

A REFUTATION OF CLAIMS OF SUNDAY-KEEPING

BY J. N. ANDREWS

THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK NOT THE SABBATH

As the first day of the week is now almost universally observed in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, we design in this article to examine the ground on which this observance rests. It is an injunction of the New Testament, that we “prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” This precept we shall attempt to follow in this investigation. Those who are willing to submit their opinions to the test of scripture and reason, are invited to unite with us in the examination of this subject. If the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the New Testament, and the Rest-day of the Christian church, that fact will appear in all its strength, if the sacred record is examined. But if there is no divine authority for the change of the Sabbath, then the observance of the first day, in the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, must be regarded as a tradition of the elders which makes void the commandments of God.

This subject is not taken up for the benefit of such as do not believe in any Sabbath. Other portions of truth must be presented in order to benefit such. But those who do believe in a Sabbath, yet observe a different day from that enjoined in the commandment, may be benefited by an examination of their reasons for this. Papists believe that their church had power to change the Sabbath, and, on that authority alone, they are perfectly satisfied in observing the first day. Protestants deny the authority of the Romish church, and consequently, attempt to vindicate the change by an appeal to the Bible. This is what we desire them to do. We cannot better weigh the testimony in favor of a change of the Sabbath, than by introducing the Sabbath commandment, which is supposed has been changed.

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” Ex. xx, 8-11. This precept, which states the will of God in plain and explicit language, requires us to remember and keep holy, not the day on which God began to labor, but the day of his rest, which he blessed and hallowed. As the commandment is now exactly reversed by the great mass of the professed church, and that too when the majority suppose that they are observing the commandment, we inquire for the authority on which this practice rests.

One of three things is indispensable to those who would prove the change of the Sabbath. 1. One plain statement that God has changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. 2. Or a single statement that God has blessed, hallowed and sanctified the first day of the week. 3. Or a single commandment to keep the first day holy as a Sabbath unto the Lord. The reasonableness of this must be apparent to every one. For a plain commandment from the Lord of hosts, can only be changed by an explicit, divine statement authorizing such change. And as the God of heaven has blessed and sanctified his Rest-day, no human authority may presume to choose in its stead another day, and require that that day be observed, unless the Lord himself shall transfer his blessing to that day and command that it be kept

holy. These truths are self-evident. But how many of the above particulars do the advocates of this change claim! They do not claim one of them! They do not claim that there is one statement in the Bible that the Sabbath has been changed. They do not claim that there is a single testimony in the Scriptures, that God has ever blessed and sanctified the first day of the week. Nor do they claim that there is one precept in the Volume of inspiration which commands us to observe the first and keep it holy. But what authority, then, do they show for changing the Sabbath! Not a particle of direct testimony, as we have already seen. However, they have several inferences which they think make the subject very plain.

1. Redemption is greater than creation; therefore we ought to keep the day of Christ's resurrection, instead of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

Where has God said this? Nothing of the kind is found in either Testament! Who, then, knows that this is according to truth? Those only, who are wise above what is written. Is not that act by which God formed the world out of nothing, infinitely beyond our conception! Certainly, nothing but *infinite* power could create the universe; and *finite* man must be a poor judge of how much creation is exceeded by redemption. But admitting that redemption is greater than creation, who knows that we ought to keep the first day of the week on that account? Has God said that we should? No, never. God has not said that we should keep any day to commemorate redemption. But if it were duty to observe any day for this reason, most certainly the crucifixion day presents the strongest claims. It is not said that we have redemption through Christ's resurrection, but it is said that we have redemption through his blood. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i, 7. See Col. i, 14. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation." Rev. v, 9. See Heb. ix, 12, 15.

Then redemption is through the death of the Lord Jesus. Consequently the day on which he shed his precious blood to redeem us and said, "It is finished," (John xix, 30,) is the day that should be observed as a memorial of redemption, if any one day should be observed for that purpose. Nor can it be plead that the resurrection day is the most remarkable day in the history of the church. It needs but a word to prove that it is far exceeded in this respect, by the day of the crucifixion. Which is the most remarkable event, that God should give his beloved Son to die for a face of rebels, or that he should raise that beloved Son from the dead? Every one must acknowledge, that while it is an event of a most wonderful character that God should give his only Son to die for guilty man, it is not a wonderful thing, that he should raise that beloved Son from the dead. Then the crucifixion day has far greater claims than the day of the resurrection. But God has not enjoined the observance of either. And how shameful it is to make void the fourth commandment by wisdom that is folly in the sight of God. 1 Cor. i, 19, 20.

If we would commemorate the events of redemption, no necessity exists that we should destroy the holy Sabbath in order to do it. God has provided us with memorials bearing his own signature; and these we may observe with the blessing of Heaven. Would you commemorate the death of our Lord! Then heed the following: "For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the

cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

Would you commemorate the burial and resurrection of the Saviour! The following scriptures teach us the will of God in this: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death! Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. vi, 3-5; Col. ii, 12.

We have now examined the argument for a change of the Sabbath from the supposed superiority of the work of redemption over that of creation. As it is not found in the Bible, it can only occupy the rank of a cunningly devised fable. Can such an argument be deemed sufficient authority for the open desecration of the fourth commandment!

2. But the disciples met on the day of our Lord's resurrection, to commemorate that event, and the Saviour sanctioned this meeting by uniting with them.

Were every word of this true, it would then amount only to a very slender inference that the Sabbath was changed. But to show the utter fallacy of this inference, we will agree to prove that they did not at that time believe that he had been raised from the dead; but were assembled for the purpose of eating supper, and secluding themselves from the Jews. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples *were assembled for fear of the Jews*, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John xx, 19. "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief, and hardness of heart, because they *believed not* them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark xvi, 14. Then it is a fact that the disciples were not engaged in commemorating the resurrection of the Saviour, for they did not believe that that event had taken place. Certain it is that the disciples did not entertain the most distant idea of a change of the Sabbath. At the burial of the Saviour the women who had followed him, prepared spices and ointments to embalm him; the Sabbath drew on; they "rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment;" and when the Sabbath was past, they came to the sepulchre upon the first day, to embalm Jesus. Luke xxiii, 53-56; xxiv, 1. Then there is not even a plausible inference, in this case, for perverting the fourth commandment. The disciples kept the Sabbath according to that precept, and resumed their labor upon the first day of the week.

3. But after eight days Jesus again met with the disciples, (John xx, 26,) and this must have been upon the first day of the week.

Were it certain that this occurred upon the first day of the week, it would be very slight evidence that that day had become the Sabbath; for there is not even an intimation of the kind. But who knows that "*after eight days*" means just a week! Certainly it would be nearer the *literal* construction of the language to conclude that this was upon the ninth day. As an illustration, read Matt. xvii, 1. "And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James and John," &c. Now turn to Luke ix, 28. "And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John and James," &c. Then *after six days* is about eight days. But if *after eight days* means just a week, it would then bring this appearing of Christ upon the second day of the week. For the week must be reckoned from the evening, at the close of the first day, (John

xx, 19,) and the day itself closes at six o'clock. As the day was *far spent* when the two disciples were at Emmaus, [Luke xxiv,] and as they returned to Jerusalem, a distance of seven and a half miles, *before* Christ appeared to the assembled disciples; [Mark xvi, 12-14;] it is evident that Christ's first appearing to the eleven [Luke xxiv, 33-36] must have been in the evening which followed the first day, and with which the second day commenced! But granting that Christ's appearing on this occasion was actually upon the first day of the week, would that appearing make a Sabbath of the day! The appearing of Christ is sufficient to constitute a day a Sabbath, or it is not. If it is sufficient, then the fishing day on which he next showed himself to his disciples, and on which he miraculously aided them to take fish, was a Sabbath! John xxi. But if it was not sufficient to constitute the day of its occurrence a Sabbath, then his appearing to several of his disciples on the first day of the week, and to all of them on the Thursday of his ascension, (Acts i,) did not cause those days to become Sabbaths. If it be asked, how the disciples could be found together, (John xx, 26,) unless they had some special object, we answer, that they had one common abode, as may be learned from Acts i, 11. Who can help regretting that such reasons as we have examined, should be deemed sufficient authority for violating one of the ten commandments? But are there no other and better arguments for the change of the Sabbath than those which have been examined? We answer, there are several other reasons urged as proof of this. Whether they are better than those we have already examined, we shall soon learn.

4. The Holy Ghost descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week. Therefore the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. Acts ii, 1, 2.

One can hardly refrain from feelings of indignation that grave Doctors of Divinity should found their first-day Sabbath upon such a basis as this. The disciples had been engaged in earnest prayer for ten days. For the day of Pentecost was fifty days from the day of Christ's resurrection, and forty of those days, the Saviour spent with his disciples. Acts i, 3. Forty days from the resurrection day would end on Thursday, the day of his ascension. A period of ten days after the ascension on Thursday, would include two first days. If the design of God had been to honor the first day of the week, why did not the Holy Ghost descend upon the first of those first days? Why must the day of Pentecost come before the Holy Spirit could descend! The answer is obvious. It was not the design of Heaven to honor the first day of the week, but to mark the antitype of the feast of Pentecost. The slaying of the paschal lamb, on the fourteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God, on that day. Ex. xii; John xix; 1 Cor. v, 7. The offering of the first fruits, on the sixteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord on that day, the first-fruits of them that slept. Lev. xxiii; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23. It remained that the feast of Pentecost, fifty days later, should also have its fulfillment. Lev. xxiii, 15-21. The fulfillment of this type is what the pen of inspiration has here recorded. As God has spoken nothing in this place respecting a change of the Sabbath, those who contend that he has, are cited to Prov. xxx, 6. "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

5. Paul once broke bread upon the first day of the week. Therefore the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. Acts xx, 7.

We answer, that at one period the apostolic church at Jerusalem broke bread every day. Acts ii, 42-46. Hence, according to this view, every day of the week is a Christian Sabbath! If a single instance of breaking bread at Troas, upon the

first day of the week, was quite sufficient to constitute it a Sabbath, would not the continued practice of the apostolic church in breaking bread every day, be amply sufficient to make every day a Sabbath? Moreover, as the act of the Great head of the church in breaking bread must be quite as important as that of his servant Paul, must not the day of the crucifixion be pre-eminently the Christian Sabbath, as Christ instituted, and performed this ordinance on the evening with which that day commenced? 1 Cor. xi, 23-36. And as the breaking of bread commemorates the crucifixion of our Lord, and not his resurrection, would not the crucifixion day be as appropriate for the breaking of bread, as the resurrection day?

But on what day of the week did this act of Paul occur? For if it is of sufficient importance to make the day of its occurrence the future Sabbath of the Church, the day is worth determining. The act of breaking bread was after midnight. For Paul preached to the disciples until midnight; then healed Eutychus; then attended to breaking the bread. Verses 7-11. If, as time is reckoned at the present day, the first day of the week terminated at midnight, then Paul's act of breaking bread took place upon the second day of the week, which should henceforth be regarded as the Christian Sabbath, if breaking bread on a day makes it a Sabbath. But if the Bible method of commencing the day, viz: from six o'clock P.M. was followed, it would appear that the disciples came together at the close of the Sabbath for an evening meeting, as the Apostle was to depart in the morning. Paul preached until midnight, and then broke bread with the disciples early in the morning of the first day of the week. Did this constitute that day the Sabbath? If so, then why did Paul, as soon as it was light, start on his long journey to Jerusalem? If Paul believed it to be the Christian Sabbath, why did he violate it? If he did not believe it to be sacred time, why should you? This text affords direct proof that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath. And it is indeed quite remarkable that this single instance of religious worship on the first day, should be urged as proof that the Sabbath of the Lord has been changed, while this same book gives the account of religious worship on at least eighty-four Sabbaths. Acts xiii, 14, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4, 11.

6. Paul commanded the church at Corinth to take up a collection on the first day of the week. Therefore the Sabbath must have been changed to that day. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

The readiness with which men grasp at every thing that can be made to support this first-day Sabbath, may be seen in the use made of this text. It is first claimed that Paul commanded a public collection on that day, and then it is inferred that He, who once commanded that we remember and keep holy the day of his rest, had now changed his mind and would have us remember and keep holy the day on which he began to labor. But it is a remarkable fact that Paul enjoins exactly the reverse of a public collection. He does not say "Place your alms in the public treasury on the first day of the week;" but he says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you *lay by him* in store." The text, therefore, does not prove that the Corinthian church was assembled for public worship on that day, but on the contrary, it does prove that each must be at his own home, where he could examine his worldly affairs, and lay by himself in store as God has prospered him. If each one should thus, from week to week, collect of his earnings, when the Apostle should come, their bounty would be ready, and each would be able to present to him what they had gathered. The method of giving, enjoined in the New Testament, is the reverse of a public contribution. "But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; *that thine alms may be in secret;*

and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly.” Matt. vi, 3, 4. This humble, unostentatious method of giving alms in secret, was what Paul enjoined upon the Corinthians. So that if the first-day Sabbath has no better foundation than the inference drawn from this text, it truly rests upon sand.

7. John was in the Spirit upon the Lord’s day, which is the first day of the week. Rev. i, 10.

It is peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of a change of the Sabbath, that in every instance they are obliged to assume the very point which they ought to prove. This text is clear proof that there is a day in the gospel dispensation which the Lord claims as his. But is there one text in the Book of God that testifies that the first day of the week is the Lord’s day! There is not one. Has God ever claimed the day as his! Never. Has God ever claimed any day as his, and reserved it to himself? He has. “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Gen. ii, 3. “Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord thy God.” Ex. xvi, 23. “But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Ex. xx, 10. “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable,” &c. Isa. lviii, 13. “Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” Mark ii, 28. Then the seventh day is the day which God reserved to himself, when he gave to man the other six; and this day he calls his holy day. This is the day which the New Testament designates the Son of man as Lord of. Is there one testimony in the Scriptures that the Lord of the Sabbath has put away his holy day and chosen another? Not one. Then that day which the Bible designates as the Lord’s day, is none other than the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

We see, therefore, that there is no authority for the change of the Sabbath; hence, those who believe in a Sabbath, must either resort to the so-called Christian Fathers for proof of the change, or they must observe the Sabbath according to the commandment. The history of the change will be given hereafter. But we now ask, what right have the elders of the Christian church to change the fourth commandment, any more than the elders of the Jewish church had to change the fifth! The Pharisees pretended that they had a tradition handed down from Moses, which authorized them to change the fifth commandment; the Papist and Protestant Doctor of Divinity pretend that they have a tradition handed down from Christ and the apostles, authorizing them to change the fourth. But if Christ rebuked the Pharisees for holding a damnable heresy, what would he not say to the like act on the part of his own professed followers! Matt. xv, 3-9. And further, if we allow the Fathers to corrupt the fourth commandment, must we not also admit their right to corrupt all the ordinances of the New Testament! And as they have established purgatory, invocation of saints, the worship of the virgin Mary, &c., must we not receive those also?

The Protestant professes to receive the Bible *alone* as his standard of faith and practice. The Papist receives the Bible and the tradition of the Fathers as his rule. The Protestant cannot prove the change of the Sabbath from his own standard, (the Bible,) therefore he is, on this point, obliged to adopt that of the Papist. viz: the Bible as explained and corrupted by the Fathers. The change of the Sabbath is proved by Papists as follows:

“Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?

“Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

“Q. Does the Scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

“A. The Scripture commands us to hear the Church, (Matt. xviii, 17; Luke x, 16,) and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 15. But the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord’s day [Rev. i, 10;] but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandments. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7. And Paul [1 Cor. xvi, 2] orders that on the first day of the week the Corinthians should lay by in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither the one nor the other tells us that this first day of the week was to be henceforward the day of worship, and the Christian Sabbath; so that truly, the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinance of the church. And therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion; since Sundays and holy-days all stand upon the same foundation viz: the ordinance of the church.

“Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday?

“A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day on which this work was completely finished, was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord’s day.”—*Catholic Christian Instructed*. Chapter xxiii.

This testimony from the “Right Rev. Dr. Challoner,” shows conclusively that the fourth commandment, which the New Testament has never changed, has been corrupted by the Romish Church. And in this testimony we find the authority of the Protestant church for saying that the commandment was changed because redemption was greater than creation.

We have seen that there is no divine authority for the change of the Sabbath, and that the various arguments urged in its behalf are totally destitute of foundation in the word of God. And we here see that the principal of these arguments were invented by the church of Rome. The change of the Sabbath, therefore, rests upon the Papal church. Those who despise the Lord’s Sabbath, and in its stead honor the Sabbath of the Romish church, virtually acknowledge that the Papal apostasy is above God and able to change his times and laws. Dan. vii, 25; 2 Thess. ii.

Those who believe in a change of the Sabbath of the Lord, should look at these facts: The Sabbath of the Lord means the Rest-day of the Lord. Six days the Almighty wrought in the work of creation. The seventh day he rested from all his work. The Sabbath, or Rest-day of the Lord, is, therefore, a definite day, which can no more be changed to one of the days upon which God wrought, than the resurrection day can be changed to one of the days upon which Christ did not rise, or the crucifixion day be changed to one of the six days of the week upon which

Christ was not crucified. Hence, it is as impossible to change the Rest-day of the Lord, as it is to change the crucifixion day, or the day of the resurrection.

To all who read this article we submit one question: Must it not be sinful in the sight of Heaven for men to change the Sabbath of the Lord, for another day, and then steal that commandment which guards the holy Sabbath, to enforce the observance of that new day?

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

The observance of a different day of the week from that enjoined in the fourth commandment, and for a different reason from that which is there assigned, is by many, supposed to be the apostolic mode of rendering obedience to that precept. That such an idea has no foundation in the New Testament, we have already seen. For the benefit of such as wish to learn the manner in which the first day of the week obtained the place of the Lord's Sabbath, we present the following important testimony. It is taken from the "History of the Sabbath" published by the American Sabbath Tract Society, New York. We think that those who will read the testimony on this subject with care, will acquiesce in the frank testimony of Dr. Neander, the distinguished historian of the church. In his "History of the Christian Religion and Church," page 168, he thus remarks: "Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday, very early, indeed, into the place of the Sabbath. . . . 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."

The apostle Paul informed the Thessalonian church that the mystery of iniquity had already begun to work, and that in the predicted period, the man of sin would be revealed. As the great apostasy had begun to develop itself in the days of the apostles, it follows that the early observance of any precept, or belief of any doctrine does not stamp it as apostolic or divine, if it have no foundation in the word of God. To us, therefore, it is a matter of peculiar interest to trace the gradual corruption of the truths of the Bible, even from the days of the apostles, down to the complete development of the man of sin.

"The History of the Sabbath," after proving from the New Testament that the Lord Jesus and his inspired followers observed the Sabbath according to the commandment, narrates the circumstances connected with its observance in the early church. It speaks as follows:

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES TO CONSTANTINE

After the period described in the Acts of the apostles, Christianity soon became widely spread in the Roman empire, which, at that time, extended over most of the civilized world. But as it receded from the time of the apostles, and the number of its professors increased, the church became gradually less spiritual, and more disposed to deck the simple religion of Jesus with mysteries and superstitious formalities; and the bishops or pastors became ambitious of their authority over the churches. Those churches, even in Gentile cities, appear to have been composed, at first, principally of converted Jews, who not only observed the weekly Sabbath, but also the feast of the Passover, adapted particularly to Christian worship; respecting which, there was much contention. In the mean time, converts were

greatly multiplied from among the Gentiles, and were united with those from the Jews, who, not without reason, considered themselves entitled to some distinction as the original founders of the gospel church, and as being better informed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, having been in the habit of reading them every Sabbath in the synagogues.

About three years after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, according to the common account, Judea was invaded by the Roman armies, and Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed, as our Lord had predicted. By this awful calamity it is supposed that most of the churches in Judea were scattered; for they fled their country at the approach of their enemies, as they were taught by Jesus Christ to do. Matt. xxiv, 16. This war resulted not only in the breaking up of the nation, and the destruction of a great portion of the people, but also in bringing a general odium upon the Jews wherever they were found; so that even the Christians of Judea suffered what our Saviour taught them to expect, (Matt. xxiv, 9,) "And ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." These circumstances, added to the enmity which formerly existed between the Gentiles and the Jews, produced a prejudice which had its influence in the church, in bringing into disrepute, and in fixing a stigma upon, whatever was regarded as Judaism. "The doctrines of our Saviour and the church flourishing from day to day, continued to receive constant accessions," says Eusebius, "but the calamities of the Jews also continued to grow with one accumulation of evil upon another." The insurrectionary disposition of the conquered Jews in the reign of Trajan, in the early part of the second century, and the calamities that followed them, seemed to confirm the opinion, that the Jews were given over by the Almighty to entire destruction. But their calamities increased in the reign of Adrian, who succeeded Trajan, in whose reign the revolt of the Jews again proceeded to many and great excesses, "and Rufus, the lieutenant governor of Judea, using their madness as a pretext, destroyed myriads of men, women and children, in crowds; and by the laws of war, he reduced their country to a state of absolute subjection, and the degraded race to the condition of slaves." The transformation of the church in Jerusalem is thus described by Eusebius: "The city of the Jews being thus reduced to a state of abandonment for them, and totally stripped of its ancient inhabitants, and also inhabited by strangers; the Roman city which subsequently arose changing its name, was called AElia, in honor of the emperor AElia Adrian; and when the church was collected there of the Gentiles, the first bishop after those of the circumcision was Marcus." Thus was extinguished the Hebrew church in Jerusalem, having had a succession of fifteen pastors; "all which," says Eusebius, "they say, were Hebrews from the first. At that time the whole church under them," he adds, "consisted of faithful Hebrews, who continued from the time of the apostles to the siege that then took place."

This church, which heretofore held the first rank in regard to its influence, being now composed entirely of Gentiles, and stripped of its apostolic character and influence, could no longer successfully oppose the growing ambition and influence of the bishops of the church in the metropolis of the empire.

Up to this period, and for some time after, there does not appear to have been any change in the sentiments or practice of the church, in any place, relative to the Sabbath; but from what is related by subsequent writers, which will be noticed in its place, it is certain that it was observed by the churches universally.

This fact is so generally acknowledged by those acquainted with the history of the matter, that we need refer to only a few passages in proof:

The learned Grotius says, in his Explication of the Decalogue, "Therefore the Christians also, who believed Christ would restore all things to their primitive practice, as Tertullian teacheth in Monogamia, kept holy the Sabbath, and had their assemblies on that day, in which the law was read to them, as appears in Acts xv, 21, which custom remained till the time of the council of Laodicea, about A.D. 365, who then thought meet that the gospels also should be read on that day."

Edward Brerewood, Professor in Gresham College, London, in a treatise on the Sabbath, 1630, says: "It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's Day by Christian emperors, and they know little who do not know, *that the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed by the eastern churches three hundred years after our Saviour's passion.*"

TESTIMONY FOR THE FIRST DAY EXAMINED

At what time the first day of the week came into notice as a festival in the church, it is not easy to determine. The first intimation we have of this, in any ancient writer of acknowledged integrity, is from Justin Martyr's Apology for the Christians, about A.D. 140. He is cited as saying, "that the Christians, in the city and in the country assembled on the day called Sunday; and after certain religious devotions, all returned home to their labors;" and he assigns as reasons for this, that God made the world on the first day; and, that Christ first showed himself to his disciples on that day, after his resurrection. These were the best, and probably all the reasons that could then be offered for the practice. He also speaks of Sunday only as a festival, on which they performed labor, when not engaged in devotions; and not as substitute for the Sabbath. From this author we can learn nothing as to the extent of the practice; for though he says this was done by those "in the city and in the country," he may have intended only the city of Rome and its suburbs, since Justin, although a native of Palestine, in Syria, is stated by Eusebius to have made his residence in Rome. Now can we determine from this, that he intended any thing more, than that they did thus on the Sunday in which the church of Rome, a short time after this, is known to have closed the paschal feast, which was observed annually.

It is contended, however, that mention is made of keeping the first day previous to Justin. The first intimation of this kind, it is believed, is from an apocryphal writing, styled the *Epistle of Barnabas*. But to this epistle it is objected, that there is no evidence of its genuineness. Eusebius, who lived near the time when it was written, mentions it as a spurious writing, entitled to no credit. Dr. Milnor says it is an injury to St. Barnabas, to ascribe this epistle to him. Mosheim says it is the work of some superstitious Jew of mean abilities. And we think it has but little to recommend it besides its antiquity. Barnabas' theory for observing the first day, rests upon the tradition that the seventh day was typical of the seventh millennium of the age of the world, which would be purely a holy age; and that the Sabbath was not to be kept until that time arrived; and he says, "We keep the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus arose from the dead."

The citations from Ignatius, are as little to the purpose. In the passage of which most use has been made, he did not say that himself or any one else kept the Lord's day, as is often asserted. His own words are, that "the prophets who lived before Christ, came to a newness of hope, not by keeping Sabbaths, but by living according to a lordly or most excellent life. In this passage, Ignatius was speaking of altogether a different thing from Sabbath-keeping. There is another quotation from him, however, in which he brings out more clearly his view of the relation

existing between the Sabbath and Lord's day. It is as follows: "Let us not keep the Sabbath in a Jewish manner, in sloth and idleness. But let us keep it after a spiritual manner, not in bodily ease, but in the study of the law, and in the contemplation of the works of God." "And after we have kept the Sabbath, let every one that loveth Christ keep the Lord's day *festival*."—From this it seems that he would have the Sabbath kept first, *as such*, and in a manner satisfactory to the strictest Sabbatarian, after which the Lord's day, not as a Sabbath, but as a festival. Indeed with this distinction between the *Sabbath* and a *festival* before us, it is easy to explain all those passages from early historians which refer to the first day. We shall find them to be either immediately connected with instructions about such seasons as *Good Friday* and *Holy Thursday*, or in the writings of those who have recommended the observance of these festival days.

It is also said that Pliny, Governor of Bithynia, in A.D. 102, in a letter to Trajan, states that the Christians met on the first day of the week for worship; but by no fair interpretation of his words can he be so understood. He says, in writing about those of his own province, "that they were accustomed to assemble on a *stated day*." This might be referred to the first day, if there were credible testimony that this day was alone regarded by Christians at that time; but as there is no evidence of this, and as the Sabbath is known to have been the stated day of religious assembling a long time after this, it seems more proper to refer it to the Sabbath than to the first day.

We will mention but one more of these misinterpreted citations, and this is from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, who lived a little after Justin. His letter to Soter, bishop of Rome, is cited as saying, "This day we celebrated the holy Dominical day, in which we have read your epistle." As given by Eusebius, it is thus: "To-day we have *passed the Lord's holy day*," &c. the only ground upon which this phrase can be referred to the first day, is, that this day was at that time known by the same title that God had given to the Sabbath, [see Isa. lviii, 13.] of which there is no proof. Therefore it is not just to cite this passage as evidence of the observance of the first day at that time.

It is indeed, a well known fact, that the first day has come into very extensive use among the great body of Christians, as the only day of weekly rest and worship. The origin of this practice does not appear, however, to be as ancient by some centuries, as many suppose; nor was its adoption secured at once, but by slow and gradual advances it obtained general notice in Christian countries. This is frankly admitted by Morer, an English Episcopalian, in his *Dialogues on the Lord's Day*, page 236. He says, "In St. Jerome's time, (that is, in the fifth century,) Christianity had got into the throne as well as into the empire. Yet for all this, the entire sanctification of the Lord's day proceeded slowly, and that it was the work of time to bring it to perfection, appears from the several steps the church made in her constitution, and from the decrees of emperors and other princes, wherein the prohibitions from servile and civil business advanced by degrees from one species to another, till the day got a considerable figure in the world." The same author says on the same page: "If the Christians in St. Jerome's time, after divine service on the Lord's day, followed their daily employments, it should be remembered, that this was not done till the worship was quite over, when they might with innocency enough resume them, because the length of time and the number of hours assigned for piety were not then so well explained as in after ages."

It is probable that no other day could have obtained the same notice in ancient

times as the first day of the week did; for there were circumstances, aside from the resurrection, that had an influence in promoting its observance. It was at first a celebration of the same character as the fourth and sixth days of the week, and the annual festivals of saints and martyrs. These celebrations were comparatively unobjectionable, when not permitted to interfere with a divine appointment; but when they were made to supersede or cause a neglect of the Sabbath, they were criminal. In respect to these days of weekly celebration, Mosheim, when remarking upon this early period, and the regard then paid to the seventh and first days, says: "Many also observed the fourth day, in which Christ was betrayed, and the sixth day, in which he was crucified." He adds, "the time of assembling was generally in the evening after sunset, or in the morning before the dawn."

SUNDAY-KEEPING OF HEATHEN ORIGIN

The respect which the Gentiles had for the first day, or Sunday, while they were Pagans, contributed much to render its introduction easy, and its weekly celebration popular, among such materials as composed the body of the church of Rome in the second, third and fourth centuries. The observance of the first day of the week, as a festival of the Sun, was very general in those nations from which the Gentile church received her converts. That an idolatrous worship was paid to the Sun and other heavenly bodies by the Gentiles, the Old Testament abundantly testifies; and this kind of adoration paid to the Sun in later times, is so plainly a matter of historical record. Thomas Bampfield, an English writer of the seventeenth century, quoting Verstegan's Antiquities, page 68, says: "Our ancestors in England, before the light of the Gospel came among them, went very far in this idolatry, and dedicated the first day of the week to the adoration of the idol of the Sun, and gave it the name of Sunday. This idol they placed in a temple, and there sacrificed to it." He further states, that from his historical reading, he finds that a great part of the world, and particularly those parts of it which have since embraced Christianity, did anciently adore the Sun upon Sunday. It is also stated by Dr. Chambers, in his Cyclopaedia, "that Sunday was so called by our idolatrous ancestors, because set apart for the worship of the Sun." The Greeks and Latins also gave the same name to the first day of the week. Dr. Brownlee, as quoted by Kingsbury, on the Sabbath, page 223, also says: "When the descendants of Adam apostatized from the worship of the true God, they substituted in his place the Sun, that luminary, which, more than all others, strikes the minds of savage people with religious awe; and which, therefore, all heathens worship." Attachment to particular days of religious celebration, from habit merely, is well known, even in our own day, to be very strong, and powerful convictions of duty are often required to produce a change. This was no doubt well understood by the teachers of Christianity in those times. Dr. Mosheim, when treating on that age, says: "That the leaders imagined that the nations would the more readily receive Christianity when they saw the rites and ceremonies to which they had been accustomed, established in the churches, and the same worship paid to Jesus Christ and his martyrs which they had formerly offered to their idol deities. Hence it happened, that in those times, the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed but little in its external appearance from that of Christians."

Prejudice against the Jews was another influence against the Sabbath, and in favor of the first day. This was very strong, and directly calculated to lead the Gentile Christians to fix a stigma upon every religious custom of the Jews, and to brand as *Judaism* whatever they supposed had any connection with the Mosaic

religion. Hence it was that in those times, as often occurs in our own, to produce disaffection and disgust to the seventh day as the Sabbath, they spoke of it and reproached its observance as Judaizing. This feeling in relation to Judaism led Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in Egypt, in the fourth century, who with his people then observed the Sabbath, to say, in his *Interpretation of the Psalms*, "We assemble on Saturday, not that we are infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath." In a community of Christians whose religion was formal, and whose celebrations were designed more to act upon their passions and senses than to improve their hearts or to conform them to divine requirements, a more powerful argument could scarcely be used against the Sabbath day, or one that would more effectually promote the observance of the first day, which was raised up as its rival. Dr. Neander says distinctly, "Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday very early."

The observance of the Passover, or Easter, by the early Christians, aided the introduction of the first day as a religious festival in the church, if it was not indeed the direct cause of it.—This feast was held by the Asiatic Christians, who began it at the same time the Jews began their Passover, and ended it in like manner, without regard to the particular day of the week. The church of Rome does not appear to have observed it until the latter part of the second century, when in the time of Victor, bishop of Rome, it seems that it was observed by the Roman and western churches. Victor insisted upon the fast being closed on the first day of the week, on whatever day it might commence; and he claimed the right, as *bishop of Rome*, to control all the churches in this matter. "Hence," says Eusebius, "there were synods and convocations of the bishops on this question, and all (i.e., the western bishops) unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated to all the churches in all places, that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal feasts." The bishops of Asia, however, persisted for a considerable time in observing the custom handed down to them by apostolic tradition, until, either by threats of excommunication which were made, or by a desire for peace, they were induced partially to adopt the custom of the western churches. This change was made, as we are told, "partly in honor of the day, and partly to express some difference between Jews and Christians."

But the question does not appear to have been fully settled, for we find Constantine, in an epistle to the churches, urging them to uniformity in the day of the celebration, wherein, after a strong invective against the practice of the Jews, he says, "For we have learned another way from our Saviour, which we may follow. It is indeed most absurd that they should have occasion of insolent boasting on account of our not being able to observe these things in any manner unless by the aid of their instruction." "Wherefore, let us having nothing in common with that most odious brood of the Jews."

By this contest an important point was gained for the first day, although it was but an annual celebration. The Sabbath, however, does not appear to have been laid aside in any place, but continued to be the principal day of religious worship throughout the whole Christian church.

At what time the first day began to be observed weekly, we have no particular account; but from the favor it received from the bishops of Rome and some of the Christian fathers at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth cen-

ture, we suppose it had then become a practice in Rome and some of the western churches.

This brings us near to the close of the third century. And here it ought to be noted, that the Lord's day, or Sunday, was not the only holy-day of the Church during these three centuries. Origen, (as quoted by Dr. Peter Heylyn in his History of the Sabbath,) names the *Good Friday* as we call it now, the *Parasceve* as he calls it there; the feasts of *Easter* and of *Pentecost*. And anciently, not only the day which is now called *Whitsunday* or *Pentecost*, but all the fifty days from Easter forward, were accounted holy, and solemnized with no less observance than the Sundays were. Of the day of the *Ascension* or *Holy Thursday*, it may likewise be said, that soon after, it came to be more highly esteemed than all the rest. Such was the estimation in which the Lord's day was held. It was on a level with those other holy days which are now disregarded by the body of Protestant Church. It is to be remembered, farther, that the term Sabbath was applied exclusively to the seventh day of the week, or Saturday. Indeed, wherever, for a thousand years and upwards, we meet the word *Sabbatum* in any writer, of what name so ever, it must be understood of no day but Saturday.

THE SABBATH FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE TO THE REFORMATION

We have seen how the matter stood until the commencement of Constantine's career. The Sabbath was generally observed, while the Lord's day was regarded as a festival of no greater importance or authority than Good Friday or Holy Thursday. No text of Scripture, or edict of emperor, or decree of council, could be produced in its favor. But from this time forth may be found emperors and councils combining to give importance to the Lord's day and to oppose the Sabbath.

An important change in the regard paid to the first day, was produced soon after the accession of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, in the early part of the fourth century. When he became master of Rome, he soon gave himself up to the guidance of the Christian clergy. According to Jones' Church History, "He built places of public worship. He encouraged the meeting of synods and bishops-honored them with his presence, and employed himself continually in aggrandizing the church. He was scrupulously attentive to the religious rites and ceremonies which were prescribed to him by the clergy. He fasted, observed the feasts in commemoration of the martyrs, and devoutly watched the whole night on the vigils of the saints," and showed great anxiety for uniformity in the doctrines and observances of religion in the church. He was, therefore, exactly suited to the wishes of the Roman bishop and clergy, in establishing, by his imperial authority, what they had no Scripture to support, and what their influence had hitherto been unable to effect, viz. a uniformity in the celebration of Easter and the first day. In 321, Constantine first published his edicts enjoining upon his subjects these superstitious celebrations.

Eusebius in his life of Constantine, says, "He appointed as a suitable time for prayers the Dominical day, which was then an especial day, and now is undoubtedly the very first. His body guard observed the day, and offered on it prayers written by the emperor. The happy prince endeavored to persuade all to do this, and by degrees to lead all to the worship of God; wherefore he determined that those obeying Roman power should abstain from every work upon the days named after the Saviour, that they should venerate also the day before the Sabbath, in memory, as seems to me, of the events occurring in those days to our common Saviour."

He says again, "An edict also, by the will and pleasure of the emperor, was transmitted to the Prefects of the provinces, that they *henceforth* should venerate the Dominical day; that they should honor the days consecrated to the martyrs, and should celebrate the solemnities of the festivals in the churches, all which was done according to the will of the emperor." And as quoted by Lucius, he says, that he admonished his subjects likewise that those days which were *Sabbaths* should be honored, or worshipped.

Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History, b. 1, c. 8, says, "He (Constantine) also made a law that on the Dominical day, which the Hebrews call the first day of the week, the Greeks the day of the Sun, and also on the day of Venus, (i.e. Friday,) judgments should not be given, or other business transacted, but that all should worship God with prayer and supplications, and venerate the Dominical day, as on it Christ rose from the dead; and the day of Venus, as the day on which he was fixed to the cross."

Dr. Chambers says, "It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the observance of Sunday, and who, according to Eusebius, appointed that it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire. Before him, and even in his time, they observed the Jewish Sabbath as well as Sunday; both to satisfy the law of Moses, and to imitate the apostles, who used to meet together on the first day." He adds, "Indeed, some are of opinion that the Lord's day mentioned in the Apocalypse, is our Sunday; which they will have to have been so early instituted." "By Constantine's laws, made in 321, it was decreed that for the future the Sunday should be kept a day of rest in all cities and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work. In 538, the Council of Orleans prohibited this country labor.

To give the more solemnity to the first day of the week, (as we learn from Lucius' Ecclesiastical History,) Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome while Constantine was Emperor, changed the name of Sunday, giving it the more imposing title of *Lord's day*.

It cannot be doubted, that the laws of Constantine did much to make the first day conspicuous throughout the empire, as all public business was forbidden upon it. They changed its character from a special day, in which, as a weekly festival, all kinds of business and labor were performed in city and country, to be, as Eusebius says, *the very first*. This imperial favor for the first day operated against all who conscientiously regarded the Sabbath from respect to the fourth commandment, in obedience to which the seventh day had always been observed; and if it had produced a general abandonment of its observance, it would not have been very surprising, considering the influence of court example, and the general ignorance and darkness of the age. This, however, does not appear to have been the case. The Sabbath was still extensively observed; and to counteract it the Council of Laodicea, about A.D. 350, passed a decree, saying, "It is not proper for Christians to Judaize, and to cease from labor on the Sabbath, but they ought to work on that day, and put especial honor upon the Lord's day, as Christians. If any be found Judaizing, let him be anathematized."

But this did not produce any material change, for Socrates, a writer of the fifth century, who resided at Constantinople, makes the following remarks upon the celebration of the Sabbath at the time he wrote, A.D. 440. He says, "There are various customs concerning assembling; for though all the churches throughout the whole world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath day, yet the Alexandrians and the Romans, from an ancient tradition, refuse to do this; but the Egyptians

who are in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and those inhabiting Thebais, indeed have assemblies on the Sabbath, but do not participate in the mysteries, as is the custom of the Christians. At Caesarea, Cappadocia, and in Cyprus, on the Sabbath and Dominical day, at twilight, with lighted lamps, the presbyters and bishops interpret the Scriptures. At Rome they fast every Sabbath.”

This account of the manner of celebrating the Sabbath in the fifth century, is corroborated by Sozomen, in his Ecclesiastical History, b. 7, c. 9. He says, “At Constantinople, and almost among all, the Christians assembled upon the Sabbath, and also upon the first day of the week, except at Rome and Alexandria; the ecclesiastical assemblies at Rome were not upon the Sabbath, as in almost all other churches of the rest of the world; and in many cities and villages in Egypt, they used to commune in the evening of the Sabbath, on which day there were public assemblies.”

In regard to fasting on the Sabbath at Rome, referred to by Socrates, it ought to be said, that from the earliest times to the fourth century, the practice had been to observe the Sabbath as a holiday. But the Church of Rome, in its opposition to the Jews, made it a fast day, that the separation might be marked and strong. In the eastern churches they never fasted upon the Sabbath, excepting one Sabbath in the year, which was the day before the Passover. But in the western churches they celebrated a fast every week. It was in reference to this that Ambrose said, “When I come to Rome, I fast upon the Sabbath; when I am here, I do not fast.” Augustine also said concerning this, “If they say it is sinful to fast on the Sabbath, then they would condemn the Roman Church, and many places near to and far from it. And if they should think it a sin not to fast on the Sabbath, then they would blame many eastern churches, and the far greater part of the world.” This Sabbath fasting was opposed by the eastern church; and in the sixth general council, held at Constantinople, it was commanded that the Sabbath and Dominical days be kept as festivals, and that no one fast or mourn upon them. The practice of fasting, therefore, was chiefly in the western churches, about Rome.

It is perhaps difficult to determine exactly the relative importance attached to the seventh and first days of the week at this time. Sufficient may be found, however, to assure us, that the Sabbath was observed, and that no one regarded Sunday as having taken its place. This is shown by the provision of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, that the Gospels should be read on that day. It is shown by the action of a Council in 517, (mentioned in *Robinson's History of Baptism*,) which regulated and enforced the observance of the Sabbath. It is shown by the expostulation of Gregory of Nyssa, “How can you look upon the Lord's day, if you neglect the Sabbath? Do you not know that they are sisters, and that in despising the one you affront the other?” And as sisters we find them hand in hand in the ecclesiastical canons. Penalties were inflicted by the councils both of Laodicea and Trullo, on clergymen who did not observe both days as festivals.

How the first day of the week, or Lord's day, was observed in the early part of the fifth century, we may learn from the words of St. Jerome. In a funeral oration for the Lady Paula, he says: “She, with all her virgins and widows who lived at Bethlehem in cloister with her, upon the Lord's day, repaired duly to the church, or house of God, which was near to her cell; and after her return from thence to her own lodgings, she herself and all her company *fell to work*, and they all performed their task, which was the making of clothes and garments for themselves and for others, as they were appointed.”

St. Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople, “recommended to his audience, after impressing upon themselves and their families what they had heard on the Lord’s day, to return to their daily employments and trades.”

Dr. Francis White, Lord Bishop of Ely, speaking of this matter, says, “The Catholic Church, for more than six hundred years after Christ, permitted labor, and gave license to many Christian people to work upon the Lord’s day, at such hours as they were not commanded to be present at the public service by the precepts of the church.”

In the sixth century efforts were made to prevent this labor.

The following promulgation of a synod held by command of King Junthran, of Burgundy, will show the condition of things, and the means used to improve it: “We see the Christian people, in an unadvised manner, deliver to contempt the Dominical day, and, as in other days, indulge in continual labor.” Therefore they determined to teach the people subject to them to keep the Dominical day, which, in not observed by the lawyer, he should irreparably lose his cause, and if a countryman or servant did not keep it, he should be beaten with heavier blows of cudgels. The council of Orleans, held 538, prohibited the country labor on Sunday which Constantine by his laws permitted. According to Chambers, this council also declared, “that to hold it unlawful to travel with horses, cattle, and carriages, to prepare food, or to do any thing necessary to the cleanliness and decency of houses or persons, savors more of Judaism than Christianity.” According to Lucius, in another council held in Narbonne, in France, in the seventh century, they also forbid this country work.

Early in the seventh century, in the time of Pope Gregory I., the subject of the Sabbath attracted considerable attention. There was one class of persons who declared, “that it was not lawful to do any manner of work upon the Saturday, or the old Sabbath; another, that no man ought to bathe himself on the Lord’s day, or their new Sabbath.” Against both of these doctrines Pope Gregory wrote a letter to the Roman citizens. Baronius, in his Councils, says, “This year (603) at Rome, St. Gregory, the Pope, corrected that error which some preached, by Jewish superstition, or the Grecian custom, that it was a duty to worship on the Sabbath, as likewise upon the Dominical day;” and he calls such preachers the preachers of Antichrist. Nearly the same doctrine was preached again in the time of Gregory VII., A.D. 1074, about five hundred years after what we are now speaking of. This is sufficient to show that the Sabbath was kept until those times of decline which introduced so many errors in faith and practice. Indeed, it is sufficient to show, that wherever the subject has been under discussion, the Sabbath has found its advocates, both in *theory* and in *practice*.

According to Lucius, “Pope Urban II., in the eleventh century, dedicated the Sabbath to the Virgin Mary, with a mass. Binius says, “Pope Innocent I. constituted a fast on the Sabbath day, which seems to be the first constitution of that fact; but dedicating the Sabbath to the Virgin Mary was by Urban II., in the latter part of the eleventh century.” About this time we find Esychius teaching the doctrine that the precept for the observance of the Sabbath is not one of the commandments, because it is not at all times to be observed according to the letter; and Thomas Aquinas, another Romish Ecclesiastic, saying, “that it seems to be inconvenient that the precept for observing the Sabbath should be put among the precepts of the Decalogue, if it do not at all belong to it; that the precept, ‘*Thou shalt not make a graven image,*’ and the precept for *observing the Sabbath*, are ceremonial.”

FIRST DAY OBSERVANCE INTRODUCED INTO GREAT BRITAIN

First day observance in this country being derived from England, mainly, we are interested in learning the origin of the observance in that country. As the great body of the professed church drink from this stream, a knowledge of its fountain head is of much value. The "History of the Sabbath" testifies to the point:

The observance of the first day was not so early in England and in Scotland as in most other parts of the Roman Empire. According to Heylyn, there were Christian societies established in Scotland as early as A.D. 435; and it is supposed that the gospel was preached in England in the first century by St. Paul. For many ages after Christianity was received in those kingdoms, they paid no respect to the first day. Binius, a Catholic writer, in the second volume of his works, give some account of the bringing into use of the Dominical day [Sunday] in Scotland, as late as A.D. 1203. "This year," he says, "a council was held in Scotland concerning the introduction of the Lord's day, which council was held in 1203, in the time of Pope Innocent III.," and he quotes as his authority Roger Hoveden, Matth. Paris, and Lucius' Eccl. Hist. He says, "By this council it was enacted that it should be holy time from the twelfth hour on Saturday noon until Monday."

Boethus (de Scottis, page 344.) says, "In 1203, William, king of Scotland, called a council of the principal of his kingdom, by which it was decreed, that Saturday, from the twelfth hour at noon, should be holy, that they should do no profane work, and this they should observe until Monday."

Binius says that in 1201, Eustachius, Abbot of Flay, came to England, and therein preached from city to city, and from place to place. He prohibited using markets on Dominical days; and for this he professed to have a special command from heaven. The history of this singular document, entitled, *A holy Command of the Dominical Day*, the pious Abbot stated to be this: "It came from Heaven to Jerusalem, and was found on St. Simon's tomb in Golgotha. And the Lord commanded this epistle, which for three days and three nights men looked upon, and falling to the earth, prayed for God's mercy. And after the third hour, the patriarch stood up; and Akarias the archbishop stretched out his mitre, and they took the holy epistle of God and found it thus written."

"I, the Lord, who commanded you that ye should observe the Dominical Day, and ye have not kept it, and ye have not repented of your sins, as I said by my gospel, heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away; I have caused repentance unto life to be preached unto you, and ye have not believed; I sent pagans against you, who shed your blood, yet ye believed not; and because ye kept not the Dominical day, for a few days ye had famine; but I soon gave you plenty, and afterwards ye did worse; I will again, that none from the ninth hour of the Sabbath until the rising of the sun on Monday, do work any thing unless what is good, which if any do, let him amend by repentance; and if ye be not obedient to this command, amen, I say unto you, and I swear unto you by my seat, and throne, and cherubims, who keep my holy seat, because I will not change any thing by another epistle; but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and logs of wood, and hot water by night, and none may be able to prevent, but that I may destroy all wicked men. This I say unto you, ye shall die the death, because of the Dominical holy day and other festivals of my saints which ye have not kept. I will send unto you beasts having the heads of lions, the hair of women, and tails of camels; and they shall be so hunger-starved that they shall devour your flesh, and ye shall desire to flee to the sepulchres of the dead,

and hide you for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from your eyes; and I will send upon you darkness, that without seeing ye may kill one another, and I will take away my face from you, and will not show you mercy; for I will burn the bodies and hearts of all who keep not the Dominical holy day. Hear my voice, lest ye perish in the land because of the Dominical holy day. Now know ye, that ye are safe by the prayers of my most holy mother Mary, and of my holy angels who daily pray for you. I gave you the law from Mount Sinai, which ye have not kept. For you I was born into the world, and my festivals ye have not known; the Dominical day of my resurrection ye have not kept; I swear to you by my right hand, unless ye keep the Dominical day and the festivals of my saints, I will send pagans to kill you.”

Provided with this new command from heaven, “Eustachius preached in various parts of England against the desecration of the Dominical day, and other festivals; and gave the people absolution upon condition that they hereafter reverence the Dominical day, and the festivals of the saints.” And the people vowed to God, that thereafter they would neither buy nor sell any thing but food on Sunday. “Then,” says Binius, “the enemy of man, envying the admonitions of this holy man, put it into the heart of the king and nobility of England, to command that all who should keep the aforesaid traditions, and chiefly all who had cast down the markets for things vendible upon the Dominical day, should be brought to the king’s court to make satisfaction about observing the Dominical day.”

Binius relates many miraculous things that occurred on the Sabbath to those that labored after the ninth hour (i.e. after three o’clock in the afternoon) of the seventh day, or Saturday. He says, that upon a certain Sabbath, after the nine hour, a carpenter, for making a wooden pin, was struck with the palsy; and a woman, for knitting on the Sabbath, after the ninth hour, was also struck with the palsy. A man baked bread, and when he broke it to eat, blood came out. Another, grinding corn, blood came in a great stream instead of meal, while the wheel of his mill stood still against a vehement impulse of water. Heated ovens refused to bake bread, if heated after the ninth hour of the Sabbath; and dough, left unbaked, out of respect to Eustachius’ new doctrine, was found on Monday well baked without the aid of fire. These fables were industriously propagated throughout the kingdom; “yet the people,” says Binius, “fearing kingly and human power more than divine, returned as a dog to his own vomit, to keep markets of saleable things upon the Dominical day.”

Mr. Bampfield, in his Enquiry, page 3, says, “The king and princes of England, in 1203, would not agree to change the Sabbath, and keep the first day, by this authority. This was in the time of King John, against whom the popish clergy had a great pique for not honoring their prelacy and the monks, by one of whom he was finally poisoned.”

Binius (Councils, cent. 13,) states that King John of England, in 1208, in the tenth year of his reign, for not submitting to popish impositions upon his prerogatives was excommunicated by the Pope, and his kingdom interdicted, which occasioned so much trouble at home and abroad, that it forced him at last to lay down his crown at the feet of Mandulphus, the Pope’s agent. After he was thus humbled by the excommunication and interdict, the king, in the fifteenth year of his reign, by writ, removed the market of the city of Exon from Sunday, on which it was held, to Monday. The market of Lanceston was removed from the first to the fifth day of the week. In the second and third years of Henry III. many other markets were removed from the first to other days of the week, which the

King at first would not permit. He also issued a writ which permitted the removal of markets from the first day to other days without special license.

The Parliament of England met on Sundays until the time of Richard II., who adjourned it from that to the following day.

In 1203, according to Boethus, "a council was held in Scotland to inaugurate the king, and concerning the feast of the Sabbath; and there came also a legate from the Pope, with a sword and purple hat, and indulgences and privileges to the young king. It was also there decreed, that Saturday, from the twelfth hour at noon, should be holy." The Magdeburgenses say that this Council was about the observance of the Dominical day *newly brought in*, and that they ordained that it should be holy from the twelfth hour of Saturday even till Monday."

Binius says, "A synod was held in Oxford, A.D. 1223, by Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, where they determined that the Dominical day be kept with all veneration, and a fast upon the Sabbath."

SUNDAY KEEPING ESTABLISHED BY LAW IN ENGLAND

According to Bampfield, the first law of England made for the keeping of Sunday, was in the time of Edward VI., about 1470. "Parliament then passed an act, by which Sunday and many holy days, the feasts of all Saints and of holy Innocents, were established as festivals by law. This provided also, that it should be lawful for husbandmen, laborers, fisherman, and all others in harvest, or at any other time of the year when necessity should require, to labor, ride, fish, or do any other kind of work, at their own free will and pleasure, upon any of the said days."

By such means as these, the observance of the first day was gradually forced upon the people wherever they owed allegiance to the Pope as head of the church, and the Sabbath was as gradually brought into contempt and disuse.

The process by which the change was effected appears to be this: By first obtaining an annual celebration of the first day at the close of Passover, in honor of the resurrection; then a partial observance of the day weekly, it being generally so observed among the heathen; then obtaining for it the support of civil laws, ecclesiastical canon and penalties, and by giving it the title of Lord's day; then by requiring the consecration of the entire day. To abate and ultimately eradicate all respect for the Sabbath, it was first turned into a fast; then it was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, resting upon it was stigmatized as Judaism and heresy, and the preaching of it was called Antichrist; and finally the fourth commandment was pronounced ceremonial, and was effectually abstracted from the Decalogue. And thus, so far as the Roman church was concerned, the point was gained; and thus, probably, she performed her part in the fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel, (vii, 25,) "He shall think to change *times* and *laws*; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

The cause of the Sabbath must also have been seriously affected by the rise of the Ottoman Empire in the seventh century, and the success of the Mohometans in conquering the eastern division of the church. Mohomet formed the plan of establishing a new religion, or, as he expressed it, of replanting the only true and ancient one professed by Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and the prophets; by destroying idolatry, and weeding out the corruptions which the later Jews and Christians had, as he supposed, introduced. He was equally opposed to both Jews and Christians. To distinguish his disciples from each, he selected as their day of weekly celebration the sixth day, or Friday. And thus, as a writer of the seventeenth century remarks, "they and the Romanists crucified the Sabbath, as the

Jews and the Romans did the Lord of the Sabbath, between two thieves, the sixth and the first day of the week.”

We have thus traced the history of the Sabbath in the Roman church down to the thirteenth century; and we see that through the whole of this period, the seventh day every where retained the honor of being called the Sabbath, and that no other day had ever borne that title; that not until the remarkable letter found on St. Simeon’s tomb, had it been asserted by any one, that the observance of the *first day, Lord’s day, or Sunday*, was enjoined by the authority of Jesus or his apostles, nor was any example of theirs plead in its favor. Even then it was not pretended that the Scriptures required its observance.

There are some traces of the Sabbath among those Christians who separated from the Catholic communion, or were never embraced in it. The Greek church separated from them about the middle of the eleventh century, and had a larger extent of empire than the Papists. According to *Brerewood’s Enquiries*, page 128, this church solemnized Saturday festivals, and forbade as unlawful to fast on any Saturday except in Lent, retaining the custom followed before their separation. The same author states that the Syrian Christians, who composed a numerous body in the East, celebrated divine worship solemnly on both the Sabbath and the first day, continuing the custom of the Roman church at the time they separated from that community. *Sandy’s Travels*, page 173, speak of a Christian empire in Ethiopia that celebrate both Saturday and Sunday, “that they have divers errors and many ancient truth.” The Abyssinian Christians, another numerous body are represented as being similar in some respect to the Papists; and Purchase speaks of them as “subject to Peter and Paul, and especially to Christ,” and as observing the Saturday Sabbath. They are also mentioned by Brerewood. Mosheim mentions a sect of Christians in the twelfth century, in Lombardy, called Pasaginians, charged with circumcising their followers, and keeping the Jewish Sabbath. Mr. Benedict considers the account of their practicing the bloody rite a slander changed on them on account of their keeping the Jewish Sabbath. Binius says that in 1555 there were Christians in Rome who kept the Sabbath, and were therefore called Sabbatarii, and they are represented as differing in other respects from the Romanists. Many of the Armenian Christians are believed to observe the ancient Sabbath. Dr. Buchanan, in his *Researches*, when speaking of those of them who are settled in the East Indies, says, “Their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides this, they maintain the solemn observation of Christian worship throughout our empire on the seventh day.”

THE WALDENSES KEPT THE SABBATH

Probably there has not existed a class of Christians since the times of the apostles, who could more justly claim to be apostolic than the Waldenses, formerly a numerous people living in the valleys of Piedmont; whither they retired, says Burnside, on the promulgation of Constantine’s laws for the observance of the first day, in the fourth century; and where they remained, according to Scaliger and Brerewood, in the time of Elizabeth of England, in the latter part of the sixteenth century. They adhered firmly to the apostolic faith, and suffered severe persecutions from the Catholics. Robinson, in his *History of Baptism*, says, “They were called *Sabbati* and *Sabbatati*, so named from the Hebrew word Sabbath, because they kept the Saturday for the Lord’s Day.” They were also called *In-sabbatati*, because they rejected all the festivals, or Sabbaths, in the low Latin sense of the word. The account the Papists gave of their sentiments in 1250, was

briefly this: That they declared themselves to be the apostolic successors, and to have apostolic authority; that they held the church of Rome to be the ‘whore of Babylon;’ that none of the ordinances of the church which have been introduced since Christ’s ascension ought to be observed; that baptism is of no advantage to infants, because they cannot actually believe. They reject the sacrament of confirmation, but instead of that their teachers lay their hands upon their disciples. Jones, in his Church History, says, that because they would not observe *saints’ days*, they were falsely supposed to neglect the Sabbath also. Another of their enemies, an Inquisitor of Rome, charged them with despising all the feasts of Christ and his saints. Another, a Commissioner of Charles XII of France, reported to him, “that he found among them none of the ceremonies, images, or signs of the Romish church, much less the crimes with which they were charged; on the contrary, they kept the Sabbath day, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church, and instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and commandments of God.”

It is believed that there have been Christians in every age who have kept holy the seventh day. During the first three centuries of the Christian Church, the Sabbath seems to have been almost universally kept. It was kept generally in the Eastern Church for six hundred years. And from that time onward to the present, frequent traces of Sabbath-keepers may be found, either in the history of individuals, or in the acts of Councils against those who kept it. These notices extend to the time of the Reformation; and are as frequent as are the references to the first day of the week under the title of Lord’s day.

In Germany, according to Ross “Picture of all Religions,” observers of the seventh-day as the Sabbath were common in the sixteenth century, their numbers being such as to lead to organization, and attract attention. A number of these formed a church and emigrated to America in the early settlement of the country. There were Sabbath-keepers in Transylvania about the same time, among them was Francis David, first chaplain to the Court of Sigismund, the prince of that kingdom, and afterwards superintendent of all the Transylvanian churches. In France, also, there were Christians of this class, among whom was M. de la Roque, who wrote in defense of the Sabbath, against Bossuet, the Catholic Bishop of Meaux. But it is difficult to determine to what extent this day was observed in those countries.

In England we find Sabbath-keepers very early. Dr. Chambers says, “They arose in England in the sixteenth century;” from which we understand that they then became a distinct denomination in that kingdom. They increased considerably in the seventeenth century; and we find that towards the close of that century there were eleven flourishing churches in different parts of that country. Among those who held this view were some men of distinction. Theophilus Brabourne was called before the Court of High Commission, in 1632, for having written and published books vindicating the claims of the seventh day. One Traske was about the same time examined in the Starr Chamber, where a long discussion on the subject seems to have been held. Nearly thirty years after this, John James, preacher to a Sabbath-keeping congregation in the east of London, was executed in a barbarous manner, upon a variety of charges, among which was his keeping of the Sabbath. Twenty years later still, Francis Bampfield died in Newgate, a martyr to non-conformity—especially as one who could not conform in the matter of the Sabbath. It is needless to mention more names, or to speak particularly of Edward, Joseph, Dr.

Joseph, and Dr. Samuel Stennett, John Maulden, Robert Cornthwaite, and others, who have written and suffered in proof of their attachment to this truth.

But the Sabbath met with great opposition in England being assailed, both from the pulpit and the press, by those who were attached to the established church. Many men of learning and talent engaged in the discussion, on both sides of the question. It is evident that the opposers of reform felt the difficulty of defending themselves against the strength of talent and scripture brought to bear in favor of the seventh day. The civil powers attempted to check the progress of all Dissenters by means of the famous *Conventicle Act*. By that law, passed in 1664, it was provided, that if any person above sixteen years of age, was present at any meeting of worship different from the Church of England, where there were five persons more than the household, for the first offense he should be imprisoned three months, or pay five pounds; for the second, the penalty was doubled; and for the third he should be banished to America, or pay one hundred pounds sterling. This act was renewed in 1669, and, in addition to the former penalties, made the person preaching liable to pay a fine of twenty pounds; and the same penalty was imposed upon any person suffering a meeting to be held in his house. Justices of the Peace were empowered to enter such houses, and seize such persons; and they were fined one hundred pounds if they neglected doing so. These acts were exceedingly harassing to those who observed the Sabbath. Many of their distinguished ministers were taken from their flocks and continued in prison, some of whom sunk under their sufferings. These persecutions not only prevented those who kept the Sabbath from assembling, but deterred some who embraced their opinions from uniting with them, and discouraged others from investigating the subject. At present the Sabbath is not as extensively observed in England as formerly. But the extent of Sabbath-keeping cannot be determined by the number and magnitude of the churches, either there or in other countries. For many persons live in the observance of the seventh day and remain members of churches which assemble on the first day; and a still greater number acknowledge its correctness, who conform to the more popular custom of keeping the first day.

At what time the Sabbath became the subject of attention in America, we cannot definitely say. The intolerance of the first settlers of New England was unfavorable to the Sabbath. The poor Christian who may have been banished to this country for its observance could find no refuge among the *Pilgrim Fathers*. The laws of Rhode Island were more tolerant than those of some other States, and observers of the Sabbath first made their appearance at Newport in 1671. The cause of the Sabbath has gradually gained ground in this country from that period; but it has found much to oppose its progress, even in Rhode Island. It was in opposition to the general practice of Christians, on which account an odium was put upon it, and those who have kept the Sabbath have been reproached with Judaizing, and classed with Jews. Besides this, they have ever been subjected to great inconvenience in their occupations, especially in cities and towns.

The common English version of the Bible has been found in many instances a sufficient means of converting men to the truth. Churches observing the Sabbath have been formed in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and in most of the Western States, embracing, as is supposed, a population of forty to fifty thousand.

The foregoing extracts from the "History of the Sabbath," give us a definite understanding of the manner in which the Sabbath was changed. The origin of that

institution which has usurped the place of the Lord's Sabbath, we can also clearly see. As we have here been permitted to mark the process by which, step by step, the day of the Sun supplanted the Rest-day of the Lord, let us now retrace the path which we have followed down.

1. First-day observance in this country, was introduced by our ancestors from England.

2. The English people received the First-day Sabbath on the authority of a roll which Eustachius, Abbot of Flay, assured them fell from heaven. This was about A.D. 1201. This roll was a forgery of the Romish church.

3. Thus, the Protestants of England obtained their first-day Sabbath from the church of Rome.

4. The church of Rome accomplished the change of the Sabbath by a succession of efforts, each of them claiming but a point, but all of them directed toward the one object. These steps began near the days of the apostles. But this does not stamp as apostolic that which the New Testament has never sanctioned; for Paul plainly testifies that the mystery of iniquity, or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess. ii. This was the power that should speak great words against the Most High, and wear out his saints, and "think to change times and laws." Dan. vii, 25.

5. The Romish church received the first-day festival from the heathen, who very generally observed it in honor of the Sun. This heathen festival the Romanists established in the place of the Lord's Sabbath. And indeed, all the leading peculiarities of Romanism, are derived from the Pagans.

6. The Pagans derived their Sunday-keeping from the Devil. When men apostatized from God, the Devil turned them to the worship of the Sun. And instead of the holy Sabbath which the Creator had instituted as the memorial of himself, Satan set apart the first day in honor of the Sun. As the Sabbath of the Lord can be traced back to Him by whom it was instituted, so this first-day festival, the rival of God's Sabbath, can be traced back to its author, the Devil.

The Sabbath is the great bulwark which God erected against atheism and idolatry. Had men always observed the Sabbath, they never could have forgotten the existence of God; for this institution would always have pointed them back to the time when he created the heaven and the earth. And they never could have been idolaters; for the Sabbath would always have pointed out Him, who, in six days created heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh. Hence, Satan has ever attempted to destroy the Sabbath of the Lord. To do this, he early led our apostate race to keep the first day in honor of the Sun.

The man of sin, who was to change times and laws, established this heathen festival in the place of the Lord's Sabbath. And thus, on the authority of the Roman Pontiff, the heathen festival of Sunday has usurped the place of the Rest-day of the Lord.

ERRATA—Page 4th, 31st line from the bottom, for "Acts i, 11," read, Acts i, 13.

Page 20th, 23d line from the bottom, for "owed," read, owned.