, in God's service." Again, in section 2, he says:

"And that man was not justified by these things, but that they were given as a sign to the people, this fact shows—that Abraham himself, without circumcision and without the observance of Sabbaths, 'believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God.' . . . Moreover, all the rest of the multitude of those righteous men who lived before Abraham, and of those patriarchs who preceded Moses, were justified independently of the things above mentioned and without the law of Moses. As also Moses himself says to the people in Deuteronomy: 'The Lord thy God formed a covenant in Horeb. The Lord formed not this covenant with your fathers, but for you.'"

Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 189-202) is quoted by Gilfillan as saying, "The eighth day appears rightly to be named the seventh, and to be the true Sabbath." This, if correctly rendered, would be testimony of some weight, but in the recent translation (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. xii, B. vi, *The Fourth Commandment*) it is rendered thus: "The eighth day may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the *latter* properly the Sabbath." So the passage proves nothing in favor of Sunday Sabbatarianism.

Tertullian (A. D. 193-220) is cited in proof of the sanctity of the Lord's day. In his time it is quite possible, as Neander

intimates, that a *false* application of the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday began to prevail. Tertullian discusses the question of kneeling in prayer on the Sabbath and on the day of the Lord's resurrection, (not "Lord's day," as Gilfillan quotes it,) and says that on the last-mentioned day we "ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude; deferring even our business lest we give any place to the devil." And he adds: "Similarly, too, in the period of Pentecost, which period we distinguish by the same solemnity of exultation. But who would hesitate *every* day to prostrate himself before God, at least in the first prayer, with which we enter on the daylight?" (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. xi, ch. xxiii, *On Prayer*.) We have seen, furthermore, that Tertullian speaks of Sunday as "a day of festivity," and of observing "a Sabbath from all servile work *always*, not only every seventh day, but through all time." (P. 22.) He is certainly, therefore, far from being a witness in favor of Sabbatarianism.

All that Minutius Felix (A. D. 210) says on the subject, as quoted by Gilfillan, is this: "On a solemn day persons of both sexes and of every age assemble at a feast, with all their children, sisters, and mothers." The scene described by this enemy of Christianity, if at all truthful, is one that does not in the least comport with the observance of a holy day. (*Octavius of Minutius Felix*, ch. ix, *Anti-Nicene Lib.*, vol. xiii.)

Origen, who wrote about A. D. 230, while he repudiates the "Jewish Sabbath observances," commends the "Christian observance of the Sabbath," in abstaining from secular duties to attend to spiritual exercises. Here is the first witness of any weight in favor of modern Sabbatarianism. He concludes his instructions by saying: "This is the observance of the Christian Sabbath"—*Sabbati Christiani*. Here, 200 years after the crucifixion, we find the first use of the term "Christian Sabbath." We believe not a solitary writer can be found prior to Origen who

ever called Sunday the Sabbath, and even he seems to have applied the term only by way of contrast. Nor did any one of them, Origen included, claim the fourth commandment as authorizing Sunday observance. If we are perchance mistaken in regard to these facts, we will fall back on the statement of Richard Baxter, who, in speaking of Sunday, says: "The ancient churches called it constantly by the name of 'Lord's day,' and *never called it the Sabbath* but when they spoke analogically by allusion to the Jewish Sabbath." (*Baxter's Works*, vol. iii, "On the Lord's Day," ch. 7.) Gilfillan erroneously makes Tertullian speak of the duty of abstaining from work on Sunday, (p. 378,) when it was the Jewish Sabbath that Tertullian was discussing.

The next one of the Fathers cited is Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, (A. D. 253,) who says: "The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day, went before in the figure; which figure ceased when, by-and-by, the truth came and spiritual circumcision was given." (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. viii, Ep. lviii.) Cyprian, in this chapter, discusses solely the question of infant baptism—whether or not it should be administered before the eighth day—and makes no allusion whatever to any observance of the Lord's day.

To complete the proof of "the ordinance of a weekly season of rest and devotion" in the first three centuries, Gilfillan says that Commodian, a Christian poet, (A. D. 270,) mentions the Lord's day, and that Victorinus, Bishop of Petau, (A. D. 290,) speaks of the custom of fasting on the seventh day, lest they "should seem to observe the Sabbath of the Jews." This quotation is neither correct nor complete. It reads: "Lest we should appear to observe *any* Sabbath with the Jews, which Christ Himself, the Lord of the Sabbath, says by His prophets that 'His soul hateth;' and which Sabbath He, in His body, *abolished*." Furthermore, Victorinus says that the "true and just Sabbath should be observed in the seventh millenary of years, when Christ

with His elect shall reign." (*Ante-Nicene Lib.*, vol. xviii, p 390.)

Such is the meagre and barren testimony upon which the existence of a Christian Sabbath is vainly sought to be traced through the first three centuries. The proof is entirely wanting, with the possible exception of the uncertain testimony of Origen. Modern Sabbatarians may trace the first use of their favorite term "Christian Sabbath" to him, whom they have facetiously styled the "*Origin* of all heresies." That Sunday was observed as a festival from a very early period is not denied, nor that in the latter part of the second century it began to be called the Lord's day. But, says Jeremy Taylor—

"It was not introduced by virtue of the fourth commandment, because they for almost 300 years together kept that day which was in that commandment; but they did it also without any opinion of prime obligation, and therefore they did not suppose it moral. . . . They affirmed it to be ceremonial and no part of the moral law, as is to be seen in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and others before quoted."

Says the learned Heylyn, as quoted by Bannerman, (*Modern Sabbath Examined*, p. 139:)

"Thus do we see upon what grounds the Lord's day stands—on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings; that custom continued by the authority of the Church of God, which tacitly approved the same, and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires."

This same author, Heylyn, as we have already seen, (p. 27,) says that more than a thousand years passed after Christ's ascension before the Lord's day had attained that state in which it stood in his time, (A. D. 1660,) and that for "1,200 years we find no Sabbath." Until some time after the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, Sunday was uniformly regarded throughout Christendom as a weekly festival or holiday. How it grew up to be a *holy* day will appear from the extracts subjoined. Says Bannerman, (p. 143:)

"In 1547 Edward VI thus directed the clergy : 'All parsons, vicars, and curates shall teach and declare unto their parishioners that they may, with a safe and quiet conscience, in the time of harvest, labor upon the holy and festival days and save that which God hath sent.' . . . The festival days mentioned included, it is well known, all Sundays in the year. These directions were adopted by Elizabeth in 1559, adding merely to the words 'quiet conscience,' 'after their common prayer.' The act of 1552 declared it 'lawful for every husbandman, laborer, fisherman, &c., upon the holy days aforesaid, in harvest time or any other time in the year, when necessity shall require, to labor, ride, fish, or work any kind of work, at their free wills and pleasure.'"

"It was shortly after this that the doctrine that the prescriptions of the fourth commandment have been transferred to the first day of the week was introduced into this country, [England.] It has been traced to Dr. Bownd, who published a book upon the subject in the year 1594[5.] . . . This new doctrine was for a long time strenuously opposed by the leading divines of the English church ; it was warmly contended for, however, by the Puritans, and shortly became one of the most distinguishing tenets of that party."

Says Dr. Heylyn, in his *History of the Presbyterians*, p. 24 :

"He [Calvin] esteemed no otherwise of the Lord's day Sabbath than of an ecclesiastical constitution appointed by our ancestors in the place of the Sabbath, and, therefore, alterable from one day to another at the Church's pleasure, followed therein by all the churches of his party, who thereupon permit all lawful recreations and many works of necessary labor on the day itself, provided that the people be not thereby hindered from giving their attendance in the Church at the times appointed ; insomuch that in Geneva, itself, all manner of exercises, as running, vaulting, leaping, shooting, and many others of that nature, are as indifferently indulged on the Lord's day as on any other. How far the English Puritans departed from their mother Church, both in doctrine and practice, with reference to this particular, we shall see hereafter."

Then on p. 337 he shows how the Puritan Sabbath was established :

"The brethren had tried many ways to suppress them [the ancient festivals] formerly, as having too much in them of the superstitions of the Church of Rome, but they had found no way successful till they fell on this, which was to set on foot some new Sabbath doctrine, and, by advancing the authority of the Lord's day Sabbath, to cry down the rest. Some had been hammering at this anvil ten years before, and had procured the mayor and aldermen of London to present a petition to the Queen for the suppression of all plays and interludes on the Sabbath (as they pleased to call it) within the liberties of their city, the gaining of which point made them hope for more, and secretly to retail those speculations which afterward [Dr.] Bownd sold in gross by publishing his treatise on the Sabbath, which came out in this year, 1595."

“ Now for the doctrine. It was marshalled in these positions ; that is to say, that the commandment of sanctifying every Sabbath-day, as in the Mosaical decalogue, is natural, moral, and perpetual ; that when all other things in the Jewish Church were so changed that they were clean taken away, this stands—the observation of the Sabbath. And though Jewish and Rabbinical this doctrine was, it carried a fair show of piety, at the least, in the opinion of the common people, and such as did not stand to examine the true grounds thereof, but took it upon the appearance ; such as did judge, not by the workmanship of the stuff, but the gloss and color, in which it is not strange to see how suddenly men were induced not only to give way unto it, but without more ado to abet the same, till in the end and in very little time it grew the most bewitching error and most popular infatuation that ever was infused into the people of England.”

Coleridge also bears testimony to the modern origin of the Christian Sabbath. Commenting upon the passage which he quotes from Luther, (p. 22,) he says :

“ The English reformers took the same view of the day as Luther and the early Church. But, unhappily, our Church, in the reigns of James and Charles First, was so identified with the undue advancement of the royal prerogative that the puritanical Judaism of the Presbyterians was too well seconded by the patriots of the nation in resisting the wise efforts of the Church to prevent the incipient alteration of the character of the day of rest. After the restoration the bishops and clergy in general adopted the view taken and enforced by their enemies.”

The astounding spread of the new Sabbath doctrine is attested also by Gilfillan himself, who quotes Fuller, the historian, as saying : “ It is almost incredible how taking this doctrine was. . . . For some years together Dr. Bownd alone carried the garland away, none offering openly to oppose, and not so much as a feather of a quill in print did wag against him.” (P. 70.) The publication of Dr. Bownd’s treatise, says Gilfillan, was “ the commencement of the earliest Sabbatic contest, entitled to the name, in the Christian Church,” (p. 66 ;) and the author goes on to give a history of the agitation, which culminated in the incorporation of the new Sabbath doctrine in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, agreed upon in 1643, approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1647, and ratified by act of Parliament in 1649. The doctrine was introduced into Holland by some English Puritans, but with poor success. John Robinson, pastor of

the Pilgrim Fathers, left England in 1608, and settled in Holland, whence in 1620 he and his flock came to America. "Of the various reasons for the resolution to quit their adopted country for America," says Gilfillan, "one was that they could not bring the Dutch to observe the Lord's day as a Sabbath." (P. 91.) "The controversy," says Hengstenberg, (*Ibid.*, p. 117,) "was kept up in Holland till the eighteenth century, but with great calmness. However, the more liberal views gradually advanced, and became more and more prevalent throughout the Reformed Churches, with the exception of Great Britain."

Thus we see where the so-called Christian Sabbath originated, when it was instituted, and by whom it was ordained. Its origin was not in Judea, but in Great Britain; it was instituted not in the first century, but in the seventeenth; it was ordained not by Christ or His Apostles, but by the Puritans.

ORIGIN AND ABROGATION OF THE JEWISH SABBATH.

The origin of the seventh-day Sabbath is not involved in the present discussion, but the weight of evidence, as well as of Christian authority, fixes it after the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. Says Calmet, in his *Dictionary of the Bible*, first published by him in 1730:

"The greater part of the Divines and Commentators hold that the benediction and sanctification of the Sabbath mentioned by Moses in the beginning of Genesis signifies only that appointment then made of the seventh day, to be afterward solemnized and sanctified by the Jews."

The learned Dr. Gill, in commenting on Gen. ii, 3, "And God blessed the seventh day," &c., remarks:

"These words may be read in a parenthesis, as containing an account of a fact that was done not at the beginning of the world and on the seventh day of it, but of what had been done in the time of Moses, who wrote this *after* the giving of the law of the Sabbath."

Throughout all history we discover no trace of a Sabbath among the nations of antiquity. Says Theodoretus, a Christian Father,

(A. D. 429 :) " No other nation beside the Jews ever observed the Sabbatic rest." (Comment. in Ezek. xx.) Passages from Josephus, Philo, and other ancient writers, have been *mistranslated* to support a contrary theory. The Christian Fathers uniformly regarded the Sabbath as a ceremonial institution peculiar to the Jews, and as having been abrogated by the advent of Christ, with no other day substituted therefor. Such also were the views of the most illustrious reformers and many of the most brilliant ecclesiastical writers, besides those already quoted. That the Apostle Paul taught the same doctrine is clear from Col. ii, 16, 17; Gal. iv, 10, 11, and Rom. xiv, 5. His teachings in this respect are in harmony with the adjudication of the first great Council of the Church, A. D. 52, which decreed that the keeping of the law, with the exception of three (or four) things named, two of them of a moral nature and the other ceremonial, was a burden not to be laid upon the Gentiles. (Acts xv, 24, 28, 29.) The observance of the Sabbath was not one of the articles enjoined. The Gentile converts knew no Sabbath, and it is incredible that that question should have been ignored if Sabbath-keeping was an essential part of Christianity. Therefore, by the formal decree of that first Church Council, the Sabbath was wholly and unequivocally abrogated.