ARTICLE V.

A CHRISTIAN SABBATH IN THE NEW DISPENSATION: BIBLICAL AND PATRISTICAL EVIDENCE.

BY REV. WILLIAM DELOSS LOVE, D.D., SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.

THERE are sabbatic elements in the Lord's day. They constitute its substance. Hence there is the Christian Sabbath in the new dispensation.

1. The Lord's day has in substance the same nature and design as the original Sabbath. (1) Both are days for bodily and mental, secular and spiritual, rest. The word "Sabbath" means *rest*, and for rest Christians have ever used the Lord's day. Even Dr. Hessey, though utterly severing the two days from each other, says, "The Lord's day should be considered a day of rest."[1] Professor Hopkins says, "The proper end of the Christian Sunday is rest with cheerful worship, beneficent activity, self-help, and self-culture."[2] Two days so much alike would seem to be related to each other. (2) Both days have a high religious purpose. The Sabbath was sanctified, and was to be kept holy. The New Testament observance of the Lord's day was certainly religious, and in no sense secular, so far as appears. Dr. Hessey says of it, "It is a divinely sanctioned, religious day, ... *the* religious day of Christians."[3] The wonder is that the Sabbath is completely "abrogated," as he claims, if Sunday is for the same end. (3) The acknowledged religious services of the early Christians on the Lord's day were fully equal to or more than those of the Jewish Sabbath. The fullest description extant is that given by Justin Martyr. The two chapters preceding are on these important topics: "The Administration of the Sacraments," and "The

[1] Sunday, p. 229. [2] Sabbath or Sunday — Pittsburgh Address.
[3] Sunday, p. 229.

Eucharist." Then, on the "Weekly Worship of the Christians," he says: "And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied we bless the Maker of all through his Son, Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday," etc.[1] According to Justin's description there were in the primitive Lord's-day services prolonged reading of Scripture, instructions, exhortations, prayers, thanksgiving, the Lord's supper, collection of alms, distribution of food and other articles to the absent sick, widows, and orphans. All in country and city assembled; and this was the chief meeting of the day. Sometimes there were other meetings on that day,—as that of early morning, spoken of by Pliny. The Jewish and Christian public religious services were nearly identical, with the addition among the Christians of observing the Lord's supper, exercising spiritual gifts, and considering new truths.[2] (4) The early Christians held more lengthy services on the Lord's day than on other days; it was especially appropriated to their religious assemblies. (5) Their Lord's day services necessitated rest from secular labor. Those coming from the country had but little time in the morning before coming, and little at evening after returning. No evidence appears among the *earliest* fathers or their contemporaries that they considered the Lord's day open to secular purposes. Lapses afterwards do not concern us now. We have seen that Tertullian taught the duty of abstinence from secularities on Sunday.[3] Though Dr. Hessey quotes Jerome as sanctioning the making of garments and visiting the sepulchres of apostles and martyrs on Sunday, he yet acknowledges that the testimony of that father is positive in respect to the religious observance of that day.[4] Moreover, Tertullian's era was two cen-

[1] See remainder of paragraph in Bib. Sac., Oct. 1880, pp. 664, 665.

[2] Smith and Barnum, Comp. Dict., p. 1074; Jahn's Archaeology, pp. 501, 502.

[3] Bib. Sac., Vol. xxxvii. pp. 385, 386; Ibid., Vol. xxxviii. pp. 281, 282.

[4] Sunday, p. 14.

turies nearer the apostles than that of Jerome, and was also one of more Christian devotion. Besides, the garment-making may have been exceptional — for the poor and enslaved. Dr. Pusey, after examining many passages of the early fathers, comes to the conclusion that "abstinence from business on the Lord's day, as a religious duty, was an early universal tradition."[1] Professor Hopkins says, "Agricultural labor, marketing, and all other necessary buying and selling went on upon the Sunday as upon any other day; that amount of time only being reserved which was necessary for attendance upon worship. From the church Christians went forth to their ordinary occupations."[2] *Reply:* Dr. Hopkins gives no proof of the truth of these statements; we do not think he can find any. Doubtless Christian servants, bound to Jewish or heathen masters, were sometimes obliged to labor on the Lord's day. But it is wholly improbable that Christians spent the "first" and "chief" of all their days in a secular manner unnecessarily. They regarded it as superior to what the Sabbath was under the old covenant. It was the *day* that they observéd, and not merely the Lord's supper on that day. The fact that they placed their usual observance of that sacrament on that day shows that they especially regarded the day. The supper and *agapae* were so important that their most sacred time would naturally be set apart for them. *Objection:* Reports of law cases in the English courts affirm that in the early Christian ages judicial courts were held on Sunday, and that not until the sixth or seventh century did Christians deem it wrong to try law cases on that day; hence they could not have regarded the Lord's day as holy. *Reply:* We notice this objection, though it comes late to hand. It is based on "Reports of Cases argued and adjudged in the Court of King's Bench," by Sir James Burrow.[3] We hold that Burrow, first, does not quote the earliest authorities on the subject, and, secondly, that the courts to which he refers were ecclesiastical,

[1] Morris's Lib. of the Fathers; Ephrem's Homilies, p. 391, note.

[2] Pittsburgh Address.

[3] Am. Ed. 1808, Vol. iii. pp. 1597-1662.

or had a religious purpose. We have already adduced language from the fathers which shows that they did regard the Lord's day as holy. Dionysius, about A.D. 170, termed it "holy."[1] Tertullian, about A.D. 200, taught that Christians ought to defer their "business" from the "Lord's day."[2] Eusebius, about A.D. 315, said of the Lord's day, "On this day ..... we assemble, ... and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths.[3]" The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363, voted that Christians should rest from labor on the Lord's day, if they were able.[4] As soon as Christianity obtained civil power in Constantine, he abolished courts on Sunday, except for the manumission of slaves. Such is the testimony of Eusebius, given about A.D. 330.[5] Sozomen, about A.D. 420, said that Constantine "commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on these [the Lord's] days."[6] Neander, drawing from the original authorities, says, "The emperor, Constantine, in a law enacted previous to the year 321, commanded the suspension of all suits and courts of justice on Sunday...... By a law of the year 386 those older changes effected by the emperor, Constantine, were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden."[7] It was Theodosius I. who gave the law of the year 386, to which Neander refers.[8] But previous to that, A.D. 368, under Valentinian and Valens, a law was made which forbade the collection of taxes and other dues on Sunday.[9] And in 469 Leo and Anthemius granted the Christians relief from civil proceedings and annoyances on the Lord's day.[10]

It follows from the foregoing evidence that the objection based on Burrow's Reports, namely, "That not until the

[1] Euseb. Eccl. Hist., book iv. chap. 23. [2] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xi. p. 199.

[3] Patrologiae Graece, Tom. xxiii. pp. 1170, 1171; Stuart's Citation and Translation in Guerney on the Sabbath, Appendix B.

[4] Neander's Church History (Am. ed. 1852), Vol. ii. p. 300.

[5] Life Const., book iv. chaps. 18, 19. [6] Eccl. Hist. (Bohn's ed.), p. 22.

[7] History of the Church (Am. ed. 1852), Vol. ii. p. 300.

[8] Hessey, Sunday, pp. 83, 84.

[9] Schaff's Church History, Vol. ii. p. 381; Hessey, Sunday, pp. 83, 84.

[10] Hessey, Sunday, pp. 83, 84.

sixth or seventh century did Christians deem it wrong to try law cases on that day [Sunday]," is utterly wrong. For those rulers would never have enacted so many laws against the holding of courts on Sunday, if Christian sentiment had not desired it. That the edicts of emperors always prevailed with all the people cannot be claimed. The early laws of Christian emperors against paganism were often transgressed. Their edicts forbidding theatres and other spectacles on Sunday were even opposed by some nominal Christians. Yet such laws and edicts showed the trend of the better Christian sentiment, which finally effectually forbade the sitting of courts on Sunday. Burrow quotes Sir Henry Spelman, an English lawyer and student of judicial antiquities, of about three centuries since. Spelman quotes a church canon against holding courts on Sunday, of A.D. 517, and speaks of that as "fortified by an imperial constitution" made by Theodosius while yet Britain was under the Roman government, which constitution must have dated a century and a half earlier than the canon. This is a confession of the more influential Christian views that moved Theodosius. Spelman seems not to have known of Constantine's edict against Sunday courts a half century previous to that of Theodosius, nor of the many others given by other rulers of the fourth and earlier part of the fifth centuries. But he refers to Epiphanius, of the latter part of the fourth century,—without giving page or book of his work—as implying that on the Lord's day "In his time (as also many hundred years after) bishops and clergymen did hear and determine causes, lest Christians, against the rule of the apostle, should go to law under heathens and infidels."[1] But these were only ecclesiastical courts to settle difficulties among brethren, or such as they had with unbelievers, or "they had a religious purpose." Whether these courts in the circumstances were advisable or not, Christianity finally ruled them out, and they do not show or imply that the early Christians at any time held or justified purely secular courts on Sunday. Spelman also refers

[1] Spelman's Works, Original of the Terms (London ed. 1727), p. 76.

to Philo Judaeus as saying in his Life of Moses that the cause of one charged with gathering sticks on the Sabbath was heard on that day, and he cites the Talmudists as saying that their Sanhedrim did the same.[1] But these, too, were religious courts, even if they were the only ones the Jews had. Yet such courts on the Sabbath are without evidence of the divine approval.

Spelman gives a fine array of evidence showing that the ancient Gentile nations refused to hold secular courts during religious occasions. He says: "The Romans likewise (whether by instinct of nature or precedent) meddled not with law causes during the time appointed to the worship of their gods, as appeareth by the primitive law of the twelve tables. ..... It was so common a thing in those days of old to exempt the times of exercise of religion from all worldly business that the barbarous nations, even our Angli, whilst they were yet in Germany, the Suevians themselves, and others in those northern parts, would in no wise violate or interrupt it. Tacitus says [etc.]."[2] It is not possible that the early Christians cared less for the day that they named after their Lord than the barbarous nations cared for their religious occasions. (6) Since the early Christians *worshipped* their Lord, the day called by his name must have had their sacred regard. That name, "Lord's day," we find repeated by Ignatius, Dionysius, Melito, Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Anatolius, Victorinus, Peter, Eusebius, Athanasius — all within about two hundred and fifty years after the apostle John's death. (7) Some essential *principles* involved in the Lord's day would of themselves soon make it more sacred to the early Christians than the seventh day. Regarding the Lord Jesus as divine, they would esteem his day as divinely sanctioned. Redemption by him would soon be more precious in their sensibilities than the original creation. In their regard the new creation in Christ Jesus would soon supersede the old in material nature. The freshness of Christ's personal presence on the earth would join with their sense

[1] Spelman's Works, etc., p. 75. [2] Ibid., p. 74.

of forgiven sin to make the day which commemorated the completion of his mediatorial work more dear to them than the Sabbath of the old dispensation. Accordingly, history presents the fact which these first principles prophesy. The Lord's day gathers to itself in the Christian heart the special sacredness of days, and the chief assemblies and festivals naturally transfer themselves to it, aside from the previously shown fact that the first day was made sacred by the apostolic and divine authority.

Have we not here in the Lord's day the substance of the original Sabbath, when not cumbered with pharisaic rules and rites? The Jewish and other Christians had been accustomed to suspend labor on their most sacred days. Would they not ordinarily abstain from it on that day, more precious to them than all others had been? Theodore Parker, discussing the Sabbath question, here and often correct, says: "The Romans, like all other ancient nations, had certain festal days in which it was not thought proper to labor, unless work was pressing. It was disreputable to continue common labor on such days without an urgent reason; they were pretty numerous in the Roman calendar. Courts did not sit on those days; no public business was transacted."[1] And did the Christians unnecessarily labor or transact business on *their* most precious day—more precious far than any Roman day to Romans? Unreasonable to suppose it! Mr. Parker says "*all other ancient nations*" thought it not proper to labor on their festal days, unless work was pressing. He includes the Jewish nation; and the Christian nations after they became Christian.

We have, then, on the Lord's day sacred time, rest, spirituality, holy convocations, Scripture reading and instruction, the Lord's supper, almsgiving, prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. What more was ever had on the seventh day, save sacrifices and ceremonies now passed away? What more can be named for the Lord's day to make up the substance of the Sabbath?

[1] Christian Use of Sunday, p. 22.

2. The Lord's day and the scriptural Sabbath of the old dispensation were similar in respect to the actual restrictions imposed upon men, and the religious liberties granted them. The Lord's day was religiously observed. The real Sabbath was always free from useless and burdensome exactions. Pharisaic restrictions should not be confounded with the true scriptural law of the Sabbath. Work for worldly gain was forbidden, but works of mercy were allowed. Healing the sick (Matt. xii. 13) and taking medicine were right. Rescuing an animal from the mire or a pit was proper and obligatory (Luke xiv. 5). Feeding and watering animals was a duty (Luke xiii. 15). Plucking ears of corn to appease present hunger was permitted, opportunity for provision the day previous not having been given (Matt. xii. 1–8); but gathering manna on the seventh day was forbidden, because it would interfere with religious services, and it could be gathered sufficiently on the sixth (Ex. xvi. 29). Proper eating without vain feasting was right (Luke xiv. 1). A "Sabbath day's journey" was proper by pharisaic rule, though the distance varied with the size of cities, and probably was without rule by the real Scriptures.[1] The use of arms for defence or other necessity was not interdicted, though the Rabbins had taught otherwise.[2] The slaughter and sacrifice of animals in worship was allowed, enjoined, and even doubled on the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9, 10); and the shew-bread, twelve loaves with frankincense, was to be renewed on that day (Lev. xxiv. 5–9). The building of fires for ordinary, or at least culinary, purposes was forbidden (Ex. xxxv. 3); for, the climate was warm, their food could be sufficiently prepared without it, and allowing it would encourage gathering wood on the Sabbath. After sunset of the seventh day they could build fires, and probably then had their chief meal of the day. Some restrictions were ceremonial and national, and hence not always binding. God blessed the

[1] The Rabbins doubtless perverted Scripture (Ex. xvi. 29), and without authority made a Sabbath-day's journey to be anywhere within a city, and two thousand cubits outside of it.

[2] Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 2762.

seventh day, and it was therefore propitious of good, cheerful, joyful, though not to be given to finding secular pleasure (Isa. lviii. 13). Religious songs and instruments of music were, with the divine sanction, used in Sabbath services. The appointment of the day symbolized a covenant made with God, enjoining upon his creatures to give him praise and thanksgiving for their creation and keeping.

In all this, where are the burdens from which we should wish to be delivered? Where any marked requisition in the original Sabbath, not ceremonial or national, which the early Christians did not cheerfully give in their observance of the Lord's day? Have we not in the first day the true sabbatic elements?

3. The Old Testament gives significance and emphasis to the first day of the week, and thus prepares for its sacred, religious distinction in the new dispensation. (1) The dawn of creation, when God said, "Let there be light, and there was light," was the first of all the first days.[1] With this beginning of light associate the fact that Christ is "the light of the world." (2) The next significant first day was that on which the wave-sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest was offered before the Lord on behalf of all the people (Lev. xxiii. 11). That sheaf was the symbol of life. With that associate the fact that Christ was "the life..... of men." (3) Another significant first day was that on which the two wave-loaves were offered to the Lord (Lev. xxiii. 15–17). That offering was emblematic of double life. Associate with that the fact that Christ is doubly the "resurrection"—to the body and to the soul; to the mortal and to the immortal part. First days in the Old Testament are symbolical of Christ's attributes and relations to mankind, and seem to prefigure the first day of the new dispensation, which he by his resurrection has made immortal and glorious.

4. The apostles gave a sabbatic character to the Lord's day. They embalmed it in sacred regard. They dedicated it to the holiest religious services, and such dedication was

[1] Prof. Murphy, Bib. Sac., Vol. xxix. p. 108.

the chief feature of the Sabbath. One of them gave to the Lord's day its most excellent name, or else copied it from the lips of his Master. *Objection:* Robertson says there is no commandment for changing Sabbath observance from the seventh to the first day.[1] Professor G. P. Fisher says the change was not by any explicit ordinance.[2] Therefore Sunday is an entirely new day, without connection with the old. *Reply:* The moral elements, which are the *chief* of the two days, being alike make the days alike, and in chief part identical. The fact that there is no positive command to keep the first day, with the fact that the early Christians *kept* it, indicates a somewhat natural transition from one to the other.[3] If the Lord's day were wholly new there would probably have been given specific and recorded directions respecting its observance. The fact that the fathers argued against observing the seventh day, and in favor of observing the first instead, indicates a similarity between the days, and in part a transition of observance. The fact that the Christians strictly kept the seventh day until they changed to the first tends to the same conclusion; also the fact that they kept the Lord's day weekly, and not annually, and that they observed, not merely the supper on the Lord's day, but the whole day itself. Again: There was no "explicit ordinance" for a change from *any* Jewish to Christian institutions. The new commenced at a specific time; the old *gradually* disappeared. Circumcision lingered after baptism began; passover ceremonies after the Easter Lord's supper commenced its yearly recurrence;[4] purifying of the flesh after the pentecostal purifying of the Spirit came so wondrously to the early church; Sabbath observance after that of the Lord's day began its control of all Christian hearts and lives. Peter, even after the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost, did not immediately learn the fullest Christian fellowship (Acts x. 28, 34, 35). Paul, notwithstanding all his knowledge and Christian

[1] Sermons (First Series), p. 118, Shad. and Sub. of Sabbath.
[2] Beginnings of Christianity, p. 562.
[3] Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, Am. Theol. Review, Vol. iv. p. 306.
[4] Smith's Bible Dict., Art. "Easter," p. 637.

liberality, did not in his early ministry omit all ceremonies of circumsion, vows, and feasts (Acts xviii. 18, 21). Baxter likens Paul's temporary observance of the seventh day after that of the Lord's day commenced to his observance of circumcision, purification, and Pentecost after the new dispensation began.[1] It is evident from the writings of Origen,[2] Eusebius,[3] and other fathers, also from Neander's investigations,[4] that some ceremonies of Jewish feasts were for a long time mingled with the Christian festivals. Christian institutions commenced promptly; the Jewish only gradually disappeared. There having been no "explicit ordinance" for a change from Jewish ceremonies and institutions to the Christian ones, none need be expected for a change from the Jewish Sabbath to the Lord's day. Much was left to the evolution of Christian thought and experience.

5. The early fathers so sacredly regarded the Lord's day, and devoted it to so holy purposes, as to warrant the inference that it contains all the moral and unchangeable sabbatic elements. They derived their views from the apostles,—the earlier fathers directly, the later from the earlier. In answer to the seventh-day Sabbatarians we have seen that the early fathers without exception taught, *first*, the observance of the first day of the week, and, *secondly*, that the observance of the seventh day was not binding. In reply to the Lord's day non-Sabbath advocates we have seen that the fathers in rejecting the seventh-day Sabbath did not discard the moral elements of the original Sabbath. These three facts point to a fourth—that the Lord's day contains sabbatic elements. We now adduce further evidence of the same.

(1) The fathers frequently contrast the Lord's day with the Sabbath; contrast implies similarity; that similarity indicates sabbatic elements in the Lord's day. Many seem to have assumed that contrast implies so much dissimilarity as to indicate an utter difference. On the contrary, Alford says, "*Contrast* partakes of two ideas; that of *opposition* and

[1] Lord's Day, chap. vii. Arg. iv. Vol. xiii. p. 423.

[2] Against Celsus, book viii. chap. 22. [3] Church History, book v. chap. 23.

[4] Church History, Vol. i. pp. 294–302.

that of *comparison*."[1] Crabbe says, "Likeness in the quality and difference in the degree are requisite for a *comparison;* likeness in the degree and opposition in the quality are requisite for a *contrast*."[2] The Lord's day and the seventh day stand opposed to each other in respect to the day of the week, but are alike in respect to their sacred character. Being opposed to each other in time-element or "quality," and having "likeness" to each other in "degree" or sacredness of character, according to both Alford and Crabbe the two days may be both contrasted and compared, and yet in the former case not be utterly dissimilar. The contrast or the comparison will depend on the specific view at any time taken. Ignatius speaks of Christians as "No longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's day,"[3] which is a contrast of the two days with each other. Barnabas speaks of Christians as keeping the eighth day,[4] and of the Lord as abolishing Sabbaths,[5] so that they should be no longer kept, and of the two days as differing from each other,[6] all of which combined show a contrast of the two days, and yet imply a similarity. Justin Martyr gives Trypho the reasons why Christians do not observe Sabbaths,[7] and elsewhere relates how they observed Sunday,[8]—in substance a contrast. Bardesanes speaks of both the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's day, in one passage, as different institutions, observed by two classes, yet in each instance for the same religious end.[9] Tertullian speaks of the Sabbaths as once beloved of God,[10] and of the sacred rites of the Lord's day,[11] implying a religious purpose in each day, though in different eras. Origen expressly contrasts the two days with each other, giving the superiority to the Lord's day.[12] The elements of opposition in the contrast made by these and other patristic writers must have been difference of days in

[1] The Queen's English, p. 234.
[2] Synonyms, "Contrast."
[3] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. i. p. 180.
[4] Ibid., p. 128.
[5] Ibid., p. 103.
[6] Ibid., pp. 127, 128.
[7] Ibid., Vol. ii. p. 109.
[8] Ibid., pp. 65, 66.
[9] Spicilegium Syriacum, p. 32.
[10] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xi. p. 162.
[11] Ibid., Vol. xv. p. 428.
[12] Comm. Ex. Patrologiae, Tom. xii. p. 345.

the week, difference in the objects commemorated, and to some extent in services,—all of positive appointment. The elements of similarity must have been rest, holy convocation, study of the inspired word, worship of God,—all moral and enduring.

(2) Some of the fathers in effect even *compare* the two days, without contrasting them, so great is the similarity of the two in their conception. They all would have done it, doubtless, had not the discussions of that period been on the *differences* between the two institutions. Irenaeus speaks of the religious design of the Sabbaths,[1] and of that of the Lord's day.[2] Clement of Alexandria indicates that the seventh day in its time was sacred, and that the Lord's day is also.[3] Victorinus speaks of the original Sabbath as blessed and sanctified, and, in the same passage, of the Lord's day as the one now devoted to religious service. In his conception the design of the former in its time was similar to that of the latter in this time.[4] Athanasius, in his treatise on the Sabbath and circumcision, clearly teaches that the Sabbath commemorating the end of the old creation has passed by, and *in its place* has come the Lord's day commemorating the beginning of the new creation.[5] Elsewhere he says he compares the Lord's day with the Sabbath.[6] Augustine speaks of Christians as observing the Lord's day, and then says: "In the same way the fathers observed the rest of the Sabbath ..... because it was incumbent at that time."[7] He thought the two days were similar, both having religious purposes. Similar citations from other fathers might be made. When any of them speak of the Sabbath as devoted to rigid fasting, while the Lord's day is given to religious joy and praise, it is not of the original Sabbath, but of the seventh day after the Lord's day has taken its place. They sometimes consented to fasting on the seventh as a compro-

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. v. p. 422.
[2] Ibid., Vol. ix. pp. 162, 163.
[3] Ibid., Vol. ii. p. 284.
[4] Ibid., Vol. xviii. p. 390.
[5] Opera, Tom. ii. fol. pp. 55–59.
[6] Hom. vii, in Exod. v.
[7] Works (Clark's ed.), Vol. v. p. 324.

mise with Judaizing Christians, but intended not to observe it in the manner the Jews did. Victorinus even says, "Lest we should appear to observe any Sabbath with the Jews."[1] It is a restricted view that notes only the *differences* between the two days. Dr. Hessey says Clement recognized the Lord's day as a "Christian ordinance quite distinct from the Sabbath."[2] On such basis he and others regard the fourth commandment as obsolete. But the contrasts and comparisons made by the fathers between the two days indicate elements common to both and identical with the moral elements of the Sinaitic Sabbath. Commenting on Justin's reasons for calling the Lord's day first or chief, Dr. Hessey says he speaks of a "Christian ordinance on its own independent grounds."[3] Independent as to its positive elements, not as to its moral. Every day has something common with every other. The Sinaitic Sabbath and the Lord's day have common elements of *rest* and *worship*, though distinct from each other in time, and chiefly distinct in events commemorated, and partly in services. The Lord's day, in a sense, commemorates God's rest from his work of creation, as well as Christ's resurrection, because of its septennial element. The fathers kept this in mind and linked the day to the weekly division of time by making it a reminder of the beginning of creation. Anatolius probably had this in mind when he said, "On the Lord's day was it that light was shown to us in the beginning."[4] Gregory of Nyssa speaks of that day as commemorating both Christ's resurrection and the beginning of creation.[5] Gaudentius of Brescia speaks of it similarly.[6] Socrates, the historian, distinctly notes the weekly occurrence of the Lord's day.[7]

(3) The fathers employed ideas and phraseology descriptive of the Lord's day which they borrowed from thoughts and language descriptive of the Sabbath. Dionysius says,

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xviii. p. 390. [2] Sunday, p. 46. [3] Ibid., p. 44.
[4] Ant. Nic Lib., Vol. xiv. p. 420.
[5] In Christ. Res.; Opera, fol. Colon. Agrip., p. 454.
[6] Biblioth. Veterum Patrum, p. 945, De Paschae, Tract 1.
[7] Greek Eccl. Hist., Vol. iii. p. 436, book vi. chap. viii.

"To-day we kept the Lord's *holy* (ἁγίαν) day."[1] His descriptive word has the same root that the Septuagint employs in the fourth commandment: "To keep it holy;" the same that it employs in Isaiah (lviii. 13): "my holy day." Dionysius gives the same idea of sacredness to the Lord's day that he found given in the Old Testament to the Sabbath; and Eusebius, copying his expression, does not dissent from it. Athanasius speaks of the command to keep the Sabbath, and then says, "So (οὕτως) we *honor* the Lord's day."[2] He borrows the idea of veneration for the first day from that given the seventh on Sinai. The Council of Laodicea says, "Christians ought not to Judaize, and be at ease on the Sabbath, but to work on that day, and, giving the chief honor to the Lord's day," etc.[3] The implication is that the honor formerly given the Sabbath should now be given the Lord's day. Theodoret speaks of Christians as consecrating, sanctifying (χαθιερουοί), the Lord's day;[4] and though condemning the Ebionites for doing it in connection with their observance of the Sabbath at that time, it is evidently the same kind of consecration as that formerly given to the Sinaitic Sabbath. Augustine speaks of the Sabbath as a "figure" of the "spiritual rest,"[5] and elsewhere of the Lord's day as "prefiguring the eternal repose."[6] Conceiving of both days as figures of the same glorious state, he must have derived that of the Lord's day from that of the Sabbath. Eusebius entitles the ninety-first (ninety-second of our version) psalm "A psalm of singing for the Sabbath day"; then shows that there is a like provision under the new dispensation, and that spending the Lord's day spiritually is like observing the Sabbath of old spiritually.[7] In his view the spiritual character of the Lord's day is accordant with, and

[1] Patrologiae, Euseb. Eccl. Hist., book iv. chap. 23.

[2] Patrologiae, Athan. Tom. iv. 6, p. 138, de Sab. and Cir. 4.

[3] Council Laod., Canon 29; Morris's Lib. of the Fathers; St. Ephrem, p. 391, note.

[4] Patrologiae, Theodoret, Tom. iv, Haeret. Fabulor. Lib., ii. 1.

[5] Letter, lv. c. 12. 22. [6] Works, City of God, book xxii. 30.

[7] Patrologiae, Euseb. Com. on Ps. xci.

copied from, that of the original Sabbath. *Objection:* Eusebius does not identify the Lord's day with the Sabbath.[1] *Reply:* It is not necessary for the present argument that he should. We look for *moral* elements common to the two days. They could not be identical, because their positive elements are of necessity different. *Objection Second:* Eusebius does not "build the observance of the Lord's day on the fourth commandment."[2] *Reply:* Enough that he claims the Lord's day as religious and the chief of days, and does not, with Dr. Hessey and some other modern authors, suppose or pronounce the fourth commandment obsolete. When it is considered that the early Christians from the first made the Lord's day religious, and that it was septennial, like the weekly religious day in the old dispensation, it would naturally be expected that sabbatic thought and language would become associated with the first day of the week. That tendency we find developed more and more as the centuries increase. It proves that some essential elements of the two days are alike.

(4) The early fathers, though not designing any such analysis and distinction, rejected from the Lord's day the positive elements, and retained for it the moral elements, of the Jewish Sabbath. They did a like thing relative to the original Sabbath as separate from peculiarly Jewish rules and provisions. They aimed to discard all that was merely Jewish, not as always evil, but now superseded. They refused longer to accept the seventh day as first and chief. They rejected the animal sacrifices appointed for the Jewish Sabbath. The Jewish sabbatic penalties they would not transfer to the Lord's day. They early dropped the Jewish method of reckoning the civil day from evening to evening, and adopted the Roman, from midnight to midnight. They discarded also all the Pharisaic and Rabbinical prohibitions respecting the Jewish Sabbath. But, on the other hand, they preserved the weekly division of time. One day in seven they turned aside from their usual worldly occupations,

[1] Hessey, Sunday, p. 301.

[2] Ibid., p. 300.

rested from them, and held religious services. They put their most valued religious services on the first day, as the Jews did theirs on the seventh. Many Christians, dependent for employment on Jews and heathen, could not observe the Lord's day to their own satisfaction, but the Christian desire and purpose found expression in the writings of bishops, the decrees of councils, and the edicts of emperors, at last. There is unity in all moral elements, and those of the Jews' sacred day entered into that of the Christians, and there received addition in the commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection.

But objectors cite the language of the fathers where they liken the Judaizing observance of the seventh day in their time to the vain observance of the Sabbath by formal and heartless Jews in the prophets' time. This they deem proof that the Sabbath is no more. *Reply:* The fathers rejected merely the Jewish Sabbath, and observed the moral elements of the real Sabbath in the Lord's day. The Jews of their time, alike with the formalist Jews of the prophets' time, were busy with the mutable positive, while the acceptable worshippers of each age absorbed the moral elements. The Jewish positive was no more; the moral of both the original and the Jewish continued. That God would not accept the Sabbaths of the Pharisaic Jews in the prophets' time is no proof that the fourth commandment is abrogated; and that the fathers would not sanction and copy the Judaistic observance of the seventh day after the Lord's day was made sacred to Christians is no evidence that the original Sabbath is wholly abolished, or that the fathers thought it wholly abolished.

(5) The fathers recognized the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law, and regarded the former as inabrogable, and therefore we may well expect to find the moral elements of the fourth commandment in some form in the Lord's day. Barnabas says, "Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord."[1] Justin Martyr speaks of law

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. i. p. 131.

as "abrogated," but it was the ceremonial, because succeeded by "the new covenant."[1] He also speaks of the moral law under the term "two commandments" in which Christ "summed up all righteousness,"[2] and of that "righteousness" as "eternal,"[3] which implies that the moral law is eternal and inabrogable. Irenaeus says, "The Lord did not abrogate the natural [precepts] of the law."[4] "Preparing man for this life, the Lord himself did speak in his own person to all alike the words of the decalogue; and, therefore, in like manner do they remain permanently with us, receiving, by means of his advent in the flesh, extension and increase, but not abrogation. . . . . He has increased and widened those laws which are natural, and noble, and common to all."[5] Clement of Alexandria teaches that the Mosaic law was the source of all moral truths[6]—the imperishable law; yet one law "was only temporary,"—the ceremonial, the "shadow of Christ."[7] Tertullian speaks of the "primordial law of God . . . . . given to Adam and Eve in paradise," and "to all nations the selfsame law";[8] also of "a law temporal and a law eternal, formally declared";[9] and of the suppression or abolition of law which was the sacrificial and ceremonial;[10] and of the law which prefigured Christ, and was replaced by the gospel.[11] Cyprian: The prophets foretold the abolition of the old and the giving of a new law,—the typical, pertaining to Christ and the new covenant;[12] Theophilus: The "great and wonderful law, which tends to all righteousness,"[13]—eternal and permanent; The Clementine Homilies: The original law, perpetual to all, and cannot be abrogated;[14] The Apostolical Constitutions: The "law, complete in ten commands, ... is never to fail"; the "additional precepts"—ceremonial — Christ "abolished,"

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. ii. p. 100.
[2] Ibid., p. 147.
[3] Ibid., p 217.
[4] Ibid., Vol. v. p. 412.
[5] Ibid., pp. 424, 425.
[6] Ibid., Vol. xii. p. 47.
[7] Ibid., Vol. iv. pp. 153, 154.
[8] Ibid., Vol. xviii pp. 203, 204.
[9] Ibid., p. 215.
[10] Ibid., p. 216.
[11] Ibid., Vol. vii. pp. 436, 437.
[12] Ibid., Vol. xiii. pp. 86, 87.
[13] Ibid., Vol. iii. p. 115.
[14] Ibid., Vol. xvii. p. 141.

but he confirmed the "decalogue";[1] Archelaus: The law of Moses is established, and is consonant with the law of Christ;[2] Augustine: A law which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil; parts of a law were in Christ fulfilled and removed.[3] The foregoing testimony shows that the early fathers do not justify modern fathers or sons in saying that the fourth commandment is obsolete. They imply, on the contrary, that the decalogue in general and the whole moral law remain. Though rejecting the Jewish Sabbath in their time, they do not assume to reject the fourth commandment proclaimed at Sinai. They evidently are not clear in their apprehension of the whole subject, but they cannot find a heart to discard even one of God's commandments. *Objection:* Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia, A.D. 367, and Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 412, say that the Sabbath was abolished.[4] *Reply:* Neither says that the fourth commandment was abolished. *Reply Second:* Both have in mind the positive Jewish Sabbath as contrasted with the Lord's day. That Sabbath *was* abolished; but that was not the whole of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; it was only a small part of it. Epiphanius argued that the Lord's day was established by the apostles; that there was no sacredness in the Sinaitic seventh day which forbade transacting secularities upon it, if religiously called for, as he says, the march around Jericho and the sacrifices in the temple on the Sabbath fully testify.[5] His aim was to justify observing the Lord's day and not observing the seventh day. Cyril had the same object.[6] Even Dr. Hessey admits that it was the Sabbath as an "observance" which Cyril pronounced abolished. His debate was with the Judaizing Christians. He attempted to show that their demands that believers should observe the seventh day were unjustifiable. Neither of them pronounced a tenth part of the decalogue obsolete. Dr. Hessey does not claim that they did. *Reply*

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xvii. pp. 163, 166. [2] Ibid., Vol. xx. p. 368.
[3] Works, Manich. Heresy, pp. 321, 323. [4] Hessey on Sunday, pp. 71, 79.
[5] Epiphanius, Adv. Haer., xxx, Opera, Tom. i. pp. 158, 159.
[6] Cyril, in Esaiam, Tom. ii. Lib. v. p. 790.

Third: Whatever these fathers may have said, they lived, one of them nearly two hundred and the other nearly two hundred and fifty years subsequent to Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178, who, removed only three fourths of a century from the apostle John, declared that the "words of the decalogue" by the advent of Christ received "extension and increase, but not abrogation."

Objection Second: Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, A.D 420 or 423, says, "The Sabbath was not an institution of nature but a matter of positive precept."[1] *Reply:* He, too, is speaking of the positive Jewish Sabbath,[2] the observance of which some men of his time would impose upon all Christians. We do not find that he denied that there were moral elements in the Sabbath of the decalogue. We do not hear him say that Christ abolished such moral elements. If we did hear it, we hear the wise Irenaeus saying two hundred and fifty years earlier than Theodoret, that Jesus Christ "has increased and widened those laws which are natural, and noble, and common to all"; that the "words of the decalogue ..... remain permanently." Victorinus speaks of a Sabbath which Christ in "his body abolished."[3] But examination shows that he has in mind only the Jewish seventh day in the time of the new dispensation.

(6) The fathers recognized a perpetuity in the original holy Sabbath, and in the Lord's day a sacredness which by its nature must also be perpetual; and we may, therefore, so far as they are authority, identify elements of the former day in those of the latter. Justin Martyr speaks of the "perpetual Sabbath."[4] There were, then, sabbatic elements which would not be abolished. The spirit of holiness taught by one holy day in the week should be made to pervade all days. But Justin did not mean that there is now no special weekly religious day, for he has taught us more of it and its services than any other patristic writer. The elements of the "perpetual Sabbath" were especially embodied in the

[1] Hessey on Sunday, p. 80.
[2] Theod. in Ezeck. chap. xx.
[3] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xviii. p. 390.
[4] Ibid., Vol. ii. p. 101.

"Sunday" which he describes. Tertullian tells us of a Sabbath "temporal" and of one "eternal." The former is "of the seventh day,"[1] of the letter, the outward, which the Jews were so careful to observe. Underlying it is the spirit of the Sabbath, and that is "eternal." When Tertullian enjoins deferring our business on the Lord's day,[2] he involves in it somewhat of the eternal Sabbath. His conception of the eternal would not allow him to say that the whole soul of the fourth commandment was abolished. Perpetuity is embraced in his idea of the "Creator's Sabbaths,"[3] and also the idea of man's proper observance of them. Irenaeus wrote of the Sabbaths as teaching the continual service of God.[4] Though the Jewish seventh days have passed by, the real Sabbath is in some sense teaching and therefore existing still. Its special outward manifestation now is in the Lord's day. There is a Sabbath as inabrogable as the moral law. A mere formal observance of the Lord's day does not reach it, but a spiritual observance does. The Lord's day is a teacher of the true rest still. As Augustine says, it prefigures the eternal repose.[5] The seventh-day Sabbath was based, in the fourth commandment, on the "eternal" Sabbath. The Lord's day, having divine appointment and a like design and observance, has the same basis. But when the fathers speak of a localized sabbatic institution, having "Sabbath" for its usual name, it is the seventh-day Sabbath, which they regarded as "temporal" and not "eternal."

(7) The doctrine was set forth among the early fathers and their contemporaries that the fourth commandment, or real Sabbath, was not abolished, whatever the changes, and though the first day was observed, and the seventh was not. It is reputed that the presbyter Diodorus writes to Bishop Archelaus, A.D. 277, that one Manes in his vicinage is teaching heresy. He reports him as, among other things, citing the punishment under Moses' law for gathering sticks on the

1 Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xviii. p. 212.
2 Ibid., Vol. xi. p. 199.
3 Ibid., Vol. vii. p. 220.
4 Ibid., Vol. v. p. 422.
5 Works, City of God, book xxii. 30.

Sabbath as inconsistent with Christ's healing a cripple and allowing his disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath. Archelaus in replying to Manes describes his error as an "effort directed to prove that the law of Moses is not consistent with the law of Christ," and says: "As to the assertion that the Sabbath has been abolished, we deny that he has abolished it plainly (*plane*), for he was himself also Lord of the Sabbath. And this (the law's relation to the Sabbath) was like the servant who has charge of the bridegroom's couch, who prepares the same with all carefulness, and does not suffer it to be disturbed or touched by any stranger, but keeps it intact against the time of the bridegroom's arrival, so that when he is come the bed may be used as it pleases himself, or as it is granted to those to use it whom he has bidden enter along with him."[1] This passage occurs in the "Acts of a Disputation" said to have been held by Archelaus with Manes. Its authenticity is not positively traceable to Archelaus. But if not his, and not dating in the third century, Beausobre is probably correct in ascribing these "Acts" to some Greek writer of the fourth century.[2] And Neander no doubt correctly remarks that there is in them "much in the representation of the doctrine which wears the appearance of truth."[3] This passage on the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, written in the third or fourth century, certainly indicates a view held thus early, and we deduce from it the following: (1) Christ could abolish or change the Sabbath; (2) The law kept the Sabbath for him till he came, and then he did with it what he would; (3) One thing he did not do, —he did not abolish it; (4) The Sabbath therefore in some sense remains, though Christians keep the first and not the seventh day.

In respect to this, as with some other subjects, there are distinctions not readily seen, which are yet so important that error will result unless they are perceived. Luther failed to

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xx. p. 373.
[2] Smith's Dict., Christ. Biography, Archelaus.
[3] Church History (ed. 1852), Vol. i. p. 485.

see clearly the distinction between works as a means of self-righteousness and works as a necessary fruit of justifying faith, and hence he rejected the Epistle of James from the canon of inspired books. Some modern writers do not distinguish clearly between a system of law,—moral, typical, and ceremonial—as the way and means of acceptance with God, and law—moral merely—as the expression of the divine pleasure under a system of grace, and hence do not perceive that law in the latter sense is never repealed. And some, failing to bear in mind the difference between the merely positive Judaic Sabbath and the moral-positive Sinaitic or Adamic institution, and seeing evidence in Scripture and the patristic writings of the abrogation of the former, erroneously conclude that both are abrogated, and that therefore the fourth commandment is entirely obsolete. This last error has done much to break down the divine order of sacred time.

Augustine distinctly teaches that the fourth commandment is not abolished. He says, "'Observe the Sabbath day' is enjoined on us more than on them, because it is commanded to be spiritually observed. For the Jews observe the Sabbath in a servile manner, using it for luxuriousness and drunkenness. How much better would their women be employed in spinning wool than in dancing on that day in the balconies? God forbid, brethren, that we should call that an observance of the Sabbath. The Christian observes the Sabbath spiritually, abstaining from servile work. For what is it to abstain from servile work? From sin. And how prove we it? Ask the Lord: 'Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.' Therefore is the spiritual observance of the Sabbath enjoined upon us. Now all those commandments are more enjoined on us, and are to be observed: 'Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery,'" etc.[1] It was merely the outward observance of the seventh day that Augustine considered annulled, not its

[1] "Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel according to St. John," Vol. i. p. 39; Tractate, iii. sec. 19 (Edinburgh ed. 1873).

spiritual teaching or moral elements. We need not be circumscribed or limited by his philosophy as to the observance of the fourth commandment. Our one point now is, he did not deem it abolished, but still in force, with the single exception of outwardly keeping the seventh day. He makes no allusion to any contrary opinion among the early fathers or Christians. The language of the other fathers is entirely consistent with his view. It follows, therefore, that Drs. Hessey, Hopkins, F. W. Robertson, and many others, who have inferred the abrogation of the fourth commandment from the patristic writings, have made a wrong deduction in respect to that vital question.

Calvin held the same view that Augustine did, and perhaps derived it from him. He says, "Besides, the Sabbath, although its external observation is not now in use, still remains eternal in its reality, like circumcision...... They [the Jews] calumniate us falsely, as if we disregarded the Sabbath; because there is nothing which more completely confirms its reality and substance than the abolition of its external use."[1] It is plain from this that Calvin would by no means countenance the idea that the fourth commandment is abolished. Let it not be claimed that Calvin held what Dr. Hessey says the fathers taught, that the Lord's day is a "Christian ordinance, quite distinct from the Sabbath."[2] For Calvin teaches that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and thus has some obligation for all men; that it has a moral nature, since it belongs to the decalogue, which he denominates the "moral law"; that the fourth commandment binds men in "every age" to religious services on stated days, and to rest from labor; that the early Christians properly "substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath," and that we should follow that order.[3] He also held that the specific seventh-day Sabbath had a typical or ceremonial character, which shadowed forth spiritual rest,

[1] On Fourth Commandment, Ex. xxxi. 13; Harmony of Pentateuch (Edinburgh ed. 1853), Vol. ii. p. 444.

[2] Sunday, p. 46.

[3] Institutes, book ii. chap. viii.

and that in that respect it was abolished with the other types. Yet in that abrogation the fourth commandment as a whole was not abolished. His co-laborers in the Reformation generally agreed with him. Luther says, "I believe that the apostles transferred the Sabbath to Sunday, otherwise no man would have been so audacious as to dare to do it."[1]

(8) It was taught among the fathers that the Lord's day under the new covenant actually took the place, in substance, of the seventh-day Sabbath under the old covenant. When Tertullian teaches that the observance of the seventh day was to be temporary, and that business and labor ought to be suspended on the Lord's day; when Athanasius says we ought to honor the Lord's day even as it was commanded to keep the Sabbath; when Augustine speaks of both the Sabbath and the Lord's day as figures of the heavenly rest, they all plainly regard the Lord's day as legitimately occupying the place of the Sinaitic Sabbath. But Eusebius, of eminent learning, who must have known the testimony and practice of the two preceding centuries, is fullest on this point. In his commentary on the ninety-second psalm, entitled "A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath Day," he says, "Wherefore as they [the Jews] rejected it [the sabbatic command], the Word [Christ] by the new covenant translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, viz. the saving Lord's day, the first [day] of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death, and passed the portals of heaven, having achieved a work superior to the six days' creation...... On this day, which is the first day of light and of the true sun, we assemble after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths, even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, and do those things according to the spiritual law which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath;

[1] Tischreden, Luther's Works (Erlangen ed. 60), p. 388; Pres. Valentine, D.D. "Is the Lord's day only a human ordinance?" p. 27.

for we make spiritual offerings and sacrifices, which are called sacrifices of praise and rejoicing; we make incense of a good odor to ascend, as it is written, 'Let my prayer come up before thee as incense,'..... and all things, whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has a precedence, and is first in rank and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath; wherefore it is delivered to us that we should meet together on this day, and it is ordered that we should do those things announced in this psalm."[1] Eusebius here teaches, (1) That Christ or his apostles translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the Lord's day; (2) That the early Christians on the Lord's days celebrated holy and spiritual Sabbaths, such as were enjoined under the old dispensation; (3) That they on that day presented unto God spiritual offerings and sacrifices in place of the ceremonial ones required of priests and people under the Jewish law; (4) That they transferred to the Lord's day all the duties, in substance, which formerly belonged to the seventh-day Sabbath; (5) That they were divinely directed to make this change of duties and services from the seventh to the first day of the week. He must have held that the Lord's day contained the chief sabbatic elements. *Objection:* Dr. Hessey says on this commentary, "Such is the passage in Eusebius of which so much has been recently made, as if it identified the Sabbath and the Lord's day. It really does nothing of the kind, but is only a strong instance of that resort to the analogy of the Jewish law."[2] *Reply:* We do not claim that it "identifies" the two days, but in substance identifies the moral elements of the two days; that it teaches that the Lord's day under the new covenant takes in substance the place of the seventh day under the old covenant, it is the Christian Sabbath, and in respect to moral elements has the authority of the fourth commandment.

[1] Patrologiae Graecae, Tom. xxiii. pp. 1170, 1171; Stuart's Translation in Gurney on the Sabbath. Appendix B.

[2] Sunday, notes, p. 301.

(9) It seems that the idea and even the name "Sabbath" was applied by one of the fathers to the Lord's day, near the close of the second century, about one hundred years after the last of the apostles. Clement of Alexandria, widely known and highly influential in his time, commenting on the fourth commandment says, "The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest,—abstraction from ills,—preparing for the primal day, our true rest; which, in truth, is the first creation of light, in which all things are viewed and possessed. . . . . . The discourse has turned on the seventh and the eighth. For the eighth may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the latter [the eighth] properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work."[1] Among Clement's thoughts are these: (1) There is a near relation and clear similarity between the seventh day and the first, or "eighth"; (2) The first day of the week is analogous to the first of creation; (3) In the new dispensation the seventh day in a sense becomes the sixth, "a day of work," and the eighth becomes the seventh, a day of "rest"; (4) The first or "eighth" day has sabbatic endowments, might "properly" be termed the "Sabbath," and "possibly" will yet be so named. Such thoughts, being in Clement's mind and writings, were certainly entertained in that early age by others. The primitive Christians, having certainly perceived the likeness between the seventh and Lord's day, must have also seen that the name of the former —Sabbath—would in many respects be suitable as a name of the latter, except that it already had a better one, in their conception. *Objection:* "It is not certain that Clement refers directly to the eighth *day*. The word for day does not appear in the original." *Reply:* The word "day,"— "seventh day,"—had been previously used in the same section; the passage is distinctly on the fourth commandment, and therefore "day" may well be supposed to be understood, especially as Clement speaks of the "seventh" as a "working,"—day for work. *Objection Second:* "The meaning

[1] Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. xii. p. 386.

may be that under the gospel dispensation the Christian has a true rest, or Sabbath." *Reply:* Clement is speaking of particular numbers,—seventh and eighth,—and not expressly of dispensations or of Christian privileges. Those numbers have no significance here unless they refer to days, nor the days any significance unless the writer has the conception that the "eighth" or first day of the week is in substance a "Sabbath," and might yet be called, or even proved to be, such. *Objection Third:* "The use of the passage to support an authoritative transfer of the ancient Sabbath to the Lord's day is hazardous." *Reply:* It is not proposed to use it for an "authoritative transfer," but to show that the early fathers recognized sabbatic elements in the Lord's day, and were very far from saying that the fourth commandment was void because the seventh-day observance was no longer binding. We have aimed to show that the fathers' testimony does not forbid finding a basis for the Lord's day in the fourth commandment. We claim to have shown that Scripture does not forbid it. Therefore the fourth commandment asserts its own demand, subject only to such modification as the New Testament gives. There we find an absolute release from the observance of the seventh day (Col. ii. 16), and in its place the privilege and obligation to observe the Lord's day. The appeal to patristical lore is to interpret and confirm the New Testament instruction. In the writings of the fathers we find ample proof that the Lord's day in that age was kept "holy," though not according to all Judaic sabbatic rules. The commandment itself has not varied its demand for holiness. Clement's reflections above given show that in his mind was doubtless the same thought that naturally has come to many other minds in the centuries past, and comes to many still,—the Lord's day does in substance take the place of the seventh day in the fourth of the Sinaitic commandments.

But why is there so great importance in finding a basis for Sabbath observance in the fourth commandment, and in holding tenaciously to that basis? Because, (1) If such is God's revealed will it is transgression and peril to disregard it. (2) It gives the most consistent and beautiful array of divine truth. On any other theory the fourth commandment stands mutilated in the most wonderful body of laws that ever existed among men. That commandment made whole accords with the fact that a day of rest was set apart and hallowed from the close of creation, and with the evidence that such a day was given for the observance of mankind previous to the existence of the Jewish nation. The divine common law, or law of precedent, in which the ante-Mosaic Sabbath was based, might be expected to receive expression in some divine statute like that of the decalogue, and that statute might be expected to continue. By divine common law, in distinction from divine statute, the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath, has its authority in the new dispensation. This doctrine of the continuity of sacred time from the beginning, based in both the divine law of precedent and the decalogue, accords best with the importance of the Sabbath and the welfare of men. (3) We may know *a priori* that human nature needs to anchor to the firm foundation of God's commandments. (4) History tells us that wherever the doctrine of the abrogation of the fourth commandment has found sway, there Sabbath desecration has been the sure result. The Jews ever disregarded and despised the Sabbath unless confronted with the divine sabbatic requirements. Many who condemned the principles of the Puritan Sabbath acknowledged its conservative and healthful influence. Many noted men who have advocated the theories of the European continental Sabbath have mourned over their evil fruits, and have in the comparison admired and desired the purer American Sabbath when free from foreign embarrassments and corruptions. Man left to his own free will, without the divine will, is sure to go astray. Therefore we should enthrone forever the whole moral law, the moral elements of the fourth commandment with all the rest. We must choose whether to regard them as void or binding. Who, with fair and full consideration, can accept the former alternative?