

1362. Sabbath—as Defined by Karlstadt

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* (“Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays”) (1524), chap. 1, unpag. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt’s *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47, No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

Sabbath is a Hebrew or Jewish word and signifies to stop working or to rest ... and means nothing else than a rest day in which created things are to rest. Behold how God created and worked in six days and rested on the seventh. Likewise man is to work six days and rest and be idle on the seventh. From this it follows that we are not allowed to celebrate created spirits, such as angels and saints. For the holiday is a rest day of God, our majesty. The Lord only is our God and Master and no angel or saint is our Lord or God.

1363. Sabbath—Catholic Catechism on “Third” Commandment

SOURCE: *This We Believe* (rev. ed. of the *Baltimore Catechism No. 3*), pp. 189–193. Copyright 1957 by Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington. Used by permission.

[p. 189] 234. *What is the third commandment of God?*

The third commandment of God is: Remember thou keep holy the Lord’s day.

(a) The obligation to worship God is imposed on all men by the natural law. Man is obliged to adore and to thank God for His continuous blessings. Since the nature of man makes it impossible for him actually to express his adoration and his thanks continuously, reason dictates that certain times be specified for this purpose. God defined more exactly how man is to fulfill this obligation by His divine precept given in the Old Testament.

Scripture

“On the sixth day God finished the work he had been doing. And he rested on the seventh day from all work he had done. God blessed the seventh day and made it holy because on it he rested from all his work of creation” (Genesis 2:2–3).

“Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days you may labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD, your God. No work may be done then either by you, or your son or your daughter, or your male or female slave, or your beast, or by the alien who lives with you. In six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is them; but on the seventh day he rested. That is why the LORD has blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy” (Exodus 20:8–11).

“Take care to keep holy the Sabbath day as the LORD, your God, commanded you. Six days you may labor and do all your work; but the seventh [p. 190] day is the Sabbath of the LORD, your God” (Deuteronomy 5:12–14).

235. *Why does the Church command us to keep Sunday as the Lord’s day?*

The Church commands us to keep Sunday as the Lord’s day, because on Sunday Christ rose from the dead, and on Sunday the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles.

(a) The early Church changed the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday on the authority given to it by Christ. The New Testament makes no explicit mention that the apostles changed the day of worship, but we know it from Tradition.

236. *What are we commanded by the third commandment?*

By the third commandment we are commanded to worship God in a special manner on Sunday, the Lord’s day.

Scripture

“Therefore, you must keep the Sabbath as something sacred. Whoever desecrates it shall be put to death. If anyone does work on that day, he must be rooted out of his people. Six days there are for doing work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of complete rest, sacred to the LORD” (Exodus 31:14–15).

237. How does the Church command us to worship God on Sunday?

The Church commands us to worship God on Sunday by assisting at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

- [p. 191] (a) Catholics who have reached the age of seven years and have sufficient use of reason are bound under pain of mortal sin to hear Mass on Sunday.
- (b) To satisfy the obligation to assist at Mass on Sunday a person must actually be present at the place where Mass is celebrated. If he cannot enter the church because it is overcrowded, he can still hear Mass provided he is part of the assembly assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. A person who is a notable distance from the worshipers certainly is not bodily present at Mass.
- (c) A person should be present for the entire Mass, from the beginning to the last Gospel. It is a venial sin to miss even slight part of a Mass of obligation deliberately and a mortal sin to miss a notable part. The obligation to assist at Mass is not fulfilled if the Consecration or the Communion is missed. The obligation can be fulfilled by hearing parts of two or more Masses in succession, provided one is present for both the Consecration and the Communion of the same Mass.
- (d) To fulfill the obligation to assist at Mass a person must have at least an implicit intention of hearing Mass and must [p. 192] advert, at least in a vague way, to the celebration of the Mass. It would be a mortal sin if he paid no attention at all to the principal parts of the Mass at which he assisted on Sunday. A person is obliged under pain of venial sin to avoid deliberate distractions during Mass and to take ordinary care to assist attentively and in a becoming manner.
- (e) The Mass offers us an opportunity to gain great spiritual benefits, and the more frequently and more devoutly we hear Mass, the more grace we can obtain. Ordinarily the best way to hear Mass is to unite with the priest and follow him in reciting the prayers of the Mass.
- (f) A grave inconvenience to oneself or to another excuses one from the obligation to hear Mass on Sundays and holy-days.

238. What is forbidden by the third commandment of God?

By the third commandment of God all unnecessary servile work on Sunday is forbidden.

239. What is servile work?

Servile work is that which requires labor of body rather than of mind.

- (a) Farming, mechanical and industrial labor, and business transactions are forbidden even though one does them for [p. 193] pleasure and without any gain. Reading, writing, typewriting, studying, drawing, painting, embroidering, playing music, traveling, hunting, fishing, and the like are not servile works even though they may require considerable bodily exertion.
- (b) The obligation to avoid servile work on Sunday is grave, and therefore, its violation is a mortal sin if one works for a notable time.

240. When is servile work allowed in Sunday?

Servile work is allowed on Sunday when the honor of God, our own need, or that of our neighbor requires it.

- (a) It is permissible on Sunday to do work directly concerned with divine worship; to perform necessary household duties which cannot conveniently be anticipated or deferred; to take personal care of the sick; and to do work required for the common good or necessary for one's own livelihood.

1364. Sabbath, Catholic Dedication of, to Mary

SOURCE: Dom Louis Gougoud, *Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1927]), p. 69. Used by permission. [FRS No. 132.]

St Peter Damian, one of those who aided most the spread of Mariology in the eleventh century, expresses the same thought in the following manner: "Sabbath signifies rest, for one reads that God himself rested on that day. It is not then fitting that the same day should be dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, in whom the divine Wisdom chose its abode, and rested as on a couch of holiness?"

[EDITORS' NOTE: The "Divine Office" of the Virgin Mary in the Roman breviary is performed on every Saturday except at certain times during the year when other ritual for specific observances supersedes it. See *A Catholic Dictionary* (3d ed.), ed. by Donald Attwater, p. 310.]

1365. Sabbath—Catholic View on Time Element in Sabbath Command

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 397–399. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 397] The point of difference is evident. The other Commandments of the Decalogue are precepts of the natural law, obligatory at all times and unalterable. Hence, after the abrogation of the Law of Moses, all the Commandments contained in the two tables are observed by Christians, not indeed because their observance is commanded by Moses, but because they are in conformity with nature which dictates obedience to them.

This Commandment about the observance of the Sabbath, on the other hand, considered as to the time appointed for its fulfillment, is not fixed and unalterable, but susceptible of change, and belongs not to the moral, but the ceremonial law. Neither is it a principle of the natural law; we are not instructed by nature to [p. 398] give external worship to God on that day, rather than on any other. And in fact the Sabbath was kept holy only from the time of the liberation of the people of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh. The observance of the Sabbath was to be abrogated at the same time as the other Hebrew rites and ceremonies, that is, at the death of Christ. Having been, as it were, images which foreshadowed the light and the truth, these ceremonies were to disappear at the coming of that light and truth, which is Jesus Christ...

The Apostles therefore resolved to consecrate the first day of the week to the divine worship, and called it *the Lord's day*. [p. 399] St. John in the Apocalypse makes mention of *the Lord's day*; and the Apostle commands collections to be made *on the first day of the week*, that is, according to the interpretation of St. Chrysostom, on the Lord's day. From all this we learn that even then the Lord's day was kept holy in the Church.

1366. Sabbath, Christ and

SOURCE: W. D. Killen, *The Ancient Church* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1883), pp. 188, 189.

[p. 188] It has often been asserted that, during His own ministry, our Saviour encouraged His disciples to violate the Sabbath, and thus prepared the way for its abolition. But this theory is as destitute of foundation as it is dangerous to morality. Even the ceremonial law continued binding till Jesus expired upon the cross; and He felt it to

be His duty to attend to every jot and tittle of its appointments. Thus it became Him “to fulfil all righteousness.” He is at pains to show that the acts of which the Pharisees complained as breaches of the Sabbath could be vindicated by Old Testament authority; and that these formalists “condemned *the guiltless*,” when they denounced the disciples as doing that which was unlawful. Jesus never transgressed either the letter or the spirit of any commandment pertaining to the holy rest; but superstition had added to the written law a multitude of minute observances; and every Israelite was at perfect liberty to neglect any or all of these frivolous regulations.

The Great Teacher never intimated that the Sabbath was a ceremonial ordinance to cease with the Mosaic ritual. It was instituted when our first parents were in Paradise; and the precept enjoining its remembrance, being a portion of the Decalogue, is of perpetual obligation. Hence, instead of regarding it as a merely Jewish institution, Christ declares that it “was made for MAN,” or, in other words, that it was designed for the benefit of the whole human family. Instead of anticipating its extinction along with the ceremonial law, He speaks of its existence after the downfall of Jerusalem. When He announces the calamities connected with the ruin of the holy city, He instructs His followers to pray that the urgency of the catastrophe may not deprive them of the comfort of the ordinances of the sacred rest. “Pray ye,” said he, “that your [p. 189] flight be not in the winter, *neither on the Sabbath-day*.”

1367. Sabbath, Christ’s Attitude Toward

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, *The Ten Commandments* (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 50.

Much has been made of the attitude of Christ in speech and deed toward the Sabbath. Some have imagined that by words He uttered and by deeds He did He relaxed the binding nature of the old command. This view, however, is to absolutely misunderstand and misinterpret the doing and the teaching of Jesus.

1368. Sabbath, Christ’s Custom of Observing

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, p. 25. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

Jesus observed the Sabbath Day of his own people. It was his “custom” to worship in the synagogues on the Sabbath Day. After he entered upon his own ministry, he and his followers continued to recognize and use the Sabbath Day, but according to his own individual and spiritual insight and interpretation. Even when Sabbath observance was made one of the chief grounds of bitter antagonism to him by the Pharisees he continued his recognition of the Sabbath and uttered no word that can properly be construed as lacking in deep reverence. Apparently, he expected that his followers would continue to hold and inculcate the spirit of the historic Sabbath.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian’s LORD’S Day.]

1369. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of—Custom Widely Spread in Josephus’ Day

SOURCE: Josephus *Against Apion* ii. 39; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 405, 407. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 96.]

[p. 405] And there is not [p. 407] one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread, and where the fasts and the lighting of lamps and many of our prohibitions in the matter of food are not observed.

1370. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of, Evening to Evening, Announced by Priest's Trumpet

SOURCE: Josephus *War* iv. 9. 12; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 171, 173. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] The last was erected above the roof of the priests' chambers, at the point where it was the custom for [p. 173] one of the priests to stand and to give notice, by sound of trumpet, in the afternoon of the approach, and on the following evening of the close, of every seventh day, announcing to the people the respective hours for ceasing work and for resuming their labours.

1371. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of, From Evening to Evening

SOURCE: Agatharchides, quoted in Josephus *Against Apion* i. 22; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 247, 249. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 247] The people known as Jews, who inhabit the most strongly fortified of cities, called by the natives Jerusalem, have a custom of abstaining from work every seventh day; on those occasions [p. 249] they neither bear arms nor take any agricultural operations in hand, or engage in any other form of public service, but pray with outstretched hands in the temples until the evening.

1372. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of—Study of the Law

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xvi. 2. 3, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 325.

The seventh day we set apart from labor; it is dedicated to the learning of our customs and laws, we thinking it proper to reflect on them, as well as on any [good] thing else, in order to our avoiding of sin [brackets in translation].

1373. Sabbath, Jewish Traditions Concerning

SOURCE: *Mishnah* (tractates and sections as indicated), trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), folios and pages as indicated. Used by permission.

a. Shabbath 1.1, in *Talmud 2a*, pp. 1, 2

[p. 1] The carryings out of the Sabbath are two which are four within, and two which are four without. How so? The poor man stands without and the master of the house within: [i] if the poor man stretches his hand within and places [an article] into the hand of the master of the house, or [ii] if he takes [an article] from it and carries it out, the poor man is liable, and the master of the house is exempt. [Again,] [i] if the master of the house stretch- [p. 2] es his hand without and places [an object] in the poor man's hand, or [ii] takes [an object] therefrom and carries it in, the master is liable, while the poor man is exempt. [iii] If the poor man stretches his hand within and the master takes [an object] from it, or places [an object] therein and he carries it out, both are exempt; [an object] from it, or places [an article] therein and he carries it inside, both are exempt.

b. Shabbath 1.5, 6, 7, 8, in *Talmud 17b*, p. 73

Beth Shammai rule: Ink, dyes and alkaline plants may not be steeped unless they can be dissolved while it is yet day;³ [Note 3: These materials had to be steeped in water before they were fit for their purpose, and Beth Shammai rule that this may not be done on Friday unless there is time for the process to be completed before the Sabbath.] but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai rule: Bundles of wet flax may not be placed in an oven unless they can begin to steam while it is yet day, nor wool in the dyer's kettle

unless it can assume the colour [of the dye]; but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai rule: One must not sell to a Gentile, or help him to load [an ass], or lift up [an article] upon him unless he can reach a near place; but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai maintain: Hides must not be given to a tanner, nor garments to a Gentile fuller, unless they can be done while it is yet day; but in all these [cases] Beth Hillel permit [them] before sunset.

c. *Shabbath 2.5*, in Talmud 29*b*, p. 131

If one extinguishes the lamp because he is afraid of Gentiles, robbers, or an evil spirit, or for the sake of an invalid, that he should sleep, he is not culpable. If [because] he would spare the lamp, the oil, or the wick, he is culpable. R. Jose exempts him in all cases, except in respect of the wick, because he makes charcoal.

d. *Shabbath 3.6*, in Talmud 42*b*, p. 196

One may not place a vessel under a lamp to catch the oil.⁵ [Note 5: On the Sabbath.] But if it is placed there before sunset, it is permitted. Yet one may not benefit from it,⁷ [Note 7: I.e., use the oil which drops therein.] because it is not *mukan*.

e. *Shabbath 5.2*, in Talmud 52*b*, p. 240

An ass may go out with its cushion if it is tied to it. Rams may go out coupled [*lebubin*]. Ewes may go out [with their posteriors] exposed [*shehuzoth*], tied [*kebuloth*], and covered [*kebunoth*]; goats may go out [with their udders] tied up. R. Jose forbids in all these cases, save ewes that are covered. R. Judah said: Goats may go out [with their udders] tied in order to dry up, but not to save their milk.

f. *Shabbath 5.3*, in Talmud 54*a*, p. 248

And wherewith may it not go out? A camel may not go out with a pad [tied to its tail] ...; and similarly other animals. One must not tie camels together and pull [one of them], but he may take the cords in his hand and pull [them], providing he does not twine them together.

g. *Shabbath 5.4*, in Talmud 54*b*, p. 250

An ass may not go out with a cushion, when it is not tied to it, or with a bell, even if it is plugged, or with a ladder [-shaped yoke] around its neck, or with a thong around its foot. Fowls may not go out with ribbons, or with a strap on their legs; rams may not go out with a waggonette under their tails,⁴ [Note 4: This refers to a species of ram whose tail was very fat, to preserve which it was yoked to a waggonette.] ewes may not go out protected [*hanunoth*], or a calf with a *gimon*, or a cow with the skin of a hedgehog,⁷ [Note 7: Tied round its udder.] or with the strap between its horns. R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah's cow used to go out with a thong between its horns, [but] not with the consent of the rabbis.

h. *Shabbath 6.1*, in Talmud 57*a*, p. 266

Wherewith may a woman go out, and wherewith may she not go out? ¹ [Note 1: On the Sabbath. The general rule is that a woman may wear superfluous garments which are ornamental, save some which the Rabbis prohibited for fear that she might remove them for a friend's inspection and admiration, carrying them meanwhile in the street. Those which are not considered ornamental constitute a burden, and are always forbidden.] A woman may not go out with ribbons of wool, linen ribbons, or fillets round her head; nor

may she perform ritual immersion whilst wearing them, unless she loosens them. [She may not go out] with frontlets, garlands [*sarbitin*], if they are not sewn, or with a hair-net [*kabul*] into the street, or with a golden city,⁷ [Note 7: An ornament which contained a picture of Jerusalem.] or with a necklace [*kaṭla*], or with ear-rings, or with a finger-ring which has no signet, or with a needle which is unpierced. Yet if she goes out [with these], she is not liable to a sin-offering.

i. Shabbath 6.2, in Talmud 60*a*, p. 280

A man may not go out with a nail-studded sandal, nor with a single [sandal], if he has no wound on his foot;⁴ [Note 4: Either because he may be suspected of carrying the other sandal under his garments (T.J.), or because he may evoke ridicule, which will cause him to remove and carry it. But when one foot is wounded, there is no fear of this. V. Rashi.] nor with *Tefillin*, nor with an amulet, if it is not from an expert, nor with a coat of mail [*shiryon*], nor with a casque [*kasda*], nor with greaves [*megafayyim*]. Yet if he goes out, he does not incur a sin-offering.

j. Shabbath 6.3, in Talmud 62*a*, p. 289

A woman may not go out with a needle that is pierced, nor with a ring bearing a signet, nor with a *kokliar*, nor with a *kobeleth*, nor with a balsam phial; and if she does go out, she is liable to a sin-offering; this is R. Meir's view. But the sages rule that she is not culpable in the case of a *kobeleth* and a balsam phial.

k. Shabbath 6.4, in Talmud 63*a*, p. 295

A man must not go out with a sword, bow, shield, lance [*allah*], or spear; and if he does go out, he incurs a sin-offering. R. Eliezer said: They are ornaments for him. But the Sages maintain, they are merely shameful, for it is said, *And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more*. A knee-band [*berith*] is clean, and one may go out with it on the Sabbath; ankle-chains [*kebalim*] are unclean, and one may not go out with them on the Sabbath.

l. Shabbath 6.5, in Talmud 64*b*, p. 306

A woman may go out with ribbons made of hair, whether they are of her own [hair] or of her companions, or of an animal, and with frontlets and with *sarbitin* that are fastened to her. [She may go out] with a hair-net [*kabul*] and with a wig into a courtyard; with wadding in her ear, with wadding in her sandals, and with the cloth prepared for her menstruation; with a peppercorn, with a globule of salt and anything that is placed in her mouth,⁷ [Note 7: Before the commencement of the Sabbath.] providing that she does not put it in her mouth in the first place on the Sabbath, and if it falls out, she may not put it back. As for an artificial tooth, [or] a gold tooth,—Rabbi permits but the Sages forbid it.

m. Shabbath 7.2, in Talmud 73*a*, pp. 348, 349

[p. 348] The primary labours are forty less one, [viz.:] sowing, ploughing, reaping, binding [p. 349] sheaves, threshing, winnowing, selecting, grinding, sifting, kneading,

baking, shearing wool, bleaching, hackling, dyeing, spinning, stretching the threads, the making of two meshes, weaving two threads, dividing two threads, tying [knotting] and untying, sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches, capturing a deer, slaughtering, or flaying, or salting it, curing its hide, scraping it [of its hair], cutting it up, writing two letters, erasing in order to write two letters [over the erasure], building, pulling down, extinguishing, kindling, striking with a hammer, [and] carrying out from one domain to another: these are the forty primary labours less one.

n. Shabbath 7.4, in Talmud 76*a*, p. 360

He who carries out a cow's mouthful of straw, a camel's mouthful of peastalks [*‘ezah*], a lamb's mouthful of ears of corn, a goat's mouthful of herbs, moist garlic or onion leaves to the size of a dried fig, [or] a goat's mouthful of dry [leaves], [is culpable]. And they do not combine with each other, because they are not alike in their standards.

o. Shabbath 8.1, in Talmud 76*b*, p. 363

[76*b*] He who carries out [raw] wine, [the standard is that it be] enough for the mixing of a cup; milk, as much as is quaffed at a time; honey, sufficient to place on a scab; oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb; water, enough for rubbing collyrium; and all other liquids, [the standard is] a *rebi'ith*; and all waste water, a *rebi'ith*. R. Simeon said: [The standard for] all these is a *rebi'ith*, all these measures having been stated only in respect of those who put them away.

p. Shabbath 8.2, 3, 4, in Talmud 78*a*, 78*b*, pp. 371, 372

[p. 371] He who carries out cord, [the standard is] as much as is required for making a handle for a basket; a reed cord, as much as is required for making a hanger for a sieve or a basketsieve. R. Judah said: As much as is required for taking the measure of a child's shoe. Paper, large enough to write a tax-collector's receipt on it. (And he who carries out a tax-collector's receipt is liable.) Erased paper, as much as is required to wrap round a small phial of spikenard oil; skin, for making an amulet; parchment, for writing thereon the shortest passage of the *Tefillin*, which is 'Hear O Israel,': ink, for writing two letters; stibium, for painting one eye; paste, for putting on the top of a lime board [*shafshaf*]; pitch and sulphur, for making a perforation [therein]; wax for putting over a small hole; clay, for making a hole in a gold refiner's pot. R. Judah said: For making a [tripod's] peg. Bran, for putting on the mouth of a gold refiner's pot; [p. 372] lime, for smearing the smallest of girls. R. Judah said: Enough to produce a hair-crown [*k'alk'al*]. R. Nehemiah said: Enough for making side-curls [*ondafe*].

q. Shabbath 10.2, in Talmud 91*b*, p. 436

If one carries out food and places it on the threshold, whether he [himself] subsequently carries it out [into the street] or another does so, he is not culpable, because the [whole] act was not performed at once. [If one carries out] a basket which is full of produce and places it on the outer threshold, though most of the produce is without, he is not culpable unless he carries out the whole basket.

r. Shabbath 10.3, in Talmud 92*a*, pp. 439, 440

[p. 439] If one carries out [an article], whether with his right or with his left [hand], in his lap or on his shoulder, he is culpable, because thus was the carrying of the children of Kohath. In a backhanded manner, [e.g.,] with his foot, in his mouth, with his elbow, in his ear, in his hair, in his belt with [p. 440] its opening downwards, between his belt and his shirt, in the hem of his shirt, in his shoes or sandals, he is not culpable, because he has not carried [it] out as people [generally] carry out.

s. *Shabbath* 10.5, in Talmud 92*b*, p. 444

If one carries out a loaf into the street, he is culpable; if two carry it out, they are not culpable. If one could not carry it out and two carry it out, they are culpable; but R. Simeon exempts [them].

t. *Shabbath* 10.6, in Talmud 94*b*, p. 452

If one pares his nails with each other or with his teeth, likewise [if one plucks] his hair, likewise his moustache, likewise his beard; and likewise if [a woman] plaits [her hair], likewise if she paints [her eyelids], likewise if she rouges [her face],—R. Eliezer declares [them] culpable, while the Rabbis forbid [these actions] as a *shebuth*.

u. *Shabbath* 11.1, 2, in Talmud 96*a*, p. 460

If one throws [an article] from private into public ground [or] from public into private ground, he is culpable. From one private domain to another, and public ground lies between, R. Akiba holds him liable, but the Sages declare him exempt. How so? If there are two balconies facing each other in the street, he who reaches over or throws [an article] from one to the other is not culpable. If both are on the same storey, he who reaches over is culpable, while he who throws is not, for thus was the service of the Levites: two waggons [stood] behind each other in public ground, [and] they reached over the boards from one to another, but did not throw.

v. *Shabbath* 11.3, in Talmud 100*a*, pp. 478, 479

[p. 478] If one throws [an article] four cubits on to a wall above ten handbreadths, it is as though he throws it into the air; if below, it is as though he throws it on to the ground. And he who throws [an article] four cubits along the ground is culpable. [p. 479] If one throws [an object] within four cubits but it rolls beyond four cubits, he is not culpable; beyond four cubits but it rolls within four cubits, he is culpable.

w. *Shabbath* 11.4, in Talmud 100*b*, p. 480

If one throws [an object over a distance of] four cubits in the sea, he is not liable. If there is a water pool and a public road traverses it, and one throws [an object] four cubits therein, he is liable. And what depth constitutes a pool? Less than ten handbreadths. If there is a pool of water and a public road traverses it, and one throws [an object] four cubits therein, he is liable.

x. *Shabbath* 11.6, in Talmud 102*a*, pp. 486, 487

[p. 486] If one throws [an article] and recalls [that it is the Sabbath] after it leaves his hand, and another catches it, or a dog catches it, or it is burnt, he is not liable. If one throws [an article] in order to inflict a wound, whether in man or in beast, and he recalls [that it is the Sabbath] before the wound is inflicted, he is not liable. This is the general principle: All who are liable to sin-offerings [p. 487] are liable only if the beginning and the end [of the forbidden action] are unwitting. If their beginning is unwitting while their

end is wilful, if their beginning is wilful while their end is unwitting, they are not liable, unless their beginning and end are unwitting.

y. *Shabbath* 12.1, in Talmud 102*b*, p. 490

If one builds, how much must he build to be culpable? He who builds however little, and he who chisels, and he who strikes with a hammer or with an adze, and he who bores [a hole], however little, is culpable. This is the general principle: Whoever does work on the Sabbath and his work endures, is culpable. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He too is culpable who beats with the sledge hammer on the anvil at the time of his work, because he is as one who improves his work.

z. *Shabbath* 12.2, in Talmud 103*a*, p. 493

He who ploughs, however little, he who weeds and he who trims [trees], and he who cuts off young shoots, however little, is culpable. He who gathers timber: If in order to effect an improvement, [the standard of culpability is] however little; if for fuel, as much as is required for boiling a light egg. If one collects grass, if to effect an improvement, [the standard of culpability is] however little; if for an animal[’s fodder], a kid’s mouthful.

aa. *Shabbath* 12.3, in Talmud 103*a*, p. 494

He who writes two letters, whether with his right or with his left hand, of the same designation or of two designations, or in two pigments, in any language, is culpable.

bb. *Shabbath* 12.4, 5, in Talmud 104*b*, pp. 502, 503

[p. 502] If one writes two letters in one state of unawareness, he is culpable. If one writes with ink, chemicals, *sikra*,⁶ [Note 6: A kind of red paint.] *k’umos*,⁷ [Note 7: Ink prepared with gum.] *k’ankantum*,⁸ [Note 8: Vitriol used as an ingredient of ink.] or with anything that leaves a mark on the angle of two walls or on the two leaves [tables] of a ledger, and they [the two letters] are read together, he is culpable. If one writes on his flesh, he is culpable: he who scratches a mark on his [p. 503] flesh, R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering; but the Sages exempt him. If one writes with a fluid, with fruit juice, with road dust, or with writer’s powder, or with anything that cannot endure, he is not culpable. [If one writes] with the back of his hand, with his foot, with his mouth, or with his elbow; if one writes one letter near [other] writing, or if one writes upon writing; if one intends writing a *h’eth* but writes two *zayyinin*; one [letter] on the ground and another on a beam; if one writes on two walls of the house, or on two leaves of a ledger which are not to be read together, he is not culpable. If one writes one letter as an abbreviation, R. Joshua b. Bathyra holds him liable, whilst the Sages exempt him.

cc. *Shabbath* 13.6, in Talmud 106*b*, p. 515

If a deer enters a house and one person shuts [the door] before it, he is culpable; if two shut it, they are exempt. If one could not shut it, and both shut it, they are culpable. R. Simeon declares [them] exempt.

dd. *Shabbath* 13.7, in Talmud 106*b*, p. 515

If one sits down in the doorway but does not fill it, and a second sits down and fills it,² [Note 2: Thereby effectively trapping an animal that has entered the house.] the second is culpable. If the first sits down in the doorway and fills it, and a second comes and sits down at his side, even if the first [then] rises and departs, the first is culpable

while the second is exempt. What does this resemble? One who shuts his house to guard it, and a deer is [thereby] found to be guarded therein.

ee. Shabbath 14.3, in Talmud 109*b*, p. 532

We may not eat Greek hyssop on the Sabbath, because it is not the food of healthy people; ² [Note 2: But obviously a medicine.] but we may eat *yo'ezer* ³ [Note 3: A certain plant.] and drink *abub ro'eh*.⁴ [Note 4: Lit., 'shepherd's flute'—name of a plant (Eupatorium) used for medicinal purposes (Jast.).] A man may eat any kind of food as a remedy, and drink any liquid,⁵ [Note 5: Provided that they are eaten and drunk without healing intentions too.] except water of palm trees and a potion of roots, because they are [a remedy] for jaundice; but one may drink water of palm trees for his thirst and rub himself with oil of roots without medical purpose.

ff. Shabbath 14.4, in Talmud 111*a*, pp. 539, 540

[p. 539] If one's teeth pain him, he must not sip vinegar through them,¹⁷ [Note 17: This is healing, which is forbidden on the Sabbath.] but may dip [his bread in vinegar] in the usual manner, and if he is cured, he is cured. If one's loins pain him, he must not rub them [p. 540] with wine or vinegar, but he may anoint them with oil, yet not rose oil. Royal children may anoint their wounds with rose oil, since it is their practice to anoint themselves thus on weekdays. R. Simeon said: All Israel are royal children.

gg. Shabbath 15.3, in Talmud 113*a*, pp. 551, 552

[p. 551] One may fold up garments even four or [p. 552] five times, and spread the sheets on the beds on the night of the Sabbath for [use on] the Sabbath, but not on the Sabbath for [use on] the conclusion of the Sabbath.

hh. Shabbath 16.2, in Talmud 117*b*, p. 576

Food for three meals may be saved, that which is fit for man, for man, that which is fit for animals, for animals. How so? If a fire breaks out Sabbath night, food for three meals may be saved; [if] in the morning, food for two meals may be saved; at [the time of] *minḥah*, food for one meal. R. Jose said: At all times we may save food for three meals.

ii. Shabbath 16.6, in Talmud 121*a*, p. 599

If a Gentile comes to extinguish, we do not say to him, 'extinguish it' or 'do not extinguish,' because his resting is not our obligation. But if a minor comes to extinguish, we must not permit him, because his resting is our obligation.

jj. Shabbath 16.7, in Talmud 121*a*, p. 600

A dish may be inverted over a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire], and over an infant's excrement, and over a scorpion, that it should not bite. R. Judah said: An incident came before R. Joḥanan b. Zakkai in Arab, and he said, I fear on his account [that he may be liable to] a sin-offering.

kk. Shabbath 16.8, in Talmud 122*a*, p. 604

If a Gentile lights a lamp, an Israelite may make use of its light; but if [he does it] for the sake of the Israelite, it is forbidden. If he draws water to give his own animal to drink, an Israelite may water [his] after him; but if [he draws it] for the Israelite's sake, it is forbidden. If a Gentile makes a stairway to descend by it, an Israelite may descend after

him; but if on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. It once happened that R. Gamaliel and the Elders were travelling in a ship, when a Gentile made a stairway for going down, and R. Gamaliel and the Elders descended by it.

ll. Shabbath 18.3, in Talmud 128*b*, pp. 640, 641

[p. 640] One may not deliver an animal [in giving birth] on a festival, but one may assist it. We may deliver a woman on the Sabbath, summon a midwife for her from place to place, desecrate the Sabbath on her account, and tie up the navel-string. R. Jose [p. 641] said: One may cut [it] too. And all the requirements of circumcision may be done on the Sabbath.

mm. Shabbath 19.1, in Talmud 130*a*, p. 649

R. Eliezer said: If one did not bring an instrument on the eve of the Sabbath,¹ [Note 1: A knife for circumcision.] he must bring it on the Sabbath uncovered; but in [times of] danger he hides it on the testimony of witnesses. R. Eliezer said further: One may cut timber to make charcoal for manufacturing iron. R. Akiba stated a general principle: Any [manner of] work which could be performed on Sabbath eve does not supersede the Sabbath; but that which could not be performed on Sabbath eve does supersede the Sabbath.

nn. Shabbath 19.2, in Talmud 133*a*, pp. 668, 669

[p. 668] We perform all the requirements of [p. 669] circumcision on the Sabbath. We circumcise, uncover [the corona], suck [the wound], and place a compress and cummin upon it. If one did not crush [the cummin] on the eve of the Sabbath, he must chew [it] with his teeth and apply [it to the wound]; if he did not beat up wine and oil on the eve of the Sabbath, each must be applied separately. We may not make a *ḥaluk*⁶ [Note 6: A kind of shirt-shaped bandage placed over the membrum and tied at the corona, to prevent the flesh from growing back and recovering the membrum.] for it in the first place, but must wrap a rag about it. If this was not prepared from the eve of the Sabbath, one winds it about his finger⁷ [Note 7: As though it were a garment, so that it shall not be carried just like on weekdays.] not and brings it, and even through another courtyard.

oo. Shabbath 19.3, in Talmud 134*b*, pp. 675, 676

[p. 675] We may bathe the infant both before and after the circumcision, and sprinkle [warm water] over him by hand but not with a vessel. R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: We may bathe an infant on the third day [of circumcision] which falls on the Sabbath, because it is said, and it came to pass on [p. 676] the third day, when they were sore. As for one who is doubtful, and an hermaphrodite, we may not desecrate the Sabbath on their account; but R. Judah permits [it] in the case of an hermaphrodite.

pp. Shabbath 20.1, in Talmud 137*b*, p. 694

R. Eliezer said: One may suspend a strainer on festivals, and pour [wine] through a suspended [strainer] on the Sabbath. But the Sages rule: One may not suspend a strainer on festivals, nor pour [wine] through a suspended [strainer] on the Sabbath, but we may pour [it] through a suspended [strainer] on festivals.

qq. Shabbath 21.2, in Talmud 142*b*, p. 721

If a stone is on the mouth of a cask [of wine], one tilts it on a side and it falls off. If it [the cask] is [standing] among [other] casks, he lifts it out, tilts it on a side, and it falls

off. If money is lying on a cushion, one shakes the cushion, and it falls off. If dirt is upon it, one wipes it off with a rag; ⁴ [Note 4: But not with water, which is forbidden as washing.] if it is of leather, ⁵ [Note 5: Which is not such as is washed with water.] water is poured over it until it disappears.

rr. Shabbath 21.3, in Talmud 143*a*, pp. 723, 724

[p. 723] Beth Shammai say: One may remove bones and [nuts]shells from the table; but Beth Hillel rule: One must take away the whole board and shake it. One may remove from the table crumbs less than the size of an olive and the panicles of beans and lentils, because they are food for animals. As for [p. 724] a sponge, if it has a leathern handle, one may wipe [the board] with it; if not, one may not wipe [the board] with it. [The Sages maintain]: In either case it may be handled on the Sabbath and is not susceptible to defilement.

ss. Shabbath 22.1, in Talmud 143*b*, p. 726

If a cask [of wine] is broken, ¹ [Note 1: On the Sabbath.] one may save thereof the requirements for three meals, and he [the owner] can say to others, 'come and save for yourselves', provided that he does not sponge it up. ³ [Note 3: I.e., he must not absorb the spilt wine in a sponge, lest he wring it out (into a vessel), which is forbidden.] Fruit may not be squeezed in order to express their juices: If they exude of their own accord they are prohibited. R. Judah said: If [they stand] as eatables, that which exudes from them is permitted; but if for liquids, that which exudes from them is prohibited. If honeycombs are crushed on the eve of the Sabbath and it [the honey] exudes spontaneously, it is forbidden; but R. Eleazar permits it.

tt. Shabbath 23.5 in Talmud 151*a*, 151*b*, p. 771

All the requirements of the dead may be done; he may be anointed with oil and washed, provided that no limb of his is moved. The pillow may be removed from under him, and he may be placed on sand, in order that he may be able to keep. The jaw may be tied up, not in order that it should close but that it should not go further [open]. And likewise, if a beam is broken, it may be supported by a bench or bed staves, not in order that it [the break] should close up, but that it should go no further.

uu. Shabbath 23.5, in Talmud 151*b*, p. 772

One may not close [the eyes of] a corpse on the Sabbath, nor on weekdays when he is about to die, and he who closes the eyes [of a dying person] at the point of death is a murderer.

vv. Shabbath 24.1, in Talmud 153*a*, p. 783

If darkness falls upon a person on a road, ¹ [Note 1: The Sabbath commences.] he entrusts his purse to a Gentile; but if there is no Gentile with him, he places it on the ass. When he reaches the outermost courtyard he removes the objects which may be handled on the Sabbath, whilst as for those which may not be handled on the Sabbath, he unties the cords and the sacks fall off automatically.

ww. Erubin 4.1, in Talmud 41*b*, p. 286

He whom Gentiles, or an evil spirit, have taken out [beyond the permitted Sabbath limit] has no more than four cubits [in which to move]. If he was brought back [he is regarded] as if he had never gone out. If he was taken to another town, or if he was put in a cattle-pen or in a cattle-fold, he may, ruled R. Gamaliel and R. Eleazar b. Azariah,

move through the whole of its area; but R. Joshua and R. Akiba ruled: He has only four cubits [in which to move].

It once happened that they were coming from Brindisi and while their ship was sailing on the sea, R. Gamaliel and R. Eleazar. b. Azariah walked about throughout its area, but R. Joshua and R. Akiba did not move beyond four cubits.

xx. *'Erubin* 4.4, in Talmud 45a, pp. 312, 313

[p. 312] If a man sat down by the way and when he rose up he observed that he was near a town he may not enter it, since it had not been [p. 313] his intention to do so; so R. Meir. R. Judah ruled: He may enter it. Said R. Judah, it once actually happened that R. Tarfon entered a town though this was not his intention.

yy. *'Erubin* 4.5, 6, in Talmud 45a, 45b, pp. 313–315

[p. 313] If a man slept by the way and was unaware that night had fallen, he is entitled to move within two thousand cubits in any direction; so R. Johanan b. Nuri. The Sages, however, ruled: He has only four cubits within which to move. R. Eliezer ruled: And the man is deemed to be in their centre. [p. 314] R. Judah ruled: He may move in any direction he desires. R. Judah, however, agrees that if he has once chosen his direction he may not go back on it.

If there were two men and a part of the prescribed number of cubits of the one overlapped with that of the other, they may bring their meals and eat them in the middle, provided the one does not carry out anything from his limit into that of the other. If there were three men and the prescribed limit of the middle one overlapped with the respective limits of the others, he is permitted to eat with either of them and either of them is permitted to eat with him, but the two outer persons are forbidden to eat with one another. R. Simeon remarked: To what may this case be compared? To three courtyards that open one into the other and also into a public domain, where, if the two outer ones made an *'erub* with the middle one, it is permitted [p. 315] to have access to them and they are permitted access to it, but the two outer ones are forbidden access to one another.

zz. *'Erubin* 5.8, in Talmud 61a, pp. 428, 429

[p. 428] The people of a large town may walk through the whole of a small town, and the people of a small town may walk through the whole of a large town. How is this [to be understood]? If a man stayed in a large town and deposited his *'erub* in a small town or if he stayed in a small town and deposited his *'erub* in a large town, he may walk through all the town and two thousand cubits beyond it. R. Akiba ruled: He is allowed to walk no [p. 429] further than two thousand cubits from the place of his *'erub*.

aaa. *'Erubin* 4.7, 8, in Talmud 49b, pp. 343, 344

[p. 343] If a man who was on a journey [home- [p. 344] ward] was overtaken by dusk, and he knew of a tree or a wall and said, 'Let my Sabbath base be under it', his statement is of no avail. If, however, he said, 'Let my Sabbath base be at its root', he may walk from the place where he stands to its root a distance of two thousand cubits, and from its root to his house another two thousand cubits. Thus he can walk four thousand cubits after dusk.

If he does not know of any tree or wall, or if he is not familiar with the *halachah*, and said, 'Let my present position be my Sabbath base', his position acquires for him the

right of movement within a radius of two thousand cubits in any direction; so R. Hanina b. Antigonus. The Sages, however, ruled: The distances are to be squared in the shape of a square tablet, so that he may gain the area of the corners.

bbb. ‘*Erubin* 10.3, in Talmud 97*b*, p. 674

If a man was reading in a scroll on a threshold and the scroll rolled out of his hand, he may roll it back to himself. If he was reading it on the top of a roof and the scroll rolled out of his hand, he may, before it reached ten hand-breadths from the ground, roll it back to himself.

ccc. *Yoma* 8.6, in Talmud 83*a*, p. 407

If one is seized by a ravenous hunger, he may be given to eat even unclean things until his eyes are enlightened. If one was bit by a mad dog, he may not give him to eat the lobe of its liver. But R. Matthia b. Heresh permits it. Furthermore did R. Matthia b. Heresh say: If one has pain in his throat, he may pour medicine into his mouth on the Sabbath, because it is a possibility of danger to human life and every danger to human life suspends the [laws of the] Sabbath.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Brackets, except for page numbers and for inserted footnotes, are in the translation.]

1374. Sabbath, Karlstadt on

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* (“Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays”) (1524), [chap. 4](#), unpagued. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt’s *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, [pp. 41, 42](#). No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke [d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts](#), founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

[p. 23] When servants have worked six days, they should have the seventh day free. God says without distinction, “Remember that you observe the seventh day.” He does not say whether we should keep Sunday or Saturday for the seventh day. Concerning Sunday it is known that men have instituted it. Concerning Saturday, it is still under [p. 24] dispute. It is clear however, that you should celebrate the seventh day and allow your servants to do so as often as they have worked six days. Should, however, a master name and select his seventh day for each individual servant, it would tend to bring disorder into the household, especially if he has many servants. Should each household in a city select a different Sabbath the order of the city and the work of the preacher would be thrown into confusion.

But if God’s word or the sermons are not set aside, or if God’s word were read or preached every day, every master of a house would have the power to choose for himself and his servants a seventh day which would be most convenient and most advantageous for his work.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Page numbers have been supplied by count.]

1375. Sabbath, Karlstadt’s View of, Rejected by Luther

SOURCE: Martin Luther, “Wider die himmlischen Propheten,” in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, [ed.](#) by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, [Vol. 20](#) (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), [col. 148](#). German.

Thanks be unto the pious Paul and Isaiah, that they so long ago freed us from these factious spirits; otherwise we would have to sit on the Sabbath with our head in our hands, and wait for a heavenly voice, as they pretend. Indeed if Karlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath, i.e., Saturday, must be kept holy.

1376. Sabbath, Luther on—Remained After Man’s Fall

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Commentary on Genesis*, ed. by J. N. Lenker, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in All Lands Co., 1904), Comment on Gen. 2:3, pp. 138–140.

[p. 138] God blessed the Sabbath and sanctified it to himself. It is moreover to be remarked that God did this to no other creature. God did not sanctify to himself the heaven nor the earth nor any other creature. But God did sanctify to himself the seventh day. This was especially designed of God, to cause us to understand that the “seventh [p. 139] day” is to be especially devoted to divine worship...

It follows therefore from this passage, that if Adam had stood in his innocence and had not fallen he would yet have observed the “seventh day” as sanctified, holy and sacred... Nay, even after the fall he held the “seventh day” sacred; that is, he taught on that day his own family. This is testified by the offerings made by his two sons, Cain and Abel. The Sabbath therefore has, from the beginning of the world, been set apart for the worship of God... For all these things are implied and signified in the expression “sanctified.” ...

[p. 140] Although therefore man lost the knowledge of God by sin, yet God willed that his command concerning the sanctifying of the Sabbath should remain. He willed that on the seventh day both the Word should be preached, and also those other parts of his worship performed, which he himself instituted.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Luther is here speaking of the fact that God willed that the Sabbath should remain after the Fall. This passage does not indicate Luther’s opinion on how long it should remain, but he states elsewhere that the seventh day, as a “ceremony” and a temporary part of the fourth commandment, was abolished along with the Mosaic system although the Decalogue, or moral law, remains forever (see Nos. 1377, 1378).]

1377. Sabbath, Luther on—“Repealed”; Otherwise Saturday Must Be Kept Holy

SOURCE: Martin Luther, “Wider die himmlischen Propheten,” in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), cols. 146–149. German.

[col. 146] 44. ... I am speaking now as a Christian and for the Christians. For Moses was given only to the Jewish people and does not concern us Gentiles and Christians. We have our gospel and the New Testament; [col. 147] if they shall prove from it that the images are to be put away, we will readily follow them. But if through Moses they want to make Jews of us, we will not stand for it.

45. ... One can see that these rabble spirits understand nothing in the Scripture, neither Moses nor Christ, and do not seek nor find anything in it but their own dreams. And we are here laying the ground from St. Paul, 1 Tim. 1:9 (“To the righteous no law is given” [Luther’s trans.]), and Peter, in Acts 15:10, “Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?” With this text (just as Paul with his) St. Peter cancels all of Moses, with all his laws, for the Christian...

46. Yes, you say, that would be true of the ceremonies and judicial matters, that is, what Moses teaches as to outward divine service and outward government, but the decalogue, that is, the ten commandments, in which there is nothing of the ceremonies and judicialia, are not canceled there. I reply: I know quite well of this general, old difference given but without reason, for out of the ten commandments come [literally; “pour out”], and with it hand all the other commandments and all of Moses...

48. Therefore it is not true that there are no ceremonies in the ten commandments, or no judicial matters; there are, and they hang therein and belong therein. That God had designated. He himself put in two ceremonies, speaking about [col. 148] images and the Sabbath, wanting to prove that these two items are ceremonies and that in their manner they are repealed in the New Testament, that one may see how Dr. Karlstadt in his book, *On the Sabbath*, handled this as cunningly as on the images. For St. Paul clearly and plainly says in Col. 2:16, 17, ‘Let no one therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect to a holy day or new moons or Sabbath days which are a shadow of things to come.’ Here Paul abolished the Sabbath by name and called it a bygone shadow because the body, which is Christ himself, has come.

49. ... Isa. 66:23, “One Sabbath will be at the other, and one new moon at the other,” i.e., daily will be Sabbath in the NT, no differentiation in the time.

50. ... For it is the truth, and no one can deny it: Whoever observes a law of Moses as Moses’ law, must observe them all as St. Paul concludes in Gal. 5:3, “He who allows himself to be circumcised must keep all the law.” Also whoever destroys images or keeps the Sabbath (that is, he who teaches it necessary to observe these commandments) must be circumcised and keep the whole law of Moses; which certain- [col. 149] ly, (if you give room to these spirits), eventually would compel them to do, to teach, and to observe.

1378. Sabbath, Luther on—Temporary Seventh Day and Permanent Commandment

SOURCE: Martin Luther, “Wider die Sabbather,” in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch. Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), col. 1855. German.

66. Now what Moses calls the seventh day, and how God created the world in six days, because of which they are not to do any work, that is the temporary adornment with which Moses clothes this commandment especially for his people at this time; for earlier one does not find it written, neither by Abraham nor in the time of the ancient fathers, but it is a temporary addition and adornment, set up only for this people that was led out of Egypt. Nor was it to remain forever, any more than the whole law of Moses. But keeping it holy, that is, teaching and preaching the word of God is the right, clear, and only meaning of this commandment. It has been from the beginning and remains for ever and ever in all the world. Therefore the seventh day does not concern us Gentiles at all, nor does it concern the Jews themselves any longer than until the Messiah, although nature and need compel that on the day on which God’s word is preached, one must, as stated, be quiet, cease from work, or keep Sabbath, for God’s word cannot be heard or taught where one at the same time thinks of something else or is not quiet.

1379. Sabbath, Lutheran Confession on the Sabbath—Changing of the Law

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession, part 2, art. 7, “Of Ecclesiastical Power,” trans., in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 69–71.

[p. 69] There are certain marvelous disputations touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sab- [p. 70] bath: which all arose from the false persuasion, that there should be a [*sic*] service in the Church, like to the Levitical; and that Christ committed to the Apostles and Bishops the devising new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church, when the righteousness of faith was not plainly enough taught. Some dispute that the

observation of the Lord's day is not indeed of the law of God, but *as it were* of the law of God; and touching holidays, they prescribe how far it is lawful to work in them. What else are such disputations but snares for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate traditions, yet the equity of them can never be perceived so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth; which must needs remain, where the righteousness of faith and Christian liberty are not known.

The Apostles commanded 'to abstain from blood' (Acts xv. 20). Who observeth that nowadays? And yet they do not sin that observe it not. For the Apostles themselves would not burden men's consciences with such a servitude; but they forbade it for a time, because of scandal. For in the decree, the will of the Gospel is always to be considered. [p. 71] Scarcely any Canons are precisely kept; and many grow out of use daily...

The Bishops might easily retain lawful obedience, if they would not urge men to observe such traditions as can not be kept with a good conscience.

1380. Sabbath, Made for the Human Race

SOURCE: Tayler Lewis, translator's note on [Gen. 2:3](#) in John Peter Lange, *A Commentary: ... Genesis* (New York: Scribner, 1868), p. 197.

If we had no other passage than this of Gen. ii. 3, there would be no difficulty in deducing from it a precept for the universal observance of a sabbath, or seventh day, to be devoted to God, as holy time, by all of that race for whom the earth and its nature were specially prepared. The first men must have known it. The words "He hallowed it," can have no meaning otherwise. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who were required to keep it holy.

1381. Sabbath, Manner of Observing, Karlstadt on

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* ("Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays") (1524), [chap. 4](#), unpagged. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt's *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47. No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

[p. 26] What man on the Sabbath is to do or to leave undone and how he has to behave toward God and his brethren is easy to say, for the Scripture is clear. But it is more difficult to perceive and to examine than to understand because it is beyond all natural abilities. Man must be at rest and at peace with God and must ask of God and await all sanctification... Moses also speaks (Ex. 35:2) of a Sabbath of rest to the Lord. This rest consists in this, that man knows he cannot attain any sanctification except through Christ and yet is to be as holy as God is holy, which, however, he is unable to do. Therefore [p. 27] man becomes irritable and full of unrest, toil, and drudgery, and can find neither peace nor rest nor leisure until he surrenders irrevocably to God—until he knows that God sanctifies only through Christ and without merit and work. When he knows this and understands it correctly, namely that God sanctifies gratuitously, then he is satisfied with God and arrives at the rest in God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Page numbers have been supplied by count.]

1382. Sabbath, Obligation of, Ever Since Eden

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] I honestly believe that this commandment is just as binding to-day as it ever was. I have talked with men who have said that it has been abrogated, but they have never been able to point to any place in the Bible where God repealed it. When Christ was on earth, He did nothing to set it aside; He freed it from the traces under which the

scribes and Pharisees had put [p. 47] it, and gave it its true place. “The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.” It is just as practicable and as necessary for men to-day as it ever was—in fact, more than ever, because we live in such an intense age.

The sabbath was binding in Eden, and it has been in force ever since. This fourth commandment begins with the word “remember,” showing that the sabbath already existed when God wrote this law on the tables of stone at Sinai. How can men claim that this one commandment has been done away with when they will admit that the other nine are still binding?

1383. Sabbath, Obligation of, Perpetual

SOURCE: Adam Clarke, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, [n.d.]), Vol. 2, p. 524, comment on Col. 2:16.

There is no intimation here that the *Sabbath* was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy*, is a command of *perpetual obligation*, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time. As it is a *type* of that rest which remains for the people of God, of an eternity of bliss, it must continue in full force till that eternity arrives; for no *type* ever ceases till the *antitype* be come. Besides, it is not clear that the apostle refers at all to the *Sabbath* in this place, whether Jewish or Christian; his *σαββατων* of *Sabbaths* or *weeks*, most probably refers to their *feasts of weeks*, of which much has been said in the notes on the Pentateuch.

1384. Sabbath, Obligatory if We Follow the Bible Alone

SOURCE: F. G. Lentz, *The Question Box* (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), p. 98. [FRS No. 54.]

If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord.

1385. Sabbath—Origin and Nature of the Institution

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 40, 41. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 40] The Sabbath comes to us out of its original beginnings as primarily religious, ethical, and moral. It is never, with the sanction of revelation, reckoned as a mere ceremonial...

Its faithful observance is strictly and urgently enjoined. It is required, negatively, that men abstain from all the ordinary functions of work for obtaining livelihood. On the Sabbath Day men must rest from business, from toil, from physical indulgence. On the positive side men must reverence the day as holy; and use it to cultivate their relationship to God, recognizing their dependence upon him and expressing their response to him. Just how this shall be done is left to spiritual discernment and voluntary device. In a way not equally applicable to any other institution of religion, Jesus could affirm that the Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath. As no other expression of religion it is independent of any necessary forms, free from the powerful tendencies to ceremonialism, and is universally observable under all conditions of human life...

[p. 41] As presented to us in the Scriptures the Sabbath was not the invention of any religious founder. It was not at first part of any system of religion, but an entirely independent institution. Very definitely it is presented in Genesis as the very first institution, inaugurated by the Creator himself. It was purely religious, wholly moral,

wholly spiritual. It had no prescribed ceremonies, no sacramentarian significance. It required no priest, no liturgy. It was for man as God's creature, steward and friend.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver, any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian's Lord's Day.]

1386. Sabbath, Origin of—Antedates Sinai

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 15, 16. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 15] There are evidences that the [Sabbath] day was observed in some manner by the Jewish people before this command was given to Moses. The day is first mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with the fall of manna, and even there it is mentioned as something with which the Israelites were familiar. The Sinaitic legislation as writers mention, simply gave force of law to an already existing custom.

1387. Sabbath, Origin of—From Creation

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, in *Debate on the Evidences of Christianity ... Between Robert Owen ... and Alexander Campbell* (London: R. Groombridge, 1839), p. 291.

The seventh day was observed from Abraham's time; nay, from the creation. The Jews identified their own history with the institution of the sabbath day. They loved and venerated it as a patriarchal usage.

1388. Sabbath, Origin of, Jewish Historian on

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* i. 1. 1; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 17. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Thus, so Moses tells us, the world and everything in it was made in six days in all; and on the seventh God rested and had respite from His labours, for which reason we also pass this day in repose from toil and call it the sabbath, a word which in the Hebrew language means "rest."

1389. Sabbath, Origin of—Not New Truth at Sinai

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 20–24. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 20] Through all the history of the race from [p. 21] Adam to Moses, extending over a period of more than two thousand years, there is no distinct reference to a Sabbath day, though there are many references to Sabbath engagements, such as altars, and sacrifices, and communion with God. Jesus says: "The Sabbath was made for man;" and the necessary inference is that from the beginning man knew the primary uses of the day, and received the benefits which it was designed to impart...

[p. 22] Before the giving of the law from Sinai the obligation of the Sabbath was understood. When some of the people went out to get manna on that day, God said unto Moses: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he hath given you on the sixth day bread enough for two days."

Indeed, it may be questioned if the law given through Moses on tables of stone disclosed any new truth...

[p. 23] The law simply gathered up the truth, and set it among the things of God, that can not be [p. 24] moved. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of the Lord abideth forever."

The fourth commandment does not institute a Sabbath, nor does it sanctify a day; it simply writes the Sabbath among the immutable things of God. Nehemiah bears this forceful testimony: "Thou camest down also upon Sinai, and spakest with thy people

from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.”

1390. Sabbath, Purpose of

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* (“Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays”) (1524), chap. 2, unpag. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt’s *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47. No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

God has given to mankind all commandments and prohibitions that man may become aware of His image within, and that he may understand how God created him in His image, and that he may become as God is, that is, holy, serene, good, righteous, wise, strong, truthful, kind, merciful, etc... as it is written: Ye shall become holy and be holy, for I, your God and Lord, am holy, says God; keep my commandments and do them... Hence the Sabbath is instituted by God so that we may desire to become holy as God is holy, and rest as He did and cease from work...

That is the spiritual reason for the Sabbath which is commanded in the honor of God, to our benefit... Just as God looks after our benefit and holiness, so we too should have in mind and seek God’s glory and honor, and the good of our neighbor, and not our own.

Whoever turns his eyes upon his own advantage, he sullies himself, makes himself unholy, and neglects the reason for the Sabbath. All this was understood and explained by Isaiah, when he says, I cannot bear nor endure your Sabbath and feastday. Your actions are unclean and wicked; put away from your eyes your evil thoughts and cease to do evil...

If a soul does not become aware of its clearness and inwardness and does not let go of darkness, uncleanness, wickedness and unholiness, it is far from and foreign to the purpose of the instituted Sabbath and God hates their Sabbath and rejects their feastdays. For in all commandments it is the purpose and the spirit which must be kept in mind and nothing else; that is, that only the God who commands must be taken to heart and His will must be sought and recognized. Whoever thinks differently, misses the commandment and deceives himself.

The above-stated purpose is eternal and unchangeable. No man may disturb it; even the least creature cannot without harm frustrate God’s honor and revile God. This purpose is spiritual, invisible and eternal. Nor is man in this way lord of the Sabbath; he is rather a servant of God or a servant of this Sabbath. Therefore man cannot without noticeable loss depart from the purpose of the Sabbath even the width of his hair. The faith and the love of God look to this purpose and just as man may not without his destruction shorten faith or transgress against God’s love, so he may not transgress God’s Sabbath without damnation.

1391. Sabbath—Spiritual Nature of Fourth Commandment

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 32–34. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 32] As a code for the Jewish theocracy the law has its temporal aspects, but in all its ordinances it is primarily and essentially spiritual. It is the means by which guilt is disclosed, and the need of salvation impressed on the mind...

[p. 33] The Sabbath is a day of rest, but its physical aspects are only secondary and incidental...

[p. 34] Like other statutes of the law, the fourth commandment is spiritual. Preeminently and especially it provides a season of rest for the soul. In the old Testament, whether in the Patriarchal or the Mosaic dispensation, the Sabbath is the supreme provision for knowing God and finding rest in him. “Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.”

1392. Sabbath, Time of Beginning—Sunset in Arctic Summer as Late as Midnight

SOURCE: Paul B. Du Chaillu, *The Land of the Midnight Sun* (New York: Harper, 1882), Vol. 1, pp. 61, 64.

[p. 61] We crossed the arctic circle at 66° 32' N., or 1408 geographical miles south from the pole, where the sun shines for an entire day on the 22d of June, and the observer will see it above the horizon at midnight, and due north...

The sun at midnight is always north of the observer, on account of the position of the earth. It seems to travel around a circle, requiring twenty-four hours for its completion, it being noon when it reaches the greatest elevation, and midnight at the lowest. Its ascent and descent are so imperceptible at the pole, and the variations so slight, that it sinks south very slowly, and its disappearance below the horizon [sunset] is almost immediately followed by its reappearance [sunrise]...

[p. 64] Its motion is very slow, and for quite awhile it apparently follows the line of the horizon, during which there seems to be a pause... This is midnight. For a few minutes the glow of sunset mingles with that of sunrise, and one cannot tell which prevails; but soon the light becomes slowly and gradually more brilliant, announcing the birth of another day.

1393. Sabbath, Time of Beginning—Sunset in Arctic Winter as Early as Noon

SOURCE: Paul B. Du Chaillu, *The Land of the Long Night* (New York: Scribner, 1899), pp. 73, 75, 109–111.

[p. 73] The day I left Pajala [in early winter] I saw the sun at noon; it was hardly above the horizon; it had barely risen and shown itself when it was sunset and it disappeared under the horizon.

Then came a long snowstorm, and for a wonder one without a gale. After the snowstorm the sky suddenly cleared, and at noon I saw the sun's lower rim touching the horizon. It was of a fiery red. Then after a while it disappeared.

The next day only the upper half of the sun was above the horizon at noon, and just as the rim was ready to sink I fancied I heard the sun say to me: “Tomorrow you will not see me; then you will have entered ‘The Land of the Long Night.’” ...

[p. 75] The sun had disappeared below the horizon, but in clear days its glow could be seen... In fine weather the glow over the horizon told me when it was about noon. It was indeed a strange land; but the Lapps could tell from the stars whether it was night or day, for they were accustomed to gauge time by them...

[p. 109] I watched the horizon [several months later] every day towards noon, hoping to see the sun, for the light was getting brighter and brighter. The glow of the hidden sun was so great at noon that it looked as if sunrise were going to take place...

One day I saw a golden thread above the snowy horizon. It was the upper rim of the sun. I watched, hoping to see the whole sun. But it was at its meridian, and in a very short time the golden thread had disappeared and the sun was on its downward course...

[p. 110] The following day the glow above the horizon became more brilliant, and towards noon the sun rose slowly above the snow; but only about half of its body made its appearance. It was of a fiery red. Then it gradually sank. The third day the whole [p. 111] of the sun appeared above the horizon [sunrise], then in a short time sank below [sunset].

1394. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church as Festivals in Eastern Churches

SOURCE: Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London: Bohn, 1870), bk. 13, chap. 9, sec. 3, Vol. 1, pp. 656, 657.

[p. 656] We also find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish sabbath. It is not easy to tell either the original of this practice, or the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin churches (excepting Milan) it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek churches as a festival: I consider it here only as a day of public Divine service, on which, as the authors who mention it assure us, all the same offices were performed as were used to be on the Lord's day. For [Pseudo] Athanasius,⁸ [Note 8: Homil. de Semente, t. 1. p. 1060.] who is one of the first that mentions it, says, They met on the sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the sabbath. And Timotheus [I, archbishop] ... of Alexandria, says, The communion⁹ [Note 9: Timoth. Ep. Canon. can. 13. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2.] was administered on this day, as on the Lord's day. Which were the only days in the week that the communion was received by the Christians of his time at Alexandria. Socrates¹⁰ [Note 10: Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 22.] is a little more particular about the service: for he says, In their assemblies on this day they celebrated the communion; only the churches of Egypt and Thebais differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbours at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place, speaking of the churches of Constantinople in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday¹¹ [Note 11: Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 8.] and Lord's day the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church assemblies. And Cassian¹² [Note 12: Cassian. Institut. lib. 2. cap. 6. In die vero sabbati vel Dominico utrasque lectiones de Novo recitant Testamento, id est, unam de Apostolo vel Actibus Apostolorum, et aliam de Evangeliiis.] takes notice of the Egyptian churches, that among them the service of the Lord's day and the sabbath was always the same; for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament only, one out of the Gospels, and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles; whereas, on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament and partly out of the New. In another place he observes,¹³ [Note 13: Cassian. lib. 3. cap. 2.] That in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord's day, when they met at three o'clock, that is, nine in the morning, to celebrate the communion. In the council of Laodicea there are three canons to the same purpose. One¹⁴ [Note 14: Conc. Laodic. can. 16.] appoints the Gospels, with the other Scriptures, to be read upon this day. Another,¹⁵ [Note 15: Ibid. can. 49.] That the oblation of the bread in the eucharist shall not be made all the time of Lent, except on the sabbath and the Lord's day. Which implies that those were communion days, and kept as festivals, even in Lent itself. And for the same reason a third canon¹⁶ [Note 16: Can. 51.] orders, That no festivals of martyrs should be kept in Lent, but only commemorations of

the martyrs be made on the sabbath and the Lord's day. The only difference that was then made between the sabbath and the Lord's day, was, that Christians were not obliged to rest from bodily ¹⁷ [Note 17: Can. 29.] labour on the sabbath, but might work on that day, (so far as Divine service would permit,) giving preference in this respect to the Lord's day, whereon they were to rest as Christians. And if any transgressed these rules about working on the sabbath, they were to be [p. 657] deemed Judaizers, and are ordered to be anathematized by another canon of the same council. By which it appears that Saturday was kept weekly as a day of public worship, but not as a Jewish sabbath. Epiphanius ¹⁸ [Note 18: Epiphanius. Epitom. t. 1. p. 1107.] mentions it likewise as a day of public assemblies in some places, but not in all. St. Basil ¹⁹ [Note 19: Basil. Ep. 289. ad Caesaream Patriciam. So Austin, Ep. 118.] says it was one of the four days in the week, on which in his time they received the communion. By all which we may perceive that the author of the Constitutions had a plain regard to the practice of the Eastern church, when he prescribed, that on every sabbath save one, (that is, the Saturday before Easter day,) and on every Lord's day ²⁰ [Note 20: Constit. lib. 5. cap. 20. It. lib. 8. cap. 23.] they should hold religious assemblies, and keep them as the weekly festivals; that is, not only with psalmody, and reading the Scriptures, and common prayers, which was the ordinary service of the morning and evening of every day; but with sermons also, or preaching the gospel, and the offering of the oblation, and reception of the holy food; as he describes the service of the sabbath and Lord's day in another place.²¹ [Note 21: Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 59. p. 268.]

1395. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Both Celebrated for a Time

SOURCE: *The Sunday Problem* (Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1923), p. 36. Copyright 1923 by The Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church in America. Used by permission of the Muhlenberg Press.

We have seen how gradually the impression of the Jewish sabbath faded from the mind of the Christian Church, and how completely the newer thought underlying the observance of the first day took possession of the church. We have seen that the Christians of the first three centuries never confused one with the other, but for a time celebrated both.

1396. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Both Festivals, but Preference for Sunday

SOURCE: Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London: Bohn, 1870), bk. 20, chap. 3, secs. 1, 2, Vol. 2, pp. 1137, 1138. [See FRS No. 74.]

[p. 1137] Next to the Lord's day, the ancient Christians were very careful in the observation [observance] of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was the ancient Jewish sabbath. Some observed it as a fast, others as a festival; but all unanimously agreed in keeping it as a more solemn day of religious worship and adoration. In the Eastern church it was ever observed as a festival, one only sabbath excepted, which was called the Great Sabbath, between Good Friday and Easter-day, when our Saviour lay buried in the grave, upon which account it was kept as a fast throughout the whole church. But setting aside that one sabbath, all the rest were kept as festivals in the Oriental church...

[p. 1138] So far as concerns public worship, they make it in all things conformable to that of the Lord's day; which is a further evidence of its being a festival. They tell us, They had not only the Scriptures read, as on the Lord's day, and sermons preached, but the communion administered also...

The council of Laodicea ... particularly forbids the offering of the eucharistical oblation, or solemnizing any memorials of martyrs, on any other days in Lent, beside the sabbath and the Lord's day, because all other days were days of fasting, but these, even in Lent, were kept as festivals and days of relaxation...

Only here we are to observe, that though the substance of the service for the sabbath and the Lord's day was the same, yet in rites and ceremonies a difference was made, and in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's day above the sabbath. For, first, we find no ecclesiastical laws obliging men to pray standing on the sabbath; for that was a ceremony peculiar to the Lord's day, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. Nor, ... any laws obliging men to abstain wholly from bodily labour. But, on the contrary, the council of Laodicea has a canon forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship; but they were to honour the Lord's day, and rest on it as Christians... The Jews abstained wholly from working on the sabbath; the Christians only so far as was necessary for their attendance upon Divine service in the church.

1397. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Difference Between East and West in 4th Century

SOURCE: George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribner, 1900), p. 118. [FRS No. 99.]

In many of the Oriental churches the Sabbath (Saturday) was still observed like Sunday, while in the West a large number, by way of opposition to Jewish institutions, held a fast on that day.

1398. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Distinction Between Maintained

SOURCE: James C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1901), pp. 54, 55. [FRS No. 106.]

[p. 54] (8.) The Lord's day was observed with greater strictness than before, although the distinction between it and the Sabbath, as to origin, authority, and manner of observance, was still carefully maintained. Constantine, as [p. 55] we have seen, ordered that no legal proceedings and no military exercises should take place on it; yet he allowed agricultural labour to be carried on, lest the benefit of favourable weather should be lost. The council of Laodicea, while it condemned all Judaizing in the observance of the day, directed that labour should be avoided on it as much as possible. Theodosius in 379, and again in 386, enacted that no civil business should then be done, and abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day was set apart from other secular uses by Constantine.

The custom of observing the Sabbath in a similar manner to the Lord's day was now declining. The Laodicean canon, which has just been quoted, denounced a cessation from work on it as Judaical.

1399. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Marked by Public Worship in the East

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Joseph Torrey (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1851), pp. 421–423. [FRS No. 98.]

[p. 421] The custom, derived from the Jews, of paying a certain respect to the Sabbath still continued to be handed down in the *Oriental* communities. In several of the Eastern churches the Sabbath was celebrated nearly after the same manner as Sunday. Church

assemblies were held, sermons delivered, and the communion celebrated on this day. The [p. 422] direction given by the council of Laodicea deserves to be noticed, viz.: that on the Sabbath, the gospels should be read along with the other parts of the holy scriptures. It may be that the new arrangement which this council designed to introduce by the above-cited canon was simply that the scriptures generally should be read in church on the Sabbath in the same manner as on Sunday; and in this case we must suppose the council wished to restore the custom, formerly observed, of assembling for worship on the Sabbath as well as on Sunday, which had now become obsolete in many of the Eastern churches. Or this ordinance may be understood as simply indicating the design of the council, that in the meetings for divine worship on the Sabbath the gospels should be read, together with other parts of the holy scriptures; whence we might infer that, as the celebration of the Sabbath had been taken from the Jews, it had been the custom also to make use of the *Old Testament only* on this day in the church lessons. [See editors' note.] In many districts a punctual Jewish observance of the Sabbath must doubtless have become common, hence the council of Laodicea considered it necessary to ordain that Christians should not celebrate this day after the Jewish manner, nor consider themselves bound to abstain from labour. It was a general rule in the Eastern church that there should be no fasting on the Sabbath, hence the Sabbath also, as well as Sunday, was excepted from the period of fasting before Easter. But in many of the Western churches, particularly in the Roman and the Spanish, opposition to the Jews and Judaists had led to the [p. 423] custom of observing the Sabbath rather as a day of fasting.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In a footnote here Neander remarks that the latter interpretation would have called for a slightly different Greek construction, while the former is out of harmony with the fact that "the customary celebration of the Sabbath is everywhere presupposed by the council, and they considered themselves bound rather to moderate" this "Judaizing tendency." Hefele, in his note on canon 16 of the Council of Laodicea, refers to Neander's note and remarks that it is unlikely that there were Judaizing congregations that read only the Old Testament on the Sabbath. He adds that "about the middle, or at least in the last half of the fourth century, Judaizing no longer flourished, and probably no single Christian congregation held such Ebionite, un-Evangelical views."]

1400. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Observed by Full Liturgy Even During Lent—Council of Laodicea

SOURCE: Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 2, trans. and ed. by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 320.

CAN. 49. "During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday."

This canon, which was repeated by the Trullan Synod in its fifty-second canon, orders that on ordinary week days during Lent, only a *Missa Praesantificationum* [Mass of the Presanctified (elements), a eucharistic service using the bread and wine that had been consecrated in an earlier mass and reserved for later use] should take place, as is still the custom with the Greeks on all days of penitence and mourning, when it appears to them unsuitable to have the full liturgy, and as Leo Allatius says, for this reason, that the consecration is a joyful act. A comparison of the above sixteenth canon, however, shows that Saturday was a special exception...

CAN. 51. "During Lent, no feasts of the martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent."

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

1401. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Rest on Sabbath; Worship on Sunday

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 15. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

It was not easy for the early Jewish converts to forget completely the sacred practices connected with the observance of the Sabbath, particularly the rest from servile work. It happened then, that although they did perform the acts of Christian worship on the Sunday, many of them still continued to observe the bodily rest on the Sabbath. A history of the problem shows that in some places, it was really only after some centuries that the Sabbath rest really was entirely abolished, and by that time the practice of observing a bodily rest on the Sunday had taken its place.

1402. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Voluntary Observance

SOURCE: Jeremy Taylor, *The Rule of Conscience* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851), pp. 456–458. [FRS No. 71.]

[p. 456] § 49. ... The primitive Christians did keep the sabbath of the Jews; not only for their compliance with the Jews till the distinction were confessed and notorious, but because the moral religion which was served by that day was not brought into the religion of the Lord's day as yet...

[p. 457] § 50. At first they kept both days, with this only difference, that though they kept the sabbath, yet it was after the christian, that is, after the spiritual manner: in these exuberancies and floods of religion which overflowed their channels, one day of solemnity was not enough; but besides that they by their sabbath meetings had intercourse with the Jews in order to their conversion, and the Jewish Christians in order to the establishment of their religion, they were glad of all occasions to glorify God; but they did it without any opinion of essential obligation, and without the Jewish rest, and upon the account of christian reasons...

[p. 458] § 51. The effect of which consideration is this; that the Lord's day did not succeed in the place of the sabbath, but the sabbath was wholly abrogated, and the Lord's day was merely of ecclesiastical institution. It was not introduced by virtue of the fourth commandment, because they for almost three hundred years together kept that day which was in that commandment; but they did it also without any opinion of prime obligation, and therefore they did not suppose it moral.

1403. Sabbath and Sunday, in 1st-Century Literature—Clement of Rome (c. 97) on “Fixed Times” for Christian Services

SOURCE: First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians xl. 1, 2; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 77, 79. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 77] 1. Since then these things are manifest to us, and we have looked into the depths of the divine knowledge, we ought to do in order all things which the Master commanded us to perform at appointed times. 2. He commanded us to celebrate sacrifices and services, and that it should not be thoughtlessly or disorderly, but at fixed times and hours... 4. So then those who offer their oblations at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed, for [p. 79] they follow the laws of the Master and do no sin.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is included here because it is one of those often quoted in favor of Sunday. It is obvious that the “fixed times” and “appointed seasons” for Christian worship do not specify Sunday or any particular day. They could just as well mean the Sabbath as Sunday, hence prove nothing. For a similarly unnamed day of Christian worship mentioned by the Roman governor Pliny the Younger, see No. 1185a.]

1404. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Ignatius of Antioch (fl. c. 107) on Sabbath Contrasted With Lord’s (Day?)

SOURCE: Ignatius, [Epistle] To the Magnesians ix. 1; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 205, 207. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 115.]

[p. 205] If then they who walked in ancient customs came to a new hope, no longer living for the Sabbath, but for the Lord’s Day, on which also our life sprang up through him and his death,—though some deny him,—and by this mystery we received faith, and for this reason also we suffer, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ our only teacher; 2. if these things be so, how then shall we be able to live without him of whom even the prophets were disciples in the Spirit and to whom they looked [p. 207] forward as their teacher? And for this reason he whom they waited for in righteousness, when he came raised them from the dead.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The Greek text from which this passage is translated (see Loeb. ed., p. 204) here reads *κατα κυριαχὴν ζῶντες*. The Greek text in *MPG*, Vol. 5, col. 669, reads *κατὰ Κυριαχὴν ζῶντες*. For a discussion of the translation problems of this passage, see No. 1614; see also No. 769. For a longer recension of Magnesians 9 in a later interpolated form of Ignatius’ epistles, see No. 1411.]

1405. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Pseudo Barnabas (c. 130 or 150?) on the “Eight Day” Celebrated in Honor of the Resurrection

SOURCE: The [False] Epistle of Barnabas xv. 1–9; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 393, 395, 397. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [See FRS No. 94.]

[p. 393] 1. Furthermore it was written concerning the Sabbath in the ten words which he spake on Mount Sinai face to face to Moses. ‘Sanctify also the Sabbath of the Lord with pure hands and a pure heart.’ 2. And in another place he says, ‘If my [p. 395] sons keep the Sabbath then will I bestow my mercy upon them.’ 3. He speaks of the Sabbath at the beginning of the Creation, ‘And God made in six days the works of his hands and on the seventh day he made an end, and rested in it and sanctified it.’ 4. Notice, children, what is the meaning of ‘He made an end in six days’? He means this: that the Lord will make an end of everything in six thousand years, for a day with him means a thousand years. And he himself is my witness when he says, ‘Lo, the day of the Lord shall be as a thousand years.’ So then, children, in six days, that is in six thousand years, everything will be completed. 5. ‘And he rested on the seventh day.’ This means, when his Son comes he will destroy the time of the wicked one, and will judge the godless, and will change the sun and the moon and the stars, and then he will truly rest on the seventh day. 6. Furthermore he says, ‘Thou shalt sanctify it with clean hands and a pure heart.’ If, then, anyone has at present the power to keep holy the day which God made holy, by being pure in heart, we are altogether deceived. 7. See that we shall indeed keep it holy at that time, when we enjoy true rest, when we shall be able to do so because we have been made righteous ourselves and have received the promise, when there is no more sin, but all things have been made new by the Lord: then we shall be able to keep it holy because we ourselves have first been made holy. 8. Furthermore he says to them, ‘Your new moons and the sabbaths I cannot away with.’ Do you see what he means? The present sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that which I have made, in which I will give rest to all things and make the beginning of an [p. 397] eighth day, that is the beginning of another world. 9. Wherefore we also celebrate with gladness the eighth day in which Jesus also rose from the dead, and was made manifest, and ascended into Heaven.

1406. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—The Didache on the Eucharist on “The Lord’s (Day?) of the Lord”¹

SOURCE: The Didache xiv. 1–3; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 331. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 113.]

1. On the Lord’s Day of the Lord come together, break bread and hold Eucharist, after confessing your transgressions that your offering may be pure; 2. but let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join in your meeting until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled. 3. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord, “In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great king,” saith the Lord, “and my name is wonderful among the heathen.”

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The following explanation has been given of the first sentence: The Greek, which does not contain the word *day*, seems to be garbled, for it reads, literally: “According to the Lord’s [?] of the Lord, coming together break bread and hold the Eucharist.” The word to be supplied after *Lord’s* could be *day*, but it could also be some other word, such as *commandment*. Therefore, in order to cite this document as proof for the Lord’s day, the thing to be proved must be assumed, and thus this quotation becomes of no value as proof. It must be interpreted in the light of other information. In later times, certainly, the adjective *kuraikē*, “Lord’s,” came to be used alone as a name for Lord’s day, but this document is not proof of that use.]

1407. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Justin Martyr (c. 155)

a. First Record of Weekly Sunday Observance

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, chap. 67, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, pp. 185, 186.

[p. 185] 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 [p. 186] Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

(Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun (Sunday), having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration.

b. Law and Sabbath Held Ended in Christ

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho, a Jew*, chaps. 11, 12, 43, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, pp. 199, 200, 216.

[p. 199, chap. 11] There will be no other God, O Trypho, nor was there from eternity any other existing ... but He who made and disposed all this universe. Nor do we think that there is one God for us, another for you, but that He alone is God who led your fathers out from Egypt with a strong hand and a high arm. Nor have we trusted in any other (for there is no other), but in Him in whom you also have trusted, the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob. But we do not trust through Moses or through the law; for then we would do the same as yourselves. But now—(for I have read that there shall be a final law, and a covenant, the chiefest [p. 200] of all, which it is now incumbent on all men to observe, as many as are seeking after the inheritance of God. For the law promulgated on Horeb is now old, and belongs to yourselves alone; but *this* is for all universally. Now, law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has put an end to the previous one; and an eternal and final law—namely, Christ—has been given to us, and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance. Have you not read this which Isaiah says: “Hearken unto Me, my people; and, ye kings, give ear unto Me: for a law shall go forth from Me, and My judgment shall be for a light to the nations. My righteousness approaches swiftly, and My salvation shall go forth, and nations shall trust in Mine arm?” And by Jeremiah, concerning this same new covenant, He thus speaks: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt”). If, therefore, God proclaimed a new covenant which was to be instituted, and this for a light of the nations, we see and are persuaded that men approach God, leaving their idols and other unrighteousness, through the name of Him who was crucified, Jesus Christ, and abide by their confession even unto death, and maintain piety. Moreover, by the works and by the attendant miracles, it is possible for all to understand that He is the new law, and the new covenant, and the expectation of those who out of every people wait for the good things of God. For the true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations), are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated while we proceed...

[chap. 12] The new law requires you to keep perpetual sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you: and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept [sabbatized] the sweet and true sabbaths of God...

[p. 216, chap. 43] As, then, circumcision began with Abraham, and the Sabbath and sacrifices and offerings and feasts with Moses, and it has been proved they were enjoined on account of the hardness of your people’s heart, so it was necessary, in accordance with

the Father's will, that they should have an end in Him who was born of a virgin, of the family of Abraham and tribe of Judah, and of David; in Christ the Son of God, who was proclaimed as about to come to all the world, to be the everlasting law and the everlasting covenant, even as the forementioned prophecies show.

c. Sabbath Observers Regarded as “Weakminded” Brethren

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho, a Jew*, chap. 47, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, p. 218.

If some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, ... along with their hope in this Christ, and [wish to perform] the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren.

1408. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Irenaeus (c. 130–c. 202) on Abraham as Righteous “Without Observance of Sabbaths”

SOURCE: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, bk. 4, chap. 16, pars. 2, 3, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, p. 481.

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

3. Why, then, did the Lord not form the covenant for the fathers? Because “the law was not established for righteous men.” But the righteous fathers had the meaning of the Decalogue written in their hearts and souls, that is, they loved the God who made them, and did no injury to their neighbour. There was therefore no occasion that they should be cautioned by prohibitory mandates (*correptoriis literis*), because they had the righteousness of the law in themselves. But when this righteousness and love to God had passed into oblivion, and became extinct in Egypt, God did necessarily, because of His great goodwill to men, reveal Himself by a voice, and led the people with power out of Egypt, in order that man might again become the disciple and follower of God; and He afflicted those who were disobedient, that they should not contemn their Creator; and He fed them with manna, that they might receive food for their souls (*uti rationalem acciperent escam*); as also Moses says in Deuteronomy: “And fed thee with manna, which thy fathers did not know, that thou mightest know that man doth not live by bread alone; but by every word of God proceeding out of His mouth doth man live.” And it enjoined love to God, and taught just dealing towards our neighbour, that we should neither be unjust nor unworthy of God, who prepares man for His friendship through the medium of the Decalogue, and likewise for agreement with his neighbour,—matters which did certainly profit man himself; God, however, standing in no need of anything from man.

1409. Sabbath and Sunday, in 3d-Century Literature—Tertullian of North Africa (160?–230?)

a. Holy Days a Point of Difference Between Jews and Christians

SOURCE: Tertullian, *Apology*, chap. 21, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. III, p. 34.

We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor in their sacred days, nor even in their well-known bodily sign, nor in the possession of a common name.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tertullian does not directly name the Sabbath. This extract is presented because it is one of those cited by those who use the Church Fathers as evidence for Sunday.]

b. Sabbaths "Strange" but Every "Eighth Day" Kept

SOURCE: Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, chap. 14, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 70.

By us, to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals formerly beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New-year's and Midwinter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented... To the *heathens* each festive day occurs but once annually: *you* have a festive day every eighth day.

c. Sabbath Not Observed by Patriarchs, Says Tertullian

SOURCE: Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*, chap. 2, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 153.

Let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day because of the threat of death, teach us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the Sabbath, or practised circumcision, and were thus rendered "friends of God." For if circumcision purges a man since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did He not circumcise him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? At all events, in settling him in paradise, He appointed one uncircumcised as colonist of paradise. Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised, and inobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering Him sacrifices, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was by Him commended; while He accepted what he was offering in simplicity of heart, and reprobated the sacrifice of his brother Cain, who was not rightly dividing what he was offering. Noah also, uncircumcised—yes, and inobservant of the Sabbath—God freed from the deluge. For Enoch, too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, He translated from this world; who did not first taste death, in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might by this time show us that we also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God. Melchizedek also, "the priest of the most high God," uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was chosen to the priesthood of God. Lot, withal, the brother of Abraham, proves that it was for the merits of righteousness, without observance of the law, that he was freed from the conflagration of the Sodomites.

d. Weekly Sabbath Temporary, Argues Tertullian

SOURCE: Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*, chap. 4, in *ANF*, Vol. 3, pp. 155, 156.

[p. 155] It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary.

For the Jews say, that from the beginning God sanctified the seventh day, by resting on it from all His works which He made; and that thence it was, likewise, that Moses said to the People: "REMEMBER the day of the sabbaths, to sanctify it: every servile work ye shall not do therein, except what pertaineth unto life." Whence we (Christians) understand that *we* still more ought to observe a sabbath from all "servile work" always, and not only every seventh day, but through all time. And through this arises the question for us, *what* sabbath God willed us to keep? For the Scriptures point to a sabbath eternal and a sabbath temporal. For Isaiah the prophet says, "*Your* sabbaths my soul hateth;" and

in another place he says, “*My sabbaths ye have profaned.*” Whence we discern that the temporal sabbath is human, and the eternal sabbath is accounted divine; concerning which He predicts through Isaiah: “And there shall be,” He says, “month after month, and day after day, and sabbath after sabbath; and all flesh shall come to adore in Jerusalem, saith the Lord;” which we understand to have been fulfilled in the times of Christ, when “all flesh”—that is, every nation—“came to adore in Jerusalem” God the Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, as was predicted through the prophet: “Behold, proselytes through me shall go unto Thee.” Thus, therefore, before this temporal sabbath, there was withal an eternal sabbath foreshown and foretold; just as before the carnal circumcision there was withal a spiritual circumcision foreshown. In short, let them teach us, as we have already premised, that Adam observed the sabbath; or that Abel, when offering to God a holy victim, pleased Him by a religious reverence for the sabbath; or that Enoch, when translated, had been a keeper of the sabbath; or that Noah the ark-builder observed, on account of the deluge, an immense sabbath; or that Abraham, in observance of the sabbath, offered Isaac his son; or that Melchizedek in his priesthood received the law of the sabbath.

But the Jews are sure to say, that ever since this precept was given through Moses, the observance has been binding. Manifest accordingly it is, that the precept was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporary, which would one day cease. In short, so true is it that it is not in the exemption from work of the sabbath—that is, of the seventh day—that the celebration of this solemnity is to consist, that Joshua the son of Nun, at the time that he was reducing the city Jericho by war, stated that he had received from God a precept to order the People that priests should carry the ark of the testament of God seven days, making the circuit of the city; and thus, when the seventh day’s circuit had been performed, the walls of the city would spontaneously fall. Which was so done; and when the space of the seventh day was finished, just as was predicted, down fell the walls of the city. Whence it is manifestly shown, that in the number of the seven days there intervened a sabbath-day. For seven days, whencesoever they may have commenced, must necessarily include within them a sabbath-day; on which day not only must the priests have worked, but the city must have been made a prey by the edge of the sword by all the people of Israel. Nor is it doubtful that they “wrought servile work,” [p. 156] when, in obedience to God’s precept, they drave the preys of war. For in the times of the Maccabees, too, they did bravely in fighting on the sabbaths, and routed their foreign foes, and recalled the law of their fathers to the primitive style of life by fighting on the sabbaths. Nor should I think it was any other law which they thus vindicated, than the one in which they remembered the existence of the prescript touching “the day of the sabbaths.”

Whence it is manifest that the force of such precepts was temporary, and respected the necessity of present circumstances; and that it was not with a view to its observance in perpetuity that God formerly gave them such a law.

e. Pagan and Christian Worship on Sunday

SOURCE: Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*, bk. 1, chap. 13, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 123.

Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians [see No. 1567], because it is a well-known fact that we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshipping

the heavenly bodies likewise, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and for banqueting. By resorting to these customs, you deliberately deviate from your own religious rites to those of strangers. For the Jewish feasts are the Sabbath and “the Purification,” and Jewish also are the ceremonies of the lamps, and the fasts of unleavened bread, and the “littoral prayers,” all which institutions and practices are of course foreign from your gods. Wherefore, that I may return from this digression, you who reproach us with the sun and Sunday should consider your proximity to us. We are not far off from your Saturn and your days of rest.

f. Christ Observed the Sabbath

SOURCE: Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, bk. 4, chap. 12, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, pp. 363, 364.

[p. 363] He was called “Lord of the Sabbath,” because He maintained the Sabbath as His own institution. Now, even if He had annulled the Sabbath, He would have had he right to do so, as being its Lord, (and) still more as He who instituted it. But He did not utterly destroy it, although its Lord, in order that it might henceforth be plain that the Sabbath was not broken by the Creator... Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: He kept the law thereof... [p. 364] “I came not to destroy, the law, but to fulfil it.” ... He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath *and* while imparting to the Sabbath-day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by His own beneficent action.

g. Kneeling in Worship on the Sabbath and Sunday

SOURCE: Tertullian, *On Prayer*, chap. 23, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 689.

Some few ... abstain from kneeling [in church] on the Sabbath... We, however (just as we have received), only on the day of the Lord’s Resurrection ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: To pray standing in public worship on Sunday was considered an expression of the joy belonging to the resurrection day (see No. 1415). Some Christians therefore reasoned that the Sabbath, as a festival commemorating Creation, should be honored in the same way.]

h. No Fasting on the Sabbath

SOURCE: Tertullian, *On Fasting*, chap. 14, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 4, pp. 111, 112.

[p. 111] Being, therefore, observers of “seasons” for these things, and of “days, and months, and years,” we *Galaticize*. Plainly we do, if we are [p. 112] observers of *Jewish* ceremonies, of *legal* solemnities: for *those* the apostle unteaches, suppressing the continuance of the Old Testament which has been buried in Christ, and establishing that of the New. But if there is a new creation in Christ, our solemnities too will be bound to be new: else, if the apostle has erased *all* devotion absolutely “of seasons, and days, and months, and years,” why do we celebrate the passover by an *annual* rotation in the *first month*? Why in the *fifty* ensuing *days* do we [the Montanists] spend our time in all exultation? Why do we devote to Stations the *fourth* and *sixth days* of the week, and to fasts the “*preparation-day*?” Anyhow, *you* [the “carnal Christians”] sometimes continue your Station even over the Sabbath,—a day never to be kept as a fast except at the passover season [see No. 1396] according to a reason elsewhere given. With us, at all events, *every* day likewise is celebrated by an ordinary consecration. And it will not, then, be, in the eyes of the apostle, the *differentiating principle*—distinguishing (as he is doing)

“things new and old”—which will be ridiculous; but (in this case too) it will be your own unfairness, while you taunt us with the *form of antiquity* all the while you are laying against us the *charge of novelty*.

1410. Sabbath and Sunday, in 3d-Century Literature—Origen of Alexandria (185?–254?) on Ceasing From Worldly Works on Sabbath (Heb. 4:9)

SOURCE: Origen, *Homily 23 on Numbers*, chap. 4, in *MPG*, Vol. 12, cols. 749, 750. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost.

[col. 749] After the festival of the unceasing sacrifice [daily sacrifice] is put the second festival of the Sabbath, and it is fitting for whoever is righteous among the saints to keep also the festival of the Sabbath. Which is, indeed, the festival of the Sabbath, except that concerning which the Apostle said, “There remaineth therefore a sabbatismus, that is, a keeping of the Sabbath, to the people of God [Hebrews 4:9]”? Forsaking therefore the Judaic observance of the Sabbath, let us see what sort of observance of the Sabbath is expected of the Christian. On the day of the Sabbath nothing of worldly acts ought to be performed. If therefore you cease from all worldly works, and do nothing mundane, but are free for spiritual works, you come to the church, offer the ear for divine readings and discussions and thoughts of heavenly things, give attention to the future life, keep before your eyes the coming judgment, [col. 750] do not regard present and visible things but the invisible and the future: this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: It is clear that Origen is referring to the seventh day of the week. However it is not equally clear that he is saying that one should not work on the Sabbath. It is not certain that the sentence “On the day of the Sabbath nothing of worldly acts ought to be performed” is his own expressed opinion. This sentence is just as likely to be the ancient Biblical command for which he is giving a figurative Christian interpretation in the next sentence; for in his continuation, beyond the extract included here, he alternately cites the Sabbath law and interprets spiritually. For example: The prohibition of bearing a burden refers to the burden of sin. If this is true, he may mean no more than that the Christian equivalent of Jewish Sabbathkeeping is to substitute spiritual for worldly occupation and to go to church. The wording of the text does not make the meaning clear.]

1411. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Interpolated Ignatius (c. 300)—Sabbath Observed Spiritually, the Lord’s Day as a Festival

SOURCE: Ignatius, *Epistle to the Magnesians* (longer recension dated c. A.D. 300), chap. 9, in *MPG*, Vol. 5, cols. 768, 769. Greek. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank Yost. [See *FRS* No. 116.]

Let us no longer sabbatize in a Jewish manner, (and) rejoicing in holidays, . . . but let each one of you sabbatize spiritually, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in rest of body, admiring the artisanship of God, not eating stale things and drinking lukewarm things and walking measured distances and enjoying dancing and plaudits which do not have sense. And after the sabbatizing, let every friend of Christ keep as a festival the Lord’s (day), the resurrection-day, the queen, the chief of all the days.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: For the shorter, genuine form of this epistle, see No. 1404. See also No. 769.]

1412. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Pope Miltiades (311–314) Forbids Fasting on Sunday

SOURCE: *The Book of the Popes (Liber Pontificalis)*, trans. by Louise R. Loomis, p. 40. Copyright 1916 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

He decreed that no one of the faithful should in any wise keep fast upon the Lord's day or upon the fifth day of the week, because the pagans celebrate those days as a sacred fast.

1413. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Eusebius (c. 260–c. 340)

a. Change of the Sabbath

SOURCE: Eusebius, *Commentary on the Psalms*, on Ps. 91 (92): 2, 3, in *MPG*, Vol. 23, col. 1172. Greek.

All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we [the church] have transferred to the Lord's day, as being more authoritative and more highly regarded and first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath.

b. Sabbath and Sunday Observed by Ebionites

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* iii. 27; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 263. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Ebionites] used to observe the sabbath and the rest of the Jewish ceremonial, but on Sundays celebrated rites like ours in commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection.

c. Religious Worship on Sunday Enforced in Constantine's Army

SOURCE: Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine*, bk. 4, chaps. 18–20, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 1, pp. 544, 545.

[p. 544] And since his desire was to teach his whole army zealously to honor the Saviour's day (which derives its name from light, and from the sun), he freely granted to those [p. 545] among them who were partakers of the divine faith, leisure for attendance on the services of the Church of God, in order that they might be able, without impediment, to perform their religious worship. . . .

With regard to those who were as yet ignorant of divine truth, he provided by a second statute that they should appear on each Lord's day on an open plain near the city, and there, at a given signal, offer to God with one accord a prayer which they had previously learnt. . . . The emperor himself prescribed the prayer to be used by all his troops, commanding them to pronounce the following words in the Latin tongue: . . .

"We acknowledge thee the only God: we own thee as our King, and implore thy succor. By thy favor have we gotten the victory: through thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for thy past benefits, and trust thee for future blessings. Together we pray to thee, and beseech thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our emperor Constantine and his pious sons."

1414. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Constitutions of the Holy Apostles (pseudonymous work, c. 375)

a. Both Days of Public Worship in the East

SOURCE: *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, bk. 2, sec. 7, chap. 59, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 7, p. 423.

Assemble yourselves together every day, morning and evening, singing psalms and praying in the Lord's house: in the morning saying the sixty-second Psalm, and in the evening the hundred and fortieth, but principally on the Sabbath-day. And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent Him to us, and condescended to let Him suffer, and raised Him from the dead. Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection, on which we pray thrice standing in memory of Him who arose [see No. 1415] in three days,

in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the Gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food?

b. Sabbath and Sunday Days of Joy; Fasting Forbidden (Except the Sabbath Preceding Easter)

SOURCE: *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, bk. 5, sec. 3, chap. 20; bk. 7, sec. 2, chap. 23, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 7, pp. 449, 469.

[p. 449] We enjoin you to fast every fourth day of the week, and every day of the preparation, and the surplusage of your fast bestow upon the needy; every Sabbath-day excepting one, and every Lord's day, hold your solemn assemblies, and rejoice: for he will be guilty of sin who fasts on the Lord's day, being the day of the resurrection, or during the time of Pentecost, or, in general, who is sad on a festival day to the Lord. For on them we ought to rejoice, and not to mourn...

[p. 469] But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed [as a fast] by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures.

c. Five-Day Week for Slaves

SOURCE: *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, bk. 8, sec. 4, chap. 33, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 7, p. 495.

I Peter and Paul do make the following constitutions. Let the slaves work five days; but on the Sabbath-day and the Lord's day let them have leisure to go to church for instruction in piety. We have said that the Sabbath is on account of the creation, and the Lord's day of the resurrection.

1415. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Basil of Caesarea (c. 329–378)

SOURCE: Basil, *On the Spirit*, chap. 27, sec. 66, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 8, p. 42.

We pray standing, on the first day of the week, but we do not all know the reason. On the day of the resurrection (or “standing again” Gr. ἀνάστασις) we remind ourselves of the grace given to us by standing at prayer, not only because we rose with Christ, and are bound to “seek those things which are above,” but because the day seems to us to be in some sense an image of the age which we expect...

The church teaches her own foster children to offer their prayers on that day standing, to the end that through continual reminder of the endless life we may not neglect to make provision for our removal thither... On this day the rules of the church have educated us to prefer the upright attitude of prayer, for by their plain reminder they, as it were, make our mind to dwell no longer in the present but in the future.

1416. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Council of Laodicea (Date Unknown, Between 343 and 381) on Sabbath and Sunday

SOURCE: Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 2, trans. and ed. by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), pp. 310, 316, 320. [FRS No. 41.]

[p. 310] CAN. 16. “On Saturday [Greek *sabbaton*, “the Sabbath”] the Gospels and other portions of the Scripture shall be read aloud.” ...

[p. 316] CAN. 29. “Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and, as being

Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out [Greek *anathema*] from Christ.” ...

[p. 320] CAN. 49. “During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday.” ...

CAN. 51. “During Lent, no feast of the martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent.”

[EDITORS’ NOTE: For the significance of canon 29, see Nos. 1399, 1638.]

1417. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Epiphanius of Constantia (315?–403) on Sabbath Worship

SOURCE: Epiphanius, *Expositio Fidei* (“Exposition of the Faith”), *MPG*, Vol. 42, col. 832. Greek.

In certain places also on the Sabbath they hold assemblies.

1418. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Gregory of Nyssa (331?–396?) on Sabbath and Sunday as Sisters

SOURCE: Gregory of Nyssa, *De Castigatione* (“On Reproof”), in *MPG*, Vol. 46, col. 309. Greek.

With what kind of eyes do you see the Lord’s Day [Sunday], you who dishonor the Sabbath? Do you not know that these days are sisters?

1419. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—John Chrysostom (c. 347–407) on Sabbath Observance in His Day

SOURCE: Chrysostom, *Commentary on Galatians*, on chap. 1:7, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 13, p. 8.

There are many among us now, who fast on the same day as the Jews, and keep the sabbaths in the same manner; and we endure it nobly or rather ignobly and basely.

1420. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Pope Siricius (384–399) on Sunday as a Day for Sacraments

SOURCE: Siricius, *Epistle*, chap. 2, in *MPL*, Vol. 13, cols. 1134, 1135. Latin.

[col. 1134] The Lord’s Day, especially Easter with its Pentecost, guards for itself the privilege [the mystery of baptism], both among us [at Rome] and among all the churches; on these days of the sun through [col. 1135] the year, it is convenient that the general sacraments of baptism be given to the multitudes flocking to the faith.

1421. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—John Cassian (c. 395) on Sabbath and Sunday Church Services Among Monks in Egypt

SOURCE: John Cassian, *The Twelve Books on the Institutes of the Coenobia*, bk. 3, chap. 2; bk. 5, chap. 26, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 11, pp. 213, 243.

[p. 213] Wherefore, except Vespers and Nocturns, there are no public services among them [monks in Egypt] in the day except on Saturday and Sunday, when they meet together at the third hour for the purpose of Holy Communion...

[p. 243] We have seen another who lived alone, who declared that he had never enjoyed food by himself alone, but that even if for five days running none of the brethren came to his cell he constantly put off taking food until on Saturday or Sunday he went to church for service and found some stranger whom he brought home at once to his cell, and together with him partook of refreshment for the body not so much by reason of his own needs, as for the sake of kindness.

1422. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—(Pseudo?) Athanasius on Sabbath Worship

SOURCE: Athanasius, *Homilia de Semente*, sec. 1, in *MPG*, Vol. 28, col. 144. Greek.

On the Sabbath day we gathered together, not being infected with Judaism, for we do not lay hold of false Sabbaths, but we come on the Sabbath to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. For of old there was among the ancients the honorable Sabbath, but the Lord changed the day of the Sabbath to the Lord's day, and not we alone despise the Sabbath, but the prophet is the one who cast it aside and said, "Your new moons and Sabbaths my should hates."

1423. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Jerome (c. 340–420) on Sabbath as a Ceasing From Sin

SOURCE: Jerome, Comment on [Isaiah 56:2](#) and [58:13](#), in [MPL](#), Vol. 24, cols. 539, 573. Latin.

[col. 539] What sort of Sabbath is it that He commands to be kept, the following line shows: *Keeping his hands that he might not do any evil.* . . .

[col. 573] From one command, therefore [not to go out of one place on the Sabbath], which is impossible according to the letter, we are obliged to understand spiritually the others also: that we must not do servile work and lose the liberty of the soul, for whoever sins is a servant of sin; that we should not carry a burden on the Sabbath, such as he carried who said, "My iniquities . . . weigh increasingly upon me like a heavy burden" [Ps. 38:4].

1424. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Asterius of Amasea (c. 400) on Sabbath and Sunday as a Beautiful "Team"

SOURCE: Asterius of Amasea, Homily 5, on [Matt. 19:3](#), in [MPG](#), Vol. 40, col. 225. Greek.

It is beautiful to Christians and to the industrious that the team of these two days comes together; I speak of the Sabbath and the Lord's day, which time in its course brings around weekly. For as mothers and nurses of the church they gather the people, set over them priests as instructors, and lead both disciples and teachers to have a care for souls.

1425. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (354–430), on Fasting on the Sabbath in Rome, Not in Milan

SOURCE: Augustine, Letter 54, to Januarius, [chap. 2](#), in [MPL](#), Vol. 33, cols. 200, 201. Latin.

[col. 200] In some places no day is omitted, on which the communion is not offered; in some [it is offered] only on the Sabbath and the Lord's day [Sunday]; in some only on the Lord's Day. . .

[col. 201] He [Ambrose, Bishop of Milan] said to me, "When I come to Rome, I fast on the Sabbath; when I am here, I do not fast. Thus even you, to whatever church you happen to come, observe its custom if you do not wish to be a stumblingblock to anyone, nor anyone to you."

1426. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Pope Innocent I (402–417) Enjoins Sabbath Fasting

SOURCE: Innocent I, Epistle 25, [chap. 4](#), in [MPL](#), Vol. 20, col. 555. Latin. [Trans.](#) by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost.

That the Sabbath is for fasting the clearest argument demonstrates. For if we not only celebrate the Lord's day on account of the revered [Latin *venerabilis*] resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ at Easter [Latin *pascha*, "passover"], but also throughout each recurring cycle of the weeks, we repeat the image of this very day, and fast on the sixth day because of the passion of the Lord, and we ought not then to omit [for fasting] the

Sabbath, which is seen closed in between the sadness and joy of this time. In it is certainly known that the apostles were in sadness both these days, and had shut themselves in for fear of the Jews.

1427. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Theodoret of Cyrrihus (390?–457?) on Sabbath and Sunday Observance by Ebionites

SOURCE: Theodoret of Cyrrihus, *De Fabulis Haereticorum* (“On the Fables of the Heretics”), bk. ii, chap. 1, in *MPG*, Vol. 83, col. 389. Greek.

They [the Ebionites] observe the Sabbath according to Jewish law, and sanctify the Lord’s day in keeping with our custom.

1428. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Socrates Scholasticus (fl. c. 440)

a. Sabbath and Easter

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, pp. 130, 131.

[p. 130] In Asia Minor most people kept the fourteenth day of the moon, disregarding the Sabbath: yet they never separated from those who did otherwise, until Victor, bishop of Rome, influenced by too ardent a zeal, fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the Quartodecimans in Asia... [p. 131] Others in the East kept that feast on the sabbath indeed, but differed as regards the month.

The feast of Easter came to be observed in each place according to the individual peculiarities of the peoples...

The fasts before Easter will be found to be differently observed among different people. Those at Rome fast three successive weeks before Easter, excepting Saturdays and Sundays.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Some in the East observed Easter on the Sabbath; whether always on a Sabbath, or only when the 14th fell on that day, is not made clear in the original. However, it is obvious that the author refers to Saturday, not Sunday, as shown by the word Σάββατον and also by its mention along with Sunday.]

b. Rome and Alexandria Drop Sabbath Communion

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 132. [FRS No. 118.]

Although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the sabbath²² [Note 22: i.e. Saturday] of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this.

c. Sabbath and Sunday Designated “the Festal Days”

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 6, chap. 8, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 144.

As often therefore as the festal days occurred—I mean Saturday and Lord’s day—in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in the churches, they [the Arians] congregated within the city gates about the public squares, and sang responsive verses adapted to the Arian heresy.

1429. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Sozomen (c. 400–c. 447) on Rome as Leader in Setting Aside Recognition of Sabbath

SOURCE: Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 7, chap. 19, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 390. [FRS No. 119.]

The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria.

1430. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Pope Leo I (440–461)

a. Easter Sunday Begins the Evening Before, After the Sabbath

SOURCE: Leo I, Letter 9, chap. 2, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, pp. 7, 8.

[p. 7] The ordination of priests or deacons should not be performed at random on any day: but after Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*], the commencement of that night which precedes the dawn of the first day of the week should be chosen on which the sacred benediction should be bestowed on those who are to be consecrated, ordainer and ordained alike fasting. This observance will not be violated, if actually on the morning of the LORD'S day it be celebrated without breaking the Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*] fast... Those who are to be consecrated should never receive the blessing except on the day of the Lord's resurrection, which is commonly held to begin on the evening of Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*], and which has been so often hallowed in the mysterious dispensations of GOD that all the more notable institutions of the LORD were accomplished on that high day. On it the world took its beginning. On it through the resurrection of Christ death received its destruction, and life its commencement. On it the apostles take from the LORD'S hands the trumpet of the gospel [p. 8] which is to be preached to all nations, and receive the sacrament of regeneration which they are to bear to the whole world. On it, as blessed John the Evangelist bears witness when all the disciples were gathered together in one place, and when, the doors being shut, the LORD entered to them, He breathed on them and said: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye have remitted they are remitted to them: and whose ye have retained they shall be retained." On it lastly the Holy Spirit that had been promised to the Apostles by the LORD came: and so we know it to have been suggested and handed down by a kind of heavenly rule, that on that day we ought to celebrate the mysteries of the blessing of priests on which all these gracious gifts were conferred.

b. Baptisms on Easter and Pentecost

SOURCE: Leo I, Letter 16, chap. 4, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 28.

It is appropriate that the power of baptism should change the old into the new creature on the death-day of the Crucified and the Resurrection-day of the Dead: that Christ's death and His resurrection may operate in the re-born... It must be added, indeed, that the solemn season of Pentecost, hallowed by the coming of the Holy Ghost is also allowed, being, as it were, the sequel and completion of the Paschal feast. And while other festivals are held on other days of the week, this festival (of Pentecost) always occurs on that day, which is marked by the LORD'S resurrection.

c. Vigil on Sabbath

SOURCE: Leo I, Sermon 88, chap. 5, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 199.

On Wednesday and Friday therefore let us fast; and on Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*] keep vigil all together in the presence of the most blessed apostle Peter, by whose merits and prayers we are sure GOD'S mercy will be vouchsafed to us in all things.

1431. Sabbath and Sunday, in 6th-Century Literature—Sabbath Observed by Some in Rome, About 600

SOURCE: Gregory I (Pope, 590–604), *Selected Epistles*, bk. 13, Epistle 1, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 13, pp. 92, 93.

[p. 92] Gregory, servant of the servants of God, to his most beloved sons the Roman citizens.

It has come to my ears that certain men of perverse spirit have sown among you some things that are wrong and opposed to the holy faith, so as to forbid any work being done on the Sabbath day. What else can I call these but preachers of Antichrist, who, when he comes, will cause the Sabbath day as well as the Lord's day to be kept free from all work. For, because he pretends to die and rise again, he wishes the Lord's day to be had in reverence; and, because he compels the people to judaize that he may bring back the outward rite of the law, and subject the perfidy of the Jews to himself, he wishes the Sabbath to be observed.

For this which is said by the prophet, *Ye shall bring in no burden through your gates on the Sabbath day* (Jerem. xvii. 24), could be held to as long as it was lawful for the law to be observed according to the letter. But after that the grace of Almighty God, our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, the commandments of the law which were spoken figuratively cannot be kept according to the letter. For, if any one says that this about the Sabbath is to be kept, he must needs say that carnal sacrifices are to be offered: he must say too that the commandment about the circumcision of the body is still to be retained. But let him hear the Apostle Paul saying in opposition to him, *If ye be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing* (Galat. v. 2).

We therefore accept spiritually, and hold spiritually, this which is written about the Sabbath. For the Sabbath means rest. But we have the true Sabbath in our Redeemer Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ. And whoso acknowledges the light of faith in Him, if he draws the sins of concupiscence through his eyes into his soul, he introduces burdens through the gates on the Sabbath day. We introduce, then, no burden through the gates on the Sabbath day if we draw no weights of sin through the bodily senses to the soul. For we read that the same our Lord and Redeemer did many works on the Sabbath day, so that he reproveth the Jews, saying, *Which of you doth not loose his ox or his ass on the Sabbath day, and lead him away to watering* (Luke xiii. 15)? If, then, the very Truth in person commanded that the Sabbath should not be kept according to the letter, whoso keeps the rest of the Sabbath according to the letter of the law, whom else does he contradict but the Truth himself? ...

These things, most dear sons, being endowed with sure constancy and right faith, observe; despise the words of foolish men, and give not easy belief to all that you hear of having been said by them; but [p. 93] weigh it in the scale of reason, so that, while in firm stability you resist the wind of error, you may be able to attain to the solid joys of the heavenly kingdom.

1432. Sabbath, Change of, as a Gradual Process

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 15, 22–25. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 15] A history of the problem shows that in some places, it was really only after some centuries that the Sabbath rest really was entirely abolished, and by that time the practice of observing a bodily rest on the Sunday had taken its place...

[p. 22] The question now arises: Did the transfer of the day of worship from the seventh day to the first day of the week by the early Christians carry with it the obligation of rest which had characterized the Jewish Sabbath? That question is difficult to answer.

All are fairly well agreed that there was no such thing as an immediate transfer of the obligation of rest. This is partly evident from the fact that there were some who regarded the practice of resting from prohibited works on a festival as characteristically Jewish, and therefore something inappropriate for the Christians. Even the Jewish converts themselves did not think of uniting rest with the Sunday. It was the seventh day of the week which typified the rest of God after creation and not the first day. The former day was to be retained as the day of rest even though the Christian worship was held on the night between Saturday and Sunday. "The idea of importing [p. 23] into the Sunday the solemnity of the Sabbath with all its exigencies was an entirely foreign one to the early Christians. This was especially true in regard to the prohibition of work." ⁴⁹ [Note 49: Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, . . . p. 47.] It was not easy at that early period, nor later as history shows, for the Jewish converts to give up completely the historical Sabbath rest. If a distinction can be made between the converts from paganism and those from Judaism, it can be said that it was probably the pagan converts who first joined a rest from labor with the Sunday.

One writer mentions that this transfer of the day of rest from the seventh to the first day of the week, although it took place gradually, was well nigh complete by the end of the first century. An almost complete absence of evidence makes this statement difficult to prove. . . . As has already been mentioned, if the early Judaeo-Christians kept any day of rest, it was probably the Sabbath, the memorial of crea- [p. 24] tion. . . .

[p. 25] But when it is said that there was no transfer of the obligation of abstaining from prohibited works on the Sabbath to the Sunday, and that no mention of such an obligation can be found in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, one must not conclude that there was actually no abstention whatsoever from work on Sunday even in the beginning.

1433. Sabbath, Change of, by Gradual Development; Both Sabbath and Sunday Observed

SOURCE: "Jesus and the Sabbath," *The Earnest Worker*, 74 (October, 1943), 609, 610. [FRS No. 60.]

[p. 609] The change from the seventh to the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath was a rather slow development. . . . The fact that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week was the chief factor in the change. The early Christians felt that the Resurrection was of such great importance as to deserve a weekly commemoration and began to observe the first day of the week as a day of worship, calling it the Lord's Day. It is very probable that the first Christians observed both days. However, there would seem to be indications that out in the Gentile world the converts to Christianity from among [p. 610] the Jews kept the Hebrew Sabbath, while those from paganism kept the first day of the week, resulting in that strife over days which Paul rebuked in his Epistles. The legalistic observance of a certain day is not of the spirit of the Christian religion, but the experience of the early church soon revealed the wisdom of having a definite day for worship, resulting in the first day of the week, the day of the Resurrection, becoming the Christian Sabbath.

1434. Sabbath, Change of, by Gradual Steps

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 203. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

The Sunday was in the beginning not looked on as a day of bodily repose; nor was an analogy drawn between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, except as days of worship...

The keeping of the Sunday rest arose from the custom of the people and the constitution of the Church...

Tertullian [3d century; see Nos. 1409, 1567] was probably the first to refer to a cessation of worldly affairs on the Sunday; the Council of Laodicea [4th century; see Nos. 1435, 1638] issued the first conciliar legislation for that day; Constantine I [in 321; see Nos. 1637, 1643–1646] issued the first civil legislation.

1435. Sabbath, Change of—Canon of Council of Laodicea—Sunday Rest Encouraged, Sabbath Rest Forbidden

SOURCE: Council of Laodicea, can. 29, [trans.](#) in Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 2, [trans.](#) and [ed.](#) by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 316. [[FRS No. 41.](#)]

Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Greek *sabbaton*, the Sabbath] but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The date of this council is unknown, but it is believed to have been held sometime between 343 and 381.

As for the authority of the Council, or as some prefer to call it, the Synod, of Laodicea, it may be remarked that while it was not ecumenical, its acts have never been called in question, and the sixty articles adopted by it became practically a part of the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church. On the significance of this enactment, see No. 1638.]

1436. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Authority Claimed for

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic," in John Gilmary Shea and others, *The Cross and the Flag, Our Church and Country* (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25. [[FRS No. 104.](#)]

[p. 24] The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the authority of the Church [p. 25] from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, ... is one of the most patent signs that we are a Christian people.

1437. Sabbath, Change of, a Catholic Change Accepted by Protestants Against the Bible.

SOURCE: *The Christian Sabbath* (2d ed.; Baltimore: The Catholic Mirror, [1893]), pp. 29–31. [[FRS No. 30](#); original editorials, [FRS No. 125.](#)]

[p. 29] The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her Divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her Divine mission because He [who] has so called Himself "the Lord of the Sabbath," ... commanded all, without exception, "to hear His Church,["?] under penalty of being classed by Him as "the heathen and the publican." ...

But the Protestant says: How can I receive the teachings of an apostate Church? How, we ask, have you managed to receive her teaching all your life, *in direct* [p. 30] *opposition* to your recognized teacher, the Bible, on the Sabbath question? ...

[p. 31] The Protestant world at i[t]s birth found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the Church's right to change the day, for over 300 years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore *to this day* the acknowledged offspring

of the Catholic Church, as Spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This pamphlet is mostly a reprint of four editorials in *The Catholic Mirror* (Baltimore), Sept. 2, 9, 16, 23, 1893. The above quotation from the beginning to the first omission, and the last paragraph, came from the editorial of September 23, but the middle portion is part of an addition inserted by the author when the material was reprinted as a pamphlet. The title, with full subtitle, reads: *The Christian Sabbath—The Genuine Offspring of the Union of the Holy Spirit, and the Catholic Church, His Spouse. The Claims of Protestantism to any Part Therein Proved to be Groundless, Self-Contradictory and Suicidal. For the text of the original four editorials, see the Review and Herald reprint in pamphlet form, entitled Rome's Challenge.*]

1438. Sabbath, Change of—Catholic Church Made Transfer

SOURCE: Peter Geiermann, *The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine* (1957 ed.), p. 50. Copyright 1930 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission. [See FRS No. 26.]

Q. Which is the Sabbath day?

A. Saturday is the Sabbath day.

Q. Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

A. We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This work received the "apostolic blessing" of Pope Pius X, Jan. 25, 1910. In old editions this statement read "because the Catholic Church in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 336)" made the change. The reference to Laodicea has long been omitted, probably because the date of the council is unknown and the two or three dates formerly cited for it are not valid; probably also because the change of the Sabbath was actually not accomplished by that council alone (see Nos. 1432–1434).]

1439. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Explanation of

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 402, 403. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 4.]

[p. 402] But the Church of God has thought it well to transfer the celebration and observance of the Sabbath to Sunday.

For, as on that day light first shone on the world, so by the Resurrection of our Redeemer on the same day, by whom was thrown open to us the gate to eternal life, we were called out of darkness into light; and hence the Apostles would have it called *the Lord's day*.

We also learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the first day [p. 403] of the week was held sacred because on that day the work of creation commenced, and on that day the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles.

1440. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Substitution Without Scriptural Authority

SOURCE: Stephen Keenan, *A Doctrinal Catechism* (3d American ed., rev.; New York: T. W. Strong, late Edward Dunigan & Bro., 1876), p. 174. [FRS No. 7.]

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.

1441. Sabbath, Change of—Catholics Claim Sunday as Protestant Homage to Papal Authority

SOURCE: Louis Gaston de Ségur, *Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day* (Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1868), p. 225.

It was the Catholic Church which, by the authority of JESUS CHRIST, has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] Church. [See No. 1442.]

1442. Sabbath, Change of, Cited as Proof of Church's Power

SOURCE: Daniel Ferris, *Manual of Christian Doctrine: or, Catholic Belief and Practice* (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1916), pp. 67, 68. Used by permission. [FRS No. 5.]

[p. 67] The Third Commandment.

Q. What does the word "Sabbath" mean?

A. It means the day of rest.

Q. When did the Sabbath begin to be kept?

A. From the very creation of the world; for then God blessed the seventh day, and rested on it from all His work.—Gen. ii. 2, 3.

Q. When was this Commandment renewed?

A. In the Old Law, when God gave the commandments to Moses on Mount Sinai, written with His own finger on two tables of stone.—Exodus xx.

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath changed into the Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born on a Sunday, arose from the dead on a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday—works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it changed?

A. By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in spirit on the Lord's day (which was Sunday)—Apoc. i. 10.

Q. How do you prove that the Church has power to command Feasts and Holy-days?

A. By this very act of changing the Sabbath into the Sunday, which is admitted by Protestants, and therefore they contradict themselves by keeping Sunday so strictly, and breaking most other Feasts commanded by the same Church.

Q. How do you prove that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday [p. 68] they acknowledge the power of the Church to ordain Feasts and to command them under sin, and by not keeping the remainder, equally commanded by her, they deny in fact the same power.

[EDITORS' NOTE: A considerable part of this extract was drawn from Henry Tu(r)berville's *An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine* (known also as the Douay Catechism) of 1649.]

1443. Sabbath, Change of, Cited as Proof That Tradition Is Above Scripture

SOURCE: Gaspare [Ricciulli] de Fosso (Archbishop of Reggio), Address in the 17th session of the Council of Trent, Jan. 18, 1562, in Mansi *SC*, Vol. 33, cols. 529, 530. Latin.

[col. 529] Such is the condition of the heretics of this age that on nothing do they rely more than that, under the pretense of the word of God, they overthrow the authority of the church; as though the church, His body, could be opposed to the word of Christ, or the head to the body. On the contrary, the authority of the church, then, is illustrated most clearly by the Scriptures; for while on the one hand she recommends them, declares them to be divine, [col. 530] offers them to us to be read, in doubtful matters explains them faithfully, and condemns whatever is contrary to them; on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been changed into the Lord's day.

Circumcision, enjoined upon Abraham and his seed under such threatening that he who had not been circumcised would be destroyed from among his people, has been so abrogated that the apostle asserts: “If ye be circumcised, ye have fallen from grace, and Christ shall profit you nothing.” These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of Christ’s teaching (for He says He has come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it), but they have been changed by the authority of the church. Indeed, if she should be removed (since there must be heresies), who would set forth truth, and confound the obstinacy of heretics? All things will be confused, and soon heresies condemned by her authority will spring up again. [See No. 1444.]

1444. Sabbath, Change of—Cited in Council of Trent as Proof that Tradition Is Above Scripture

SOURCE: Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Kanon und Tradition* (“Canon and Tradition”) (Ludwigsburg: Druck and Verlag von Ferd. Riehm, 1859), p. 263. German. [FRS No. 72.]

The Council [of Trent] agreed fully with Ambrosius Pelargus, that under no condition should the Protestants be allowed to triumph by saying that the council had condemned the doctrine of the ancient church. But this practice caused untold difficulty without being able to guarantee certainty. For this business, indeed, ‘well-nigh divine prudence’ was requisite—which the Spanish ambassador acknowledged as belonging to the council on the sixteenth of March, 1562. Indeed, thus far they had not been able to orient themselves to the interchanging, crisscrossing, labyrinthine, twisting passages of an older and newer concept of tradition. But even in this they were to succeed. Finally, at the last opening [see editors’ note] on the eighteenth of January, 1562, all hesitation was set aside: [Gaspar de Fosso] the Archbishop of Reggio made a speech [see No. 1443] in which he openly declared that tradition stood above Scripture. The authority of the church could therefore not be bound to the authority of the Scriptures, because the church had changed circumcision into baptism, Sabbath into Sunday, not by the command of Christ, but by its own authority. With this, to be sure, the last illusion was destroyed, and it was declared that tradition does not signify antiquity, but continual inspiration.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: This “last opening” of the Council of Trent was not the last day, but the opening of the 17th session, the first meeting of the last series of sessions that was opened, after a lapse of time, under a new pope. The council was in session for longer or shorter periods over a series of years.]

1445. Sabbath, Change of—Eck’s Argument for the Church’s Superiority Over Scripture

SOURCE: Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communion ... Adversus Lutheranos* (“Handbook of Common Places Against the Lutherans”) (Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Frates de Sabio, 1533), fols. 4v, 5r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost. [FRS No. 127.]

[fol. 4v] The Scripture teaches “Remember that you sanctify the day of the Sabbath; six days shall you labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God,” etc. But the Church has changed the Sabbath into the Lord’s (day) by its own author- [fol. 5r] ity, concerning which you have no scripture.

Christ said to his disciples in the mount, “I have not come to dissolve the law but to fulfill it”; and yet the church of the Apostles in the first council has boldly spoken out concerning the cessation of legal things. . .

The Scripture decrees in the [apostolic] council . . . that you abstain from . . . blood and from a strangled thing; a matter so clearly defined and expressed the Church has changed by her own authority, for she uses both blood and things strangled. See the power of the church over Scripture.

[fol. 42v] The Sabbath is commanded many times by God; neither in the Gospels nor in Paul is it declared that the Sabbath has ceased; nevertheless the Church has instituted the Lord's day through the tradition of the Apostles without Scripture.

1446. Sabbath, Change of—Influence of Surrounding Paganism

SOURCE: Hutton Webster, *Rest Days*, pp. 220, 221. Copyright 1916 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 220] The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week with its numbered weekdays, but by the close of the third century A.D. this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism... During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worships, especially that of Mithra, in the Roman world, had already led to the substitution by pagans of *dies Solis* for *dies Saturni*, as the first day of the planetary week... [p. 221] Thus gradually a pagan institution was engrafted on Christianity.

1447. Sabbath, Change of, Jerome's Argument on, Cited by Eck, Opponent of Luther at Leipzig

SOURCE: Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium ... Adversus Lutheranos* ("Handbook of Common Places Against the Lutherans") (Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Fratres de Sabio, 1533), fols. 18r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost. [FRS No. 127.]

[fol. 18r] Anicetus I commanded the Passover to be celebrated on the Lord's day. First Pius confirmed it and finally Victor, and they have maintained it... [fol. 42v] Jerome, concerning the Passover of the Lord: The whole grace of the Sabbath and that ancient festival of this day of the Jews has been changed in this observance. The Sabbath moreover has been changed, because it signifies the first creation, to the Lord's day, in which is commemorated the new creature begun in the resurrection of Christ.

1448. Sabbath, Change of, Lutheran Confession on

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (1530), part 2, art. 7, "Of Ecclesiastical Power," trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 63, 64.

[p. 63] Besides these things, there is a controversy whether Bishops or Pastors have power to institute ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, and holidays, and degrees, or orders of ministers, etc. They that ascribe this power to Bishops allege this [p. 64] testimony for it: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now; but when that Spirit of truth shall come, he shall teach you all truth' (John xvi. 12, 13). They allege also the examples of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood, and that which was strangled (Acts xv. 29). They allege the change of the Sabbath into the Lord's day, contrary, as it seemeth, to the Decalogue; and they have no example more in their mouths than the change of the Sabbath. They will needs have the Church's power to be very great, because it hath dispensed with a precept of the Decalogue.

But of this question ours do thus teach: that the Bishops have no power to ordain any thing contrary to the Gospel, as was showed before.

1449. Sabbath, Change of—Mingling of Pagan and Christian Ideas in Promotion of Sunday

SOURCE: "Sunday," *A Religious Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3 (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), p. 2259.

Sunday (*Dies solis*, of the Roman calendar, “day of the sun,” because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The “sun” of Latin adoration they interpreted as the “Sun of righteousness.” ... No regulations for ... [Sunday] observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.

1450. Sabbath, Change of—Modification of Command Attributed to Christ After His Resurrection

SOURCE: Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, *Theological Compend* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902), pp. 169–171. [FRS No. 37.]

[p. 169] By this is meant, 1. The day appointed of God, at the close of creation, to be observed by man as a day of rest from all secular employment, *because that in it God himself had rested from his work*. Gen. ii, 1–3. Not that *God’s rest* was necessitated by fatigue (Isa. xl, 28); but he rested, that is, *ceased to work*, on the seventh day as an *example* to man; hence assigned it *as a reason* why men should rest on that day. Exod. xx, 11; xxxi, 17. God’s *blessing* and *sanctifying* the day, meant that he separated it from a common to a religious use, to be a perpetual memorial or sign [p. 170] that all who thus observed it would show themselves to be the worshipers of that God who made the world in six days and rested on the seventh. Exod. xx, 8, 11; xxxi, 16, 17; Isa. lvi, 6, 7.

2. The Sabbath is indispensable to man, being promotive of his highest good, physically, intellectually, socially, spiritually, and eternally. Hence its observance is connected with the best of promises, and its violation with the severest penalties. Exod. xxiii, 12; xxxi, 12–18; Neh. xiii, 15–22; Isa. lvi, 2–7; lviii, 13, 14; Jer. xvii, 21–27; Ezek. xx, 12, 13; xxii, 26–31. Its sanctity was very distinctly marked in the gathering of the manna. Exod. xvi, 22–30.

3. The original law of the Sabbath was renewed and made a prominent part of the moral law, or ten commandments, given through Moses at Sinai. Exod. xx, 8–11...

[p. 171] 5. Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; thus showing his authority as Lord even of the Sabbath, Matt. xii, 8; not to *abrogate* or *break it*, but to *preside over* and *modify*, or give new form to it, so as to have it commemorate his resurrection, when he ceased from his redeeming work as God did from his creation work. Heb. iv, 10.

When Jesus gave instructions for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to his kingdom. Acts i, 3. This is probably one of the many unrecorded things which Jesus did. John xx, 30; xxi, 25.

1451. Sabbath, Change of, Not by Command of Christ

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 19, 20. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 19] The fact, however, that Christ until His death, and His Apostles at least for a time after Christ’s Ascension, observed the Sabbath is evidence enough that our Lord Himself did not substitute the Lord’s [p. 20] day for the Sabbath, during His lifetime on earth. Instead, as most agree, He simply gave His Church the power to determine the days to be set aside for the special worship of God... It is easy to surmise that this preference of Christ for the first day of the week greatly influenced the Apostles and the early Christians to keep that day holy, and eventually moved them to make a complete substitution of the Sabbath for the Sunday. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that the Apostles made this change of days by a definite decree.

1452. Sabbath, Change of—Not Change, but Abrogation, Says Alexander Campbell

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, “Address to the Readers of *The Christian Baptist*, No. III,” *The Christian Baptist*, 1 (Feb. 2, 1824), 44, 45, in reprint of 1848, 7 vols. in one. [FRS No. 88.]

[p. 44] Either the law remains in all its force, to the utmost extent of its literal requirements, or it is passed away with the Jewish ceremonies. If it yet exist, let us observe it according to law. And if it does not exist, let us abandon a mock observance of another day for it.

“But,” say some, “it was *changed* from the seventh to the first day.” Where? when? and by whom? No man can tell. No, it never was changed, nor could it be, unless creation was to be gone through again: for the reason assigned must be changed before the observance, or respect to the reason, can be changed!! It is all old wives’ fables to talk of the change of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day. If it be changed, it was that august personage changed it who changes times and laws *ex officio*—I think his name is DOCTOR ANTICHRIST....

[p. 45] The sabbath was, by the Lord of the sabbath, set aside, as well as every other part of the law of Moses.

1453. Sabbath, Change of, Not Determined by God

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 2. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

Some theologians have held that God likewise directly determined the Sunday as the day of worship in the New Law, that He Himself has explicitly substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath. But this theory is now entirely abandoned. It is now commonly held that God simply gave His Church the power to set aside whatever day or days, she would deem suitable as Holy Days. The Church chose Sunday, the first day of the week, and in the course of time added other days, as holy days.

2

1454. Sabbath, Change of, Not in Scriptures

SOURCE: George Sverdrup, “En ny Dag” (“A New Day”), in “Sondagen og dens Helligholdelse” (“Sunday and Its Observance”), reprinted from *Kvartal-Skrift* (“Quarterly Journal”), 4 (1878), 5 (1879), in his *Samlede Skrifter* (“Collected Works”), ed. by Andreas Helland, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Frikirkens Boghandels Forlag, 1909), p. 342. Norwegian. Used by permission of Messenger Printing, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

For, when there could not be produced one solitary place in the Holy Scriptures which testified that either the Lord Himself or the apostles had ordered such a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, then it was not easy to answer the question: Who has transferred the Sabbath, and who has had the right to do it?

1455. Sabbath, Change of, a Reversal of the 4th Commandment

SOURCE: N. Summerbell, *History of the Christian Church* (3d ed.; Cincinnati: The Christian Pulpit, 1873), p. 415. [FRS No. 49.]

The Roman Church ... reversed the Fourth Commandment by doing away with the Sabbath of God’s word, and instituting Sunday as a holiday.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This work is not a general church history but a denominational history, dealing with the "Christian Church," (not to be confused with the "Campbellite" Disciples of Christ). This body was known earlier as the Christian Connection, later as the General Convention of the Christian Church, and was merged in 1931 with the Congregationalists. Later this combination, known as the Congregational Christian Churches, united with the Evangelical and Reformed Church to form the United Church of Christ (1957–1961).]

1456. Sabbath, Change of—Rome and Alexandria Lead in Abandoning Sabbath

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus (5th century), *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 132. [FRS No. 118.]

For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries [the Lord's Supper] on the sabbath²² [Note 22: i.e. Saturday. Sunday is never called 'the Sabbath' by the ancient Fathers and historians...] of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebaïs, hold their religious assemblies on the sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for ... in the evening ... they partake of the mysteries. [See No. 1429.]

1457. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in England (Late 6th Century)

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 236, 237. Used by permission.

[p. 236] The monks sent to England [in 596] by Pope Gregory the [p. 237] Great soon came to see that the Celtic Church differed from theirs in many respects. Augustine himself [not the better-known Augustine, but a Benedictine abbot], having concluded an alliance between Ethelbert and the Roman See, held several conferences with the Christian Celts in order to accomplish the most difficult task of their subjugation to Roman authority. These differences were largely ritualistic and disciplinary. The Celtic Christians celebrated Easter according to the calculation of Sulpicius Severus, while the Romans had another mode of computing the proper day. The Celts appealed to St. John, the Romans to St. Peter. The Celtic Church might be called a monastic Church, since the abbot ruled over the bishop. The Celts shaved the front of the head from ear to ear as a tonsure, while the Romans shaved the top of the head leaving a "crown of thorns." The Celts permitted their priests to marry, the Romans forbade it. The Celts used a different mode of baptism from that of the Romans, namely, single instead of trine immersion. The calendar for all movable festivals was not the same. The Celts held their own councils and enacted their own laws, independent of Rome. The Celts used a Latin Bible unlike the Vulgate, and kept Saturday as a day of rest, with special religious services on Sunday.⁵ [Note 5: Bellesheim, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in Scot.*, Edinb., 1887–89, 4 vols., i., 86.]

1458. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in Ireland (Late 6th Century)

SOURCE: Alphons Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, trans. by D. Oswald Hunter Blair, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1887), pp. 86, 250.

[p. 86] On the following Saturday, the saint, leaning on his faithful attendant Diarmaid [or Diormit], went to bless the granary. "This day," said Columba, "in the Holy Scriptures is called the Sabbath, which means rest."¹ [Note 1: We seem to see here an

allusion to the custom, observed in the early monastic Church of Ireland, of keeping the day of rest on Saturday, or the Sabbath.]

[p. 250] The Celtic Church, as has already been pointed out, while observing the Lord's Day as a religious solemnity, appears to have followed the Jews in resting from labour on the Saturday.

[EDITORS' NOTE: If Columba kept the Sabbath, he also observed Sunday. The rest of his remark is quoted in No. 1460. This one statement of Columba is not complete proof of the general practice of the Celtic Church, but it may be taken as implying it, in view of the fact that the Sabbath was long observed as a day of worship, along with Sunday, in the Eastern Church, and there are some indications of a connection between the early Celtic Church of Ireland and the East. A school which, according to tradition, Patrick attended, was modeled after monasteries in Egypt. See De Lacy O'Leary, "The Egyptian Contribution to Christianity," in *The Legacy of Egypt*, ed. by S. R. K. Glanville (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 325.]

1459. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in Scotland (Late 11th Century)

SOURCE: William F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1877), Vol. 2, pp. 348–350.

[p. 348] They [certain of the Scots] were wont also to neglect the due observance of the Lord's day, prosecuting their worldly labours on that as on other days, which she [Queen Margaret (c. 1070)] likewise showed, by both argument and authority, was unlawful. "Let us keep," she said, "the Lord's day in reverence, on account of the resurrection of our Lord from the dead on that day, and let us do no servile work on that day on which, as we know, we were redeemed from the slavery of the devil." ...

[p. 349] But in this latter instance they seem to have followed a custom of which we find traces in the early Monastic Church of Ireland, by which they held Saturday to be the Sabbath on which they rested from all their labours, and on Sunday on the Lord's day, they celebrated the resurrection by the service in church... [p. 350] There was no want of veneration for the Sunday, though they held that Saturday was properly the Sabbath on which they abstained from work. [See No. 1460.]

1460. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church of Scotland (Late 11th Century)

SOURCE: T. Ratcliffe Barnett, *Margaret of Scotland, Queen and Saint* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1926), pp. 89, 97, 98. Used by permission.

[p. 89] Queen [Margaret (c. 1070) presided] at an Ecclesiastical Council, the object of which was to convert the older Celtic churchmen to the stricter usage of Rome...

The Five Points of Difference ... were:

- (1) That the Celtic Church began the *Feast of Lent* not on Ash Wednesday, but on the Monday of the first week of Lent, thus fasting thirty-six days instead of forty days.
- (2) That the *Holy Sacrament* was not celebrated on *Easter Day*.
- (3) That in some districts *Mass* was celebrated with a ritual that was barbarous, and opposed to the custom of the whole Church.
- (4) That the *Lord's Day* was not revered because work was done on it.
- (5) That *marriage* was allowed within the forbidden degrees of affinity...

[p. 97] (4) *The Celtic Church failed to reverence the Lord's Day, employing it for worldly business.*—"Let us," said Margaret, "venerate the Lord's Day, because on it our Saviour rose from the dead." She also added to this a similar testimony from Pope Gregory who punished a certain man with severe rebuke because of earthly labour that he had done on the Lord's Day, and passed decree of excommunication for two months upon those by whose counsels he had done it.

The Celts who were unable to oppose these arguments of the wise Queen, revered the Holy Day thereafter so that none either carried burdens on it or compelled others to do so.

In this matter the Scots had perhaps kept up the traditional usage of the ancient Irish Church which observed Saturday instead of Sunday as the Day of Rest. In his *Life of Columba*, Adamnan tells us that the Saint of Hy said to his servant Diormet, “This day in the Holy Scriptures is called the Sabbath, which means rest. And this day is indeed [p. 98] a Sabbath to me, for it is the last day of my present labouring life, and on it I rest after the fatigues of my labours. This night, at midnight, which commenceth the solemn Lord’s Day, I shall, according to the sayings of Scriptures, go the way of our fathers.”

From that passage it is plain that according to the old Columban Rule, what we now call Saturday was considered to be the Day of Rest before the Lord’s Day, and in this way the uncanonical custom of working on the Sabbath [he means Sunday] and resting on the Saturday may have arisen in the Celtic Church. [See No. 1459.]

1461. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Christian-Jewish (?) Sect in Lombardy (12th Century)

SOURCE: [J. J.] Ign. v[on] Döllinger, ed., *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1890), Vol. 2 (Latin source documents on the Waldenses and Cathari), p. 327.

(From the Cod. Ottobon. 136f., pergam)

The Passagii ... say ... that the Mosaic law is to be observed literally, and the Sabbath and circumcision and other legal observances ought still to have [their] place.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: David Benedict (*General History of the Baptist Denomination* [Boston: Manning & Loring, 1813], Vol. 2, p. 414) believes that the charge of circumcision is “a slanderous story forged by their enemies,” probably because, being Sabbatarians, the Passagii, or Passaginians, were derided as Jews, “and if they were Jews, it followed of course, that they either did or ought to circumcise their followers.” However, the medieval sources cited indicate that they were, if not semi-Jewish, at least Arian. See J. L. von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 3, century 12, part 2, chap. 5; Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 5th period, sec. 4. 2.]

1462. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (c. 1525)

SOURCE: Francisco Alvarez, *Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia (1520–1527)*, trans. by Lord Stanley of Alderley (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1861), pp. 23, 34. [FRS No. 123.]

[p. 23] When this lesson [the one said at matins] is finished, on Saturdays, Sundays, and feast days, they make a procession with four or five crosses on their poles... They make this procession through the circuit, which is like a cloister. This being ended, on the said Saturdays, Sundays, and feasts, he who has to say mass enters with two others into the chancel; they bring out an effigy of Our Lady, which they have in ancient pictures in all churches...

[p. 34] There is a tomb in this monastery which they say is of an Abba or provincial of this monastery who is named Philip, and they give him the merits of a Saint, saying that there was a King Prester John who commanded that Saturday should not be observed in his kingdoms and lordships, and this Abba Philip went to that King Prester with his friars, and undertook to show how God had commanded that Saturday should be kept, and that whoever did not keep it should die by stoning, and that he would maintain this before all the fathers of Ethiopia: and he made it good before the King. Therefore they say that he was a Saint for making Saturday to be kept, and they treat him as a Saint, and they hold a feast for him every year, in the month of July, which they call *Castar* Philip, which means funeral or memorial of Philip.

1463. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (c. 1532)

SOURCE: Zaga Zaba, *An Account of the Habassin [Ethiopian] Religion*, in Michael Geddes, *The Church-History of Ethiopia* (London: Chiswell, 1696), pp. 87, 88.

[p. 87] We do celebrate ... *the Sabbath*, ... because God, after he had finished the Creation of the World, rested thereon: Which Day, as God would have it called the *Holy of Holies*, so the not celebrating thereof with great honour and devotion, seems to be plainly contrary to God's [p. 88] Will and Precept, who will *suffer Heaven and Earth to pass away sooner than his Word*; and that especially, *since Christ came not to dissolve the Law, but to fulfil it*. It is not therefore in imitation of the *Jews*, but in obedience to Christ, and his holy Apostles, that we observe that Day... We do observe the *Lord's-Day* after the manner of all other Christians, in memory of *Christ's Resurrection*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Ethiopians received the Eastern form of doctrine in the fourth century. The Sabbath had not then been discarded as the day of rest, though the Sunday festival was observed. In the seventh century the rise of the Saracen power cut Abyssinia off from the knowledge of the world. Gibbon says: "Encompassed on all sides by the enemies of their religion, the Aethiopians slept near a thousand years, forgetful of the world, by whom they were forgotten" (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 47, par. 37). And when discovered by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, they were found making the seventh day, as well as Sunday, a day of rest, not having known of its being set fully aside in the course of apostasy. Gibbon relates how the Jesuits never rested until they persuaded the Abyssinian king (A.D. 1604) to submit to the pope, and to prohibit Sabbath observance.]

1464. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (1622)

SOURCE: Michael Russell, *Nubia and Abyssinia* (New York: Harper, 1837), pp. 227, 228. [FRS No. 82.]

[p. 227] In the work of Father Lobo, who made a voyage to Abyssinia in the year 1622, and served in that country under the celebrated Mendez, we have a brief account of the pious usages of the people. Incensed by their bigoted attachment to the customs of their ancestors, he denounces their religion as a mixture of Christianity with Jewish and Mohammedan superstitions. He admits, however, that they retain the belief of the principal mysteries of our faith; that they celebrate with a great deal of piety the sufferings and death of our Lord; reverence the cross; pay a profound devotion to the blessed Virgin, the angels, and the saints; observe the festivals, and pay a strict regard to Sunday. Every month they commemorate the Assumption of the Virgin Mary; and are of opinion that no Christians beside themselves have a true sense of the greatness of the mother of God, or render the honours which are due to her name. There are some tribes among them by whom the crime of swearing by her is punished with the forfeiture of goods, [p. 228] and even with the loss of life. Every week they keep a feast in honour of the apostles and angels; they come to mass with great devotion, and love to hear the Word of God; they receive the sacrament often, but do not always prepare themselves for it by confession. The severity of their fasts is equal to that of the primitive church; in Lent they never eat till after sunset; and their abstinence is the more rigid, because milk and butter are forbidden to them. No reason or plea of necessity can procure for them permission to eat flesh; and, as their country produces hardly any fish, they are compelled to exist on roots and pulse only.

There is no nation, he adds, where excommunication carries greater terrors than among the Abyssinians; a circumstance which gives the priests great power over them, as they frequently exert their spiritual authority for personal purposes not quite consistent with the utmost purity of motive. They have certain opinions peculiar to themselves about purgatory, the creation of souls, and some other mysteries. They repeat baptism, or the semblance of it, every year; retain the practice of circumcision; observe the Jewish

Sabbath; abstain from eating all those animals which are forbidden by the Mosaical law; and brothers espouse the widows of their brothers, according to the precept of the same ancient institute.

1465. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia in 17th Century

SOURCE: S. Giacomo Baratti, *The Late Travels of S. Giacomo Baratti*, trans. by G. D. (London: Benjamin Billingsley, 1670), pp. 135–137. [FRS No. 83.]

[p. 135] They [the Ethiopians] do believe whatsoever is in their Books called *Manda* and *Abetil*, as the Gospel it self; they do fancy that the Apostles and Disciples being assembled together at *Jerusalem*, did cause them to be written for the benefit of Christianity. In them are contained these precepts...

To meet together on the Lords day, and then to hear the Reading [p. 136] of the holy Writings of the Apostles and Prophets, which are to be expounded by some appointed for that purpose.

To meet also upon the Sabbath-day, and then to spend the time in prayer and holy duties, in which days it is not permitted to do any servile work. The *Saturday* they keep because God on that day had finished the great Work of the Creation of the world; The Lords-day is also set apart for Religious duties, because Christ on the first day of the week did rise from the dead.

Several other days of the year are kept holy, some are those that are observed in our Church, others are particular days appointed to continue the Memory of some great deliverances and particular favours which that Church and Empire have received.

[p. 137] They do believe that in their Festival days, and in the Sabbath and Lords-day, the souls of the damned are released from their torments until the Evening, but that they can never come out of that place of darkness.

1466. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Norway (1435)

SOURCE: *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. by C. R. Unger and H. J. Huitfeldt, Vol. 7 (Christiania: P. T. Mallings, 1867), No. 397, p. 391. Norwegian.

Together with honorable lords and beloved brethren—the clergy of Nidaros, Oslo, Stavanger, Bergen and Hamar, who were summoned to a provincial council with us in Bergen—we fully agreed and resolved that in harmony with the laws of the holy church, observance of the Saturday must under no circumstance be allowed hereafter unless the church canon so decrees it. We therefore counsel all the friends of God, the Christians in Norway, those who will remain obedient to God's holy church, to refrain from this great evil habit of Saturday observance, as mentioned. But other obstinates, those who persist in this custom, we forbid under the severe penalty of the holy church to keep that day as a holy day from now on; but should there be any who for Godfearing reasons wish to do good on that day instead of on another, then he shall fast or contribute to his cathedral, cloister and honorable men by willingly giving alms from his [fishing] catch which he rightly has made on the Saturday, or from any other types of work.

1467. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Reformation Times in Sweden and Finland

SOURCE: Theodor Norlin, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1864), Vol. 1, pp. 357, 358. Swedish.

[p. 357] We find traces of these Jewish doctrines throughout practically the whole of Sweden of the day, from Finland through northern Sweden, Dalarne, Westmanland and Nerike down to Westergötland and Småland. Already King Gustaf I [1523–1560] had

been obliged to issue a special letter against the delusion current among the laity of Finland ‘that because of the hard years the Jews were to keep Saturday holy.’ [Footnote: Reg. for December 5, 1554.] The King mentions in this letter that some of the common people would not work on Saturday, but would “keep (it) and behave like Jews under the law of Moses in the Old Testament.” They also assert that they through various dreams and visions were moved to such worship. The letter is really a short theological treatise from the hand of the old king against said delusion.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: It is not stated whether these Sabbathkeepers observed Sunday also, but it seems likely, since they were censured for keeping the seventh day, not for refusing to keep the first.]

1468. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Sweden, 16th Cent.

SOURCE: [Lars] Anton Anjou, *The History of the Reformation in Sweden*, trans. by Henry M. Mason (New York: General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and Church Book Society, 1859), p. 425.

In 1541, there was issued a strict prohibition against the superstitious observance of the Sabbath, or Saturday, which was pertinaciously kept by numbers of people. This prohibition, however, must regard some other than the delusion which, in 1544, was current among some of the inhabitants of Finland, who believed that the hard year and dear times were a punishment from God, because they did not keep Saturday holy, according to the law of Moses, and therefore undertook, according to the Old Testament, to celebrate it as a day of rest. The occasion and extent of this delusion are not known to us. We know it only from a letter of king Gustavus, in which he endeavors to enlighten the deluded, and by admonitions and threats to bring them to reason [see No. 1467].

1469. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Waldensian Group—Some, Sabbath, Others Sunday

SOURCE: [J. J.] Ign. v[on] Döllinger, ed., *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1890), Vol. 2 (Latin source documents on the Waldenses and Cathari), p. 662. (Cod. Viennens. Cat. 967, “Summary of the impious and Pharisical religion of the Picards.”)

They [the Picards, or Waldensian Brethren] do not celebrate the feasts of the divine Virgin Mary and of the Apostles; some [observe] only the Lord’s day. Some indeed celebrate the Sabbath with the Jews.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The Picards, representing a fusion of certain old-line Waldensian elements with the Hussites in Bohemia and Moravia, were called also Waldensian Brethren or simply Waldensians (see Döllinger, pp. 635, 663). Today a prevalent misconception limits the name Waldenses to a people still living in the Italian Alps. These Waldensians are merely the modern remnant of a medieval movement that once included evangelical dissenters of many names in many parts of Europe. It is true that there are records of Sunday observance, but no known record of Sabbathkeeping, among the north Italian Waldenses, whose descendants we know today, yet this source document furnishes contemporary proof that some of the Waldenses (cf. GC 577) observed the Sabbath.]

1470. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf and the Moravians

SOURCE: Ludwig von Zinzendorf, “Zurückgelassenes Eventual-Testament an die Gemeinde,” in his *Theologische und dahin einschlagende Bedencken*, part 4, chap. xxi, p. 183. (Büdingen: Johann Christoph Stöhr, 1742.) German.

The days that we observe are Sunday, as the Lord’s resurrection day; the Sabbath or the real rest day of the Lord on which we observe days of assembly and the Lord’s supper; the important feasts of the ancient church, on which we are reminded of the Lord’s special grace, our own days of joy and commemoration. It is known how they are

observed among us. On Sundays I admonish the brethren to continue in a state of constant wakefulness before the Lord.

1471. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf and the Moravians in Pennsylvania

SOURCE: August Gottlieb Spangenberg, *The Life of Nicholas Lewis Count Zinzendorf*, trans. by Samuel Jackson (London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1838), p. 302.

He [Zinzendorf] also resolved, with the church at Bethlehem [Pennsylvania], to keep the seventh day as a day of rest.

[EDITORS' NOTE: That he observed Sunday also is clear from other writings. See No. 1472.]

1472. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf's Practice

SOURCE: Felix Bovet, *The Banished Count; or, The Life of Nicholas Louis Zinzendorf*, trans. by John Gill (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1865), pp. 223, 224.

[p. 223] It was a habit with Zinzendorf to set apart the Saturday as a day of rest and prayer,—not out of conformity to the Mosaic law, but because of the blessing that God pronounced on that day when He had completed the work of creation. [p. 224] While, however, he was careful to let it be understood that he considered all persons free to do as they saw fit in this matter, he observed the Lord's day in common with the Christian Church at large. But though he thus kept two Sabbaths instead of one, this was not enough to satisfy the rigid notions peculiar to American puritanism; and one Sunday evening, when he was engaged with his daughter in composing some hymns, the justice of the peace made his appearance, and ordered them, in the King's name, to cease writing. The next day they were summoned to answer for their crime, and were fined six shillings each for *profaning the Sabbath*.

1473. Sabbath, So-called, in Babylonia, Not Weekly Sabbath, But Day of Evil Omen

SOURCE: T. G. Pinches, "Sabbath (Babylonian)," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 10, pp. 889, 890. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 889] Notwithstanding that the Sabbath, as we know it, may be a specifically Hebrew institution, there is every probability that it had its origin in Babylonia. In that country, however, it was not the rest-day ending the seven-day week, owing to the Creator having rested from His work on that day (Gn 2²), but was due to the festival of the full moon on the 15th [p. 890] day of the month, when the earth's satellite 'rested' for a while at the height of his brilliancy...

S'a-bat and *šapattu*, its derivative were not applied to the seventh day [of the continuous week] by the Babylonians, but another word was used which they evidently considered more appropriate, namely *û-hul-gallum*, from the Sumerian *û-hul-gala*, which they translated by *ûmu limnu*, 'evil day.' This was the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days of every month, so that, as the Babylonian months had 29 or 30 days each, every month consisted of three weeks of seven days each, and one of nine or ten days, according to the length of the month. Two reasons may be suggested for the adoption of this seven-day period: (1) the seven (divine) planetary bodies, and (2) the fact that the period of a lunation may be divided, roughly, into four sections of seven days each.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This so-called "Babylonian sabbath" was not a sabbath at all. The similarity between the Babylonian word for the "rest" of the moon and the Hebrew word for the weekly rest day does not make the full-moon day a sabbath, and the series of unlucky days on the 7th, 14th, etc., did not constitute

weeks (uniform 7-day cycles). Yet this is the basis for the theory that the sabbath originated with the Babylonians.]

1474. Sabbath, So-called, in Buddhist Lands, Not Same as the Seventh-day Sabbath

SOURCE: Hutton Webster, "Sabbath (Primitive)," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 10, p. 885. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

In Buddhist lands the *Uposatha*, which usually falls on the day of the new moon, on the day of the full moon, and on the two days which are eighth from new and full moon, is marked by fasting and the cessation of secular activities. The *Uposatha* in its origin among the Aryans of ancient India could have owed nothing to Jewish or Christian influence, and in its diffusion throughout S.E. Asia it appears to have been unaffected by the influence of Islam.

1475. Sabbaths, Ceremonial, Referred to in Col. 2:16, Not the Weekly Day of Rest

SOURCE: Albert Barnes, *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians* (New York: Harper, 1851), pp. 306, 307, on Col. 2:16.

[p. 306] *Or of the Sabbath days.* Gr., 'of the Sabbaths.' The word *Sabbath* in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to *the Sabbath* properly so called. There is no evidence from this passage that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe *any* holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of [p. 307] the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number—'THE *Sabbath*,' it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the *moral* law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law—no one of the ten commandments could be spoken of as '*a shadow* of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.

1476. Sacraments, Canons on the

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VII (March 3, 1547), Decree on the Sacraments, canons 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 119–122.

[p. 119] CANON I.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or, that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be anathema...

[p. 120] CANON IV.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous; and that, without them, or without the desire

thereof, men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification;—though all are not indeed necessary for every individual: let him be anathema...

CANON VI.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto: as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers: let him be anathema...

CANON VIII.—If any one saith, that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed, but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace: let him be anathema.

CANON IX.—If any one saith, that, in the three sacraments, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they can not be repeated: let him be anathema...

CANON XI.—If any one saith, that, in ministers, when they effect, and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does: let him be anathema.

CANON XII.—If any one saith, [p. 122] that a minister, being in mortal sin,—if so be that he observe all the essentials which belong to the effecting, or conferring of, the sacrament,—neither effects, nor confers the sacrament: let him be anathema.

1477. Sacraments, Catholic Definition of Nature of

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 143. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

No one can doubt that the Sacraments are among the means of attaining righteousness and salvation. But of the many definitions, each of them sufficiently appropriate, which may serve to explain the nature of a Sacrament, there is none more comprehensive, none more perspicuous, than the definition given by St. Augustine and adopted by all scholastic writers. *A Sacrament*, he says, *is a sign of a sacred thing*; or, as it has been expressed in other words of the same import: *A Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification*.

1478. Sacraments, Number of, in the Catholic Church

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 152, 153. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 152] The Sacraments of the Catholic Church are seven in number, as is proved from Scripture, from the tradition handed down to us from the Fathers, and from the authority of Councils. Why they are neither more nor less in number may be shown, at least [p. 153] with some probability, from the analogy that exists between the natural and the spiritual life. In order to exist, to preserve existence, and to contribute to his own and to the public good, seven things seem necessary to man: to be born, to grow, to be nurtured, to be cured when sick, when weak to be strengthened; as far as regards the public welfare, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern, and to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring. Now, since it is quite clear that all these things are sufficiently analogous to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discover in them a reason to account for the number of the Sacraments.

First comes Baptism, which is the gate, as it were, to all the other Sacraments, and by which we are born again unto Christ. The next is Confirmation, by which we grow up and are strengthened in the grace of God; for, as St. Augustine observes, *to the Apostles who*

had already received Baptism, the Redeemer said: "Stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high." The third is the Eucharist, that true bread from heaven which nourishes and sustains our souls to eternal life, according to these words of the Saviour: *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* The fourth is Penance, through which lost health is recovered after we have been wounded by sin. Next is Extreme Unction, which obliterates the remains of sin and invigorates the powers of the soul; for speaking of this Sacrament St. James says: *If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* Then follows Holy Orders, by which power is given to exercise perpetually in the Church the public administration of the Sacraments and to perform all the sacred functions. The last is Matrimony, instituted to the end that, by means of the legitimate and holy union of man and woman, children may be procreated and religiously educated for the service of God, and for the preservation of the human race.

1479. Sacrifice, Continual, and the Mass

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 158–161.

[p. 158] What is this "taking away of the continual sacrifice"?

It was taken away in type at the destruction of Jerusalem. The sacrifice of the Temple, that is, of the lamb, morning and evening, in the Temple of God, was entirely abolished with the destruction of the Temple itself. Now the Prophet Malachias says: "From the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation." This passage of the prophet has been interpreted by the Fathers of the Church, beginning with St. Irenaeus, St. Justin Martyr, and I know not how many besides, to be the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, the true Paschal Lamb, which came in the place of the type—namely, the sacrifice of Jesus Himself on Calvary, renewed perpetually and continued for ever in the sacrifice on the altar. Now has that continual sacrifice been taken away? That which was typical of it in old days has been already taken away. But has the reality been taken away? The Holy Fathers who have written upon the subject of Antichrist, and have interpreted these prophecies of Daniel, say that about the end of the world, during the reign of Antichrist, the public offering of the Holy Sacrifice for a little time will cease. Has there ever come to pass any thing which may be called an instalment or a forerunner of such an event as this? Look into the East. The Mahometan superstition, which arose in Arabia, and swept over Palestine and Asia Minor, the region of the Seven Churches, and Egypt, the north of Africa—the home of St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Optatus—and finally penetrated into Constantinople, where soon it became dominant, has in every place persecuted and suppressed the worship and sacrifice of Jesus Christ... Now let us look into the Western world: has the continual sacrifice been taken away in any other land?—for instance, in all those churches of Protestant Germany which were once [p. 160] Catholic, where the holy sacrifice of the Mass was daily offered?—throughout Norway, and Sweden, and Denmark, and one half of Switzerland, where there are a multitude of ancient Catholic churches? throughout England, in the cathedrals and the parish churches of this land, which were built simply as shrines of Jesus incarnate in the holy eucharist, as sanctuaries raised for the offering of the holy sacrifice? What is the characteristic mark of the Reformation, but the rejection of the Mass, and all that belongs to it, as declared in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits? The suppression of the continual sacrifice is, above all, the mark and characteristic of the Protestant Reformation... This prophecy of Daniel has

already its fulfilment both in the East and West,—in the two wings, as it were; while in the heart of Christendom the Holy Sacrifice is offered still. What is the great flood of infidelity, revolution, and anarchy, which is now sapping the foundations of Christian society, not only in France, [p. 161] but in Italy, and encompassing Rome, the centre and sanctuary of the Catholic Church, but the abomination which desolates the sanctuary, and takes away the continual sacrifice?

1480. Sacrifice, Daily, Time of Offering of

SOURCE: *Mishnah Pesahim* 5.1, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.;

London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Pesahim* 58a, p. 287. Used by permission.

The [afternoon] *tamid* ¹ [Note 1: The daily burnt-offering: one was brought every morning and another every afternoon. Num. XXVIII, 4.] is slaughtered at eight and a half hours ² [Note 2: The day being counted from sunrise to sunset, i.e., about six a.m. to six p.m.] and is offered at nine and a half hours. ³ [Note 3: The sacrificial ceremonies took an hour.] On the eve of Passover it is slaughtered at seven and a half hours and offered at eight and a half hours, whether it is a weekday or the Sabbath. If the eve of Passover fell on Sabbath eve [Friday], it is slaughtered at six and a half hours and offered at seven and a half hours, and the Passover offering after it.

1481. Saints, and Images, Decrees of Trent Concerning

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), On the Invocation of Saints, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 167–169. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 167] The holy synod enjoins on all bishops and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy Fathers, and to the decrees of sacred councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honour (paid) to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, Who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour... [p. 168] Also that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which bodies were the living members of Christ and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are by Him to be raised unto eternal life and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, through which (bodies) many benefits are bestowed by God on men...

[p. 169] Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints are to be had and to be retained particularly in temples, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which those images represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints whose similitude they bear; as, by the decrees of councils, and especially the second Synod of Nicaea, has been defined against the opponents of images.

1482. Saints, Crossroads Shrines of, Replaced Those of Pagan Gods

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 21, 22.

[p. 21] There were innumerable shrines in their honor [to the Lares compitales, the spirits of the crossroads] throughout the rural districts. Moreover, especially from the time of Augustus, many sanctuaries had been erected to them at street corners in Rome and other cities. Of the popularity of this worship of crossroads spirits there is adequate evidence, and of its survival substantial indications are found in the attacks [p. 22] made by mediaeval writers on the custom of offering sacrifices and lighting candles at crossroads. Nor can it be doubted that the common practice in Italy and other countries of erecting chapels to saints at crossroads goes back ultimately to the pagan worship of the Lares compitales. Apparently the earlier churchmen found that it was impossible to divert the people from their crossroads superstitions, and so they adopted a plan that they used on many other occasions. They tacitly recognized the sanctity of the site, but by substituting Christian saints for pagan spirits they succeeded in giving the religious aspirations of the devotees a new direction. Of the strength of the belief in the efficacy of these wayside shrines, we have evidence in an incident of the epidemic of cholera in Naples in 1884. The people attributed the scourge to the walling up of many of the niches that had been used as street shrines. So vehement was their protest that the old niches were reopened and many new ones added.

1483. Saints, Veneration of—Catholic Explanation

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 38.

Veneration of Saints.

196. *Why is it pleasing God to honor the saints?*

It is pleasing God to honor the saints because they are in Heaven with God, and are His special friends.

God Himself sanctified the saints—and now honors them in Heaven.

197. *Which is the best manner of honoring the saints?*

The best manner of honoring the saints is

- 1) to implore their intercession,
- 2) to imitate their examples,
- 3) to honor their relics and pictures.

Patrons saints, patrons of the church and of sodalities.

Relics = means of the body (bones) or of anything pertaining to the saints, e. g. clothing, instruments of martyrdom. The most precious relic is a particle (small piece) of the Holy Cross.—Feasts of saints.

198. *Why do we honor the images of Christ and of the saints?*

We honor the images of Christ and of the saints

- 1) because they remind us of Christ and of the saints,
- 2) because whilst looking at them we can pray with greater devotion.

A good child honors the pictures of its parents, brothers and sisters. In every Christian home, there ought to be, at least, a crucifix, an image of the Blessed Virgin, or of the Holy Family.

Crucifix = a Cross with an image of the Lord on it.

1484. Saints, Veneration of—Effects During Rise of Such a Worship

SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *History of Europe During the Middle Ages*, Vol. 3 (rev. ed.; New York: Colonial Press, 1899), pp. 31, 32.

[p. 31] That the exclusive worship of saints, under the guidance of an artful though illiterate priesthood, degraded the understanding and begot a stupid credulity and fanaticism, is sufficiently evident. But it was also so managed as to loosen the bonds of religion and pervert the standard of morality...

[p. 32] This monstrous superstition grew to its height in the twelfth century.

1485. Saints, Veneration of—Miracles, Relics, and Deified Heroes

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 119–121.

[p. 119] One phase of this cult of deified mortals has a very clear tradition, namely, the veneration of relics. Definite evidence of its existence among the Greeks is furnished by the oracle that emanated from Delphi that the Athenians should bring the bones of the hero Theseus to Athens. In Italy the bones of Virgil attained sanctity, and as the centuries passed they were regarded more and more as a guaranty of safety to the city of Naples where they were deposited...

[p. 120] Reports of miracles wrought by human beings were common among the ancient Romans and were accepted by the great mass of the people without question. The Emperor Vespasian was believed to have the power of healing; Apollonius of Tyana was credited with miracles; and many other examples might be cited. How prevalent the belief was in the second century is indicated by Lucian's ridicule of it.

Roman society, therefore, at the time when Christianity emerged, was wholly familiar with the ideas of a man-god, the sacrosanct quality of relics, and the frequent occurrence of miracles. The Christians adapted themselves to the pagan attitude. They matched the miracle-workers of the pagans with wonder-working Saints; and with their success the number of miracles increased. The sanctity of relics, well-established as it had been among the pagans, acquired far greater vogue in Christian times and was given a degree of emphasis that it had never had before. The idea showed extension also in the division of the remains of a Saint and in the efficacy attached even to the smallest relic. Moreover, we find the term Divus which [p. 121] had acquired its special connotation through the deification of emperors applied to Christian Saints. Examples are Divus Ianurius (S. Gennaro), Divus Iosephus (S. Giuseppe), and Diva Agatha (S. Agatha). And at the end of this world's long history is its faded application in modern times to actresses and opera-singers.

Like the deified heroes and emperors of pagan times the Saints were honored with altars, sacred edifices, incense, lights, hymns, ex-voto offerings, festivals with illuminations and high hilarity, prayers and invocations. They became intermediate divinities with intercessional and tutelary powers.

That St. Paul and Jesus himself would have regarded many of these beliefs and practices as wholly foreign to the spirit of Christianity is certain. Some of the early Christians themselves protested against the cult of the Saints: for example, Vigilantius and Faustus in the fifth century. But on the other side were such great apologists as Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Basil, who though claiming that God alone was worshipped, expressed full belief in the efficacy of the intercession of the Saints.

1486. Saints, Veneration of—Popular Continuation of Pagan Worship

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 9–12.

[p. 9] There have been many discussions of the relation of the doctrine of the veneration of Saints to various phases of Roman religion, ranging from the notably

temperate treatment of Lucius to the more positive statements [p. 10] of Renan and Harnack and the uncompromising assertions of Trede, "P. Saintyves" and Salomon Reinach. Renan for example says that any peasant who prays to a particular saint for a cure for his horse or ox or drops a coin into the box of a miraculous chapel is in that act pagan. He is responding to the prompting of a religious feeling that is older than Christianity and so deepset that Christianity has not been able to root it out. Harnack sees in the veneration of Saints nothing but a recrudescence of pagan polytheism.

The term "veneration of Saints" has been used advisedly. For in any fair discussion of this subject it should be remembered that the Church has never taught the worship of Saints. Every enlightened churchman knows this, but whether the peasants of southern Italy and other parts of Europe distinguish with any degree of precision between veneration and worship is another question. It is not likely that they do, and for those who are looking for evidence of the continuance of the creative [p. 11] power of Roman religion, the beliefs of the illiterate are of as much importance as the formulated doctrines of the Church. Our subject is not survivals of paganism in the modern Church but survivals in modern times.

A good example of the closeness of the resemblance of the specialization of function of different Saints to that of pagan spirits is found in the published lists of Saints used by Spanish peasants... Here are some of the examples furnished by the Spanish index: San Serapio should be appealed to in case of stomach-ache; Santa Polonia for tooth-ache; San José, San Juan Bautista and Santa Catalina for headache; San Bernardo and San Cirilo for indigestion; San Luis for cholera; San Francisco for colic; San Ignacio and Santa Lutgarda for childbirth; Santa Balsania for scrofula; San Felix for ulcers; Santa Agueda for nursing mothers; San Babilas for burns; San Gorge for an infected cut; Santa Quiteria for dog's bite; [p. 12] San Ciriaco for diseases of the ear; Santa Lucia for the eyes; Santa Bibiana for epilepsy; San Gregorio for frost-bite; San Pantaleon for haemorrhoids; San Roque for the plague; Santa Dorothea for rheumatism; San Pedro for fever; and Santa Rita for the impossible!

1487. Saints, Veneration of—Popular Departmental Deities in

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 3, 5–9.

[p. 3] The earliest Roman religion of which we have any record was a system of pandemonism. There was a spirit—a demon it was often called—in every object, every act, every process and sometimes in every stage of a process...

[p. 5] But the evidence of this particularistic character of Roman religion is not confined to these lists of obscure spirits. The gods of the Roman pantheon in general—even the greatest of them—showed, in their origin at least, a high degree of specialization. In some cases the original function of the divinity expanded in different directions but in others the early specialization maintained its old limits. Janus was the god of the door, Vesta of the hearth, Faunus of the forest, Pales of pasture land, Fons of springs, Voltumnus of running streams, Saturn of sowing, Ceres of growth, Flora of blossom, Pomona of fruit, and Consus of harvest. Even the great god Jupiter, manifold as his powers subsequently became, was at first only the spirit of the bright sky...

[p. 6] The stories of miraculous cures in temples told in his *Sermones sacri* by the rhetorician Aristides who [p. 7] lived in the time of Marcus Aurelius attest the widespread belief in manifold agencies of supernatural assistance. The vogue of the Neo-

platonic philosophy in the third century after Christ resulted in a renewal of belief in the existence of great numbers of subordinate and intermediate spirits...

[p. 8] And it is in the doctrine of the veneration of Saints that the polytheism of the old departmental deities survives. It may be that the founders of Christianity found that the belief of the people—especially the illiterate class—in these specialized spirits of minor grade was one of their greatest problems. They recognized the people's predilection for spirits that would help in specific situations, and they realized also that the masses felt more at home with beings who, while of divine nature or associations, were not too far removed from the human level. They were keenly interested in winning the pagans to the faith and they succeeded. But undoubtedly one element in their success was the inclusion in their system of the doctrine of the veneration of Saints. They seem to [p. 9] have felt that in order to make any headway at all, it was necessary for them to match the swarms of spirits available for the pagans with a multitude of wonder-working saints and martyrs.

1488. Saints, Veneration of—Processions

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 13–15.

[p. 13] The similarity in attitude of mind of pagan and Christian devotees and the survival of the polytheistic idea in modern times may be seen in a comparison of the behavior of the people who watched the procession which preceded the circus games in ancient Rome and that of the crowd which fills the streets of Naples today on the occasion of the festival held in May in honor of San Gennaro, the patron saint of the city. In the old Roman procession a conspicuous place was given to the images of the gods that were borne along in floats; and as they were carried past, pious Romans called upon the names of those whom they regarded as their special protectors. So too at the Naples festival. In the procession referred to the images of many Saints each of them with his own place in the affections of the Neapolitan [p. 14] proletariat, are carried from the Cathedral to the Church of Santa Chiara. Saints of all centuries are there, some of whom attained the dignity hundreds of years ago, while others are more recent creations. As the procession moves along, persons in the crowd call out the name of their patron Saint, and when the image of San Biagio—a sort of Christian Aesculapius with special powers in diseases of the throat—passes by, the Neapolitan mothers hold up their croupy bambini and implore a remedy.

But it is not only in southern Europe that the ancient particularism of divine function still survives. For example in Prussia St. Goar is the patron of potters, St. Crispin of shoemakers; St. Nicholas of boatmen; St. Apollonia cures toothache; St. Laurence rheumatism; and St. Agatha is guardian of the household fire. In the region of the Vosges St. Catharine helps women find husbands, St. Sabina cures the pangs of love, while St. Abdon is believed to drive away fleas. This special- [p. 15] ization of the Saints is clearly recognized in the *Diario Romano* where St. Blaise, St. Liberius and St. Martha are assigned curative powers in the case of sore throat, gallstone, and epidemics respectively.

1489. Saints, Veneration of, Replaced Worship of the Dead

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 82–84.

[p. 82] The pagan festivals of the dead seem to have been among those that showed persistence in survival. There are indications that they were celebrated even under Christian emperors...

But even after the pagan festivals ceased to be celebrated, the belief that the spirits of the dead could and, if properly approached, would give aid and protection to the living survived. The fathers of the Church saw that this was one of those inherent beliefs to which the people would cling with that unyielding pertinacity that manifests itself in the case of hereditary ideas. They compromised, shifting from the cult of the spirits of ancestors to the veneration of persons whose virtues, sufferings, or miraculous deeds justified their being regarded as intermediaries between God and man. [p. 83] In other words the Saints succeeded to the worship of the dead just as they succeeded to the cult of the departmental deities and to the “little gods” of the Roman household... While the Church never gave the Saints a higher place than that of intermediaries and intercessors whose aid might prove efficacious in gaining the favor of God, the masses of the population made no such fine distinctions, and confusing means and end came to regard the Saints themselves as present helps in trouble and addressed their prayers directly to them. They were more interested in their power to help them in their troubles than in their virtuous lives or harrowing deaths. Prior to the Reformation the efforts to check this tendency toward polytheism took the form of ecclesiastical legislation but this proved ineffectual.

Apart from the general doctrine of the veneration of Saints, there are some specific festivals of the modern Church that go back directly to pagan customs connected with the [p. 84] dead. One of these is All Saints’ Day, now celebrated on the first of November but till the time of Pope Gregory III observed on the thirteenth of May, which was one of the days of the Roman festival of the dead, the Lemuria. Whether there is any connection between these dates or not, the rites of All Saints’ Day are a survival not of the Lemuria but of the Parentalia. For in the modern festival the faithful visit the tombs of the Saints, venerate their relics, and pray for their blessing. The next day also, the second of November, All Souls’ Day, unquestionably reproduces some of the features of the Parentalia. People go in great numbers to the cemeteries and deck the graves of the members of their family with flowers and candles, and the mass, which takes the place of the ancient sacrifice, is directed to the repose of the souls of the departed.

1490. Saints, Veneration of—Saints Replaced Pagan Gods

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), p. 308.

As a residuum of the idea that all Christians were “saints”, and that the Church possessed apostles, prophets, and spiritual teachers, the conviction had remained that there had been a Heroic Age, and that those who had then won a name for themselves were “saints”. They were added to the Patriarchs and Old Testament Prophets, and they continued to receive successors in the martyrs and great ascetics. The most cultured theologians had already set up theories of the power of these heroes to intercede with God, and of their special relation to Christ. The anniversaries of the birth or death of the saints were celebrated, and thus they offered themselves in the most natural way to take the place of the dethroned gods and their festivals. They fell into line with the angelic powers, and were held to be more trustworthy than the latter. Among them Mary came to the front, and the course of the development of dogma specially favoured her, and her alone. A woman, a mother, made her appearance in proximity to the deity; and thus at last it became possible to include in Christianity the recognition of that which had been most foreign to primitive Christianity—homage paid to sex ... in a female form.

1491. Saints, Veneration of, Survival From Paganism

SOURCE: Ernest Renan, *Lectures on the Influence ... of Rome, on Christianity* (The Hibbert Lectures, 1880), trans. by Charles Beard (4th ed.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1898), p. 32.

All pagan cults were essentially superstitious. The peasant of our day, who drops a coin into the box of a miraculous chapel, who asks the aid of a particular saint for his oxen or his horses, who drinks a certain water to cure a special disease, is, in so far, pagan. Almost all our superstitions are the remains of a religion anterior to Christianity, and which Christianity has not been able entirely to root out.

1492. Salvation Army

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1562, 1563.*

[p. 1562] *History.* This movement attributes its origin to a great missionary impulse that surged in the heart of its founder, William Booth. He, an ordained minister of the Methodist New Connection Body in England, had long felt a deep concern for that vast section of the population of British cities which was quite beyond the pale of existing church activities. It was in the year 1865 that a memorable excursion was made by him into the streets where this forgotten mass of mankind lived and resorted. What he there saw and heard moved him profoundly. He returned to his home and solemnly told his devoted wife, Catherine, that he had found his destiny. The recital of that experience stirred within her similar emotions and mutually they gave themselves to the service of seeking the lost.

The East London Mission resulted. Commencing with street meetings and then going to a tent it was found that many were amenable to this kind of effort and interest. Moral miracles were wrought as the gross darkness was penetrated.

At the inception there was no thought of creating a separate organization. It was expected that the work would be regarded as supplementary to, and associated with, existing churches. This proved, however, to be impracticable. The nature of the work and the status of its clientele compelled distinctive organization. The success and development of the mission was such that its aid was invoked for other parts of London and at large centers of population throughout Great Britain. These many mission stations were all under the guidance of Rev. William Booth, who by common consent was made the "general superintendent." Expanding thus, the name had to be changed and "The Christian Mission" became descriptive. Mr. Booth being a Methodist, it was perfectly natural that the government of this string of missions should take that form. Conference met annually, but in the interim it was often found that decisions had to be given that brooked no delay. The general superintendent was thus often compelled to make decisions in advance of the conference meetings.

It was in the year 1878 that Mr. Booth, when preparing his report for conference, in company with his assistant and his secretary, was noting the distinctive military methods which had gradually developed by the very force of circumstances that the following phrase was used: "The Christian Mission is a volunteer army." Exception was taken to the qualifying word and William Booth took his pen, and, leaning over his secretary's shoulder, erased "volunteer" and wrote in "salvation." The report went to the conference and was acclaimed as giving a splendidly fitting descriptive to a movement that was devoted to unrelenting war upon the forces of evil. The mission which had become to a considerable extent an army in fact was henceforth to be so known in name. Its "missionaries" were to be "captains" and its general superintendent "general."

While much progress had been made up to this time, yet the change in name and tactics was the signal for exceptional advance. The innovation caught the imagination of a great part of the people. The "Christian Mission Magazine" (monthly) became "The War Cry" (weekly) and "members" became "soldiers."

Under this impulse the organization crossed the seas and the United States was the first country outside the British Isles to be "invaded." By a similar process Canada, Australia, and other lands were occupied. Some 95 different countries and colonies are now knowing the beneficent work of this movement.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Salvation Army is strictly "fundamental." Its people believe in a Holy God, a Holy Bible, and a holy people. Holiness of life is probably the most insistent claim it makes upon its people. It believes that basic to all effective service is a right life.

In its interpretation of Biblical truths it is Arminian rather than Calvinistic. The love of God is as wide as the world. The atoning sacrifice is as universal as is the need.

In regard to the forms and sacraments of religion, such as the Lord's Supper, baptism, and other rites, the position occupied is neutral. The sacraments that save are spiritual.

The soldiery all subscribe to a simple statement of faith in which each definitely affirms himself as willingly surrendered to God and that he will do his utmost to [p. 1563] persuade others to do likewise. Every Salvation soldier is a pledged nonuser of intoxicating drinks and all harmful drugs. This statement is known as the "Articles of War."

Organization. As implied by its name, the government of the Salvation Army is of a military character...

The unit of the organized Salvation Army is the corps. Sometimes there are several in one large city. To join these corps one becomes a recruit (conversion of course is basic) and upon signing "Articles" he or she is "sworn in." If officership is desired, the soldier becomes a candidate, and a rigid examination follows, covering spiritual, mental, educational, and physical fitness for such a career...

Every rank is open to every cadet who enters the training college. Fitness, merit, and time service are factors having to do with promotion. Being militaristic, it is necessarily autocratic in its control, yet the whole is shot through with the paternalistic idea, for fundamentally it is a service of love and anything violative of this basic principle would be entirely out of place. The originating spirit that gave birth to the movement must ever remain its vitalizing force. To nurture and to safeguard this all are in a holy conspiracy.

The international headquarters are in London. For administrative purposes there are many territorial headquarters in various parts of the world... Each of these headquarters houses, officially, the commander of the respective territory and the departmental chiefs.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 253,061 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

1493. Sargon, "Unknown" Until Excavations

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 16. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

Similar to the case of Belshazzar in Daniel 5 is what used to be an enigmatic reference to a certain "Sargon the king of Assyria" in Isaiah 20:1. Previous to the advent of modern archeology with its remarkable recovery of the civilization of ancient Babylonia-Assyria from its grave in the mounds of Mesopotamian cities, the name of Sargon did not occur in any source except in this sole passage in Isaiah. As a result the Biblical reference was commonly dismissed as completely worthless historically.

The discovery of Sargon's palace at Khorsabad (Dur-Sharrukin or Sargonsburg) in 1843 by Paul Emile Botta and further explorations of the site in more recent years by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, have changed the whole picture.

1494. Scapegoat—Meaning of the Term “Azazel”

SOURCE: W. Volck, “Azazel,” *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 1, p. 389. Copyright 1908 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

AZAZEL a-zê'zel or a-zā'zel (Heb. 'aza'zel): The word translated “scapegoat” in the A.V., found only in Lev. xvi, in the legislation concerning the Day of Atonement, where the high priest is directed to take two goats as sin-offering for the people, to choose by lot one of them “for Yahweh” and the other “for Azazel” (ver. 8), and to send the latter forth into the wilderness (ver. 10, 21–22 ...). The meaning of the word has occasioned much discussion. Starting from the fact that “for Yahweh” and “for Azazel” stand in opposition (ver. 8), many think that it is the name of a being opposed to Yahweh—a desert-monster, a demon, or directly Satan. Such as attempt an etymological interpretation then explain it as characterizing the demon or Satan as removed or apostatized from God, or a being repelled by men (*averruncus*), or one which does things apart and in secret (from *azal*, “to go away”). Others conceive of Azazel, not as a proper name, but as an appellative noun and modified reduplicated form of a root '*azal*, “to remove, retire,” signifying *longe remotus* or *porro abiens*. The sense of verses 8, 10, and 26, then, is that the goat is designated by the lot as an azazel, i.e., something which is to go far away, and is sent into the wilderness as such; and the idea is expressed symbolically that with the sending away of the goat, sin has also been removed from the people for whom atonement has been made, and they regard themselves as freed and released from their sins. The contrast between “for Yahweh” and “for Azazel,” however, in ver. 8 favors the interpretation of Azazel as a proper noun, and a reference to Satan suggests itself. It has been urged that nowhere else in the Pentateuch is Satan mentioned, and that afterward, when the idea of Satan comes out more fully in the consciousness of the Old Testament congregation, the name Azazel is not found. But it may be that Azazel—whatever its meaning may be—was the name of an old heathen idol or of one belonging to Semitic mythology and thought of as the evil principle, which older Judaism made the head of the demons as later Judaism used the name of the Philistine Baal Zebub. A definite explanation, satisfactory to all, can hardly be looked for. The name of Azazel, like Belial and Beelzebub, is transferred from the Old Testament language into the Book of Enoch as designation of a power of evil.

1495. Science, Illustrates Spiritual Realm

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 24–27. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 24] Because Science has made such enormous strides and can explain to our satisfaction so much of the physical world, and thus offers intelligent explanations of what was previously sheer mystery, we are inclined to forget that Science at its apparently most omniscient is only dealing with one particular stratum or aspect of Truth...

[p. 25] In this modern age, which treats as commonplace that which our grandparents would have thought miraculous, we ought to be able to grasp numerous analogies to help

us understand how several media or dimensions can coexist. Let us select one very obvious but useful example from our common modern life. As I write these words I am aware of various things through my physical senses. As it happens, at the moment these are chiefly the light and warmth of sunshine, the beauty of trees in full leaf, the varied songs of birds and the distant sound of children at play. I am also mentally aware of the truth I am trying to express, and of you, my imaginary reader, following the line of thought I am trying to make clear. Doubtless as you read you are taking in similar sense impressions, as well as having your thoughts guided by the complicated system of marks made upon paper which we call printing. But simultaneously, in the immediate world of you the reader and me the writer, there are radio programs of various kinds actually in our rooms with us. The “ether” (for that is the name given to this all-pervasive but intangible medium) is continually pulsing and vibrating, strongly or feebly, with perhaps a hundred or more near or distant radio transmissions. In common parlance we frequently say that a certain program is “on the air”; but that, of course, is quite inaccurate. Radio transmissions are not vibrations in the air. They would function just as well if there were no air at all, and they make their way, as we all know, with very little hindrance through such things as timber, stone, and concrete. It is only when they meet conductors or partial conductors of electricity that these [p. 26] inaudible, invisible vibrations become minute electric currents, and even then they are undetectable except by that commonplace but quite complicated piece of circuitry known as a radio set. In your body, as in my body, there are at this very moment minute electrical currents of which we are quite unaware. They are, in fact, an untuned jumble of electrical vibrations representing the assorted offerings of many radio transmissions. Now we are unaware of this and normally we take no notice of it. It is only when we want to hear a particular radio program that we tune in a certain band of these etheric vibrations and by means of the radio set turn them back into audible sound. For even if we disapprove of radio, even if we refuse to believe in its all-pervasive presence, it makes not the slightest difference to the *fact*. Whether we like it or not, or whether we believe it or not, we are permeated by this mysterious “ether,” and that is a fact which can easily be demonstrated. Before the advent of radio less than a century ago, such an idea would have seemed in the highest degree improbable and even impossible. We know today that it is true; that simultaneously with our ordinary-world sense impressions there coexists a world of mysterious “ether” of which we only become aware when certain apparatus is used.

Now, this seems to me a most helpful, if simple, analogy. Suppose it is possible that the whole material world and the whole psychological world are interpenetrated by what we may call the “spiritual.” For some reason or other we are inclined to think of the physical world and even the demonstrable world of the “ether” as somehow real, while the “spiritual” is regarded as unreal and imaginary. I believe the opposite to be true. As Paul foresaw long ago, “The things which are seen are temporal; but the things [p. 27] which are not seen are eternal.” Suppose what we are seeing and measuring and observing are the outward expressions in the time and space setup of what is really eternal and spiritual! If we make such a supposition we are in for a revolution in our whole way of thinking...

To sense the reality of the God-dimension, to conform to its purpose and order, to perceive its working in and through the visible world system, is, speaking broadly, what the Bible calls faith.

1496. Science, Impotent to Solve Basic Social Problems

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 104–107. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 104] I am sure that it would do us all a power of good if we would take time off and use our imaginations to see what is really happening on this earth from the point of view of Heaven. We might see how pathetically ready man is to be fascinated by what we might call the technical marvels of the age, how thrilled he is with the so-called electronic “brain,” with the breaking of speed records, by the possibility of an artificial satellite and such-like achievements. Yet if we [p. 105] were observing life from the true point of view, we should see how infinitely more important it is to recognize what is really going on in the world of human beings than to goggle at any number of physical marvels. We should see, how few, how tragically few, are even trying to find out what the Creator’s Plan might be for this world, and how even fewer are prepared to cooperate with it. From the angels’ point of view what enormous waste of energy, courage, talent, and personality there must be in many of Man’s highly lauded projects! The angels might well ask themselves, “Why does he want to go so fast, to climb so high, to dive so deep, and to complicate his life with so many inventions while he leaves the heart of the matter untouched?” For since Man has been promised a share in the timeless life of God, how blind and earthbound he must appear as he spends his best ingenuities, his highest intellects, and the bulk of his resources upon what is merely ephemeral! ...

[p. 106] If we will train ourselves to see life steadily from the true point of view, we cannot help seeing how very slowly it dawns upon modern man that his real problems, his real conflicts, can never be resolved on the physical plane. A man may travel far faster than sound, but that does not help him in the least to deal with the problem of his own marriage, which is fast breaking up. He may successfully launch an artificial satellite, but that does nothing to solve the squalid conditions in which his fellow men have to live only a few streets away. He may invent and produce commercially 3-D television for every home, but he has not made the slightest contribution toward solving the problems that arise in home, industry, and nation—the selfishness, cruelty, and greed, the fears, resentments, and suspicions that poison our common life. Perhaps the time is not too distant when the bankruptcy of scientific achievement to solve human problems will become in- [p. 107] creasingly obvious. Perhaps Man will then return, not indeed to rediscover any old-fashioned “hell-fire” religion, but to seek realistically that quality of living which transforms personality, and which we may fairly call New Testament Christianity.

1497. Second Advent —Ancient Term for “Coming” (Parusia) Amplified

SOURCE: Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, trans. by Lionel R. M. Strachan (rev. ed.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, [1927]), pp. 368, 369. Used by permission of the publisher and Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. 368] Yet another of the central ideas of the oldest Christian worship receives light from the new texts, viz. παρουσία, “advent, coming.” ... The parusia of the sovereign must have been something well known even to the people, as shown by the facts that special payments in kind and taxes to defray the cost of the parusia were exacted, that in Greece a new era was reckoned from the parusia of the Emperor Hadrian, that all over the world advent-coins were struck after a parusia of the emperor, and that we are even able to quote examples of advent-sacrifices.

The subject of parusia dues and taxes in Egypt has been [p. 369] treated in detail by Wilcken. The oldest passage he mentions is in the Flinders Petric Papyrus II.39e, of the 3rd cent. B.C., where, according to his ingenious interpretation, contributions are noted for a crown of gold to be presented to the king at his parusia. [Cites *Griechische Ostraka*, I. p. 274ff., 296.] This papyrus supplies an exceptionally fine background of contrast to the figurative language of St. Paul, in which *Parusia* (or *Epiphany*, “appearing”) and *crown* [cites *Griechische*, I.309] occur in collocation. While the sovereigns of this world expect at their parusia a costly crown for themselves, “at the parusia of our Lord Jesus” the apostle will wear a crown—the “crown of glory” (1 Thess. ii.19) won by his work among the churches, or the “crown of righteousness” which the Lord will give to him and to all them that have loved His appearing (2 Tim. iv.8).

1498. Second Advent, at Heart of Redemptive Truth

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 5, 6. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 5] At the heart of Biblical redemptive truth is the Blessed Hope of the personal, glorious second advent of Jesus Christ. Salvation has to do both with the redemption of men as individuals and as a society. Salvation of individual believers includes the “redemption of the body” (Rom. 8:23). We must not only be saved from the guilt of sin, and delivered from the power of sin. Redemption is not completed until we are delivered from the very effects of sin in our mortal bodies. The Biblical doctrine of the resurrection is a redemptive truth: it means the salvation of the body. This salvation will be realized only by the personal second coming of Christ...

[p. 6] The second coming of Jesus Christ is an absolutely indispensable doctrine in the Biblical teaching of redemption. Apart from His glorious return, God’s work will forever be incomplete. At the center of redemption past is Christ on the cross; at the center of redemption future is Christ returning in glory.

1499. Second Advent, Catholic Indifference to

SOURCE: Judith N. Shklar, *After Utopia*, pp. 179, 180. Copyright © 1957 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 179] The revival of apocalyptic expectations among the orthodox is particularly startling since it is not sanctioned by tradition. The Catholic Church has long repudiated the hope of an early second coming which the early Christians cherished, for these expectations threw doubt upon the doctrine that Christ founded the church [that is, as the kingdom of God on earth]. Again Bossuet’s belief in a slow evolu- [p. 180] tion of God’s design in history postpones its fulfillment indefinitely. In any case, the historical despair of the present does not even resemble the milleniarism of the past, for it is derived from the deductions of social theology and from political analysis.

1500. Second Advent—Child Preachers in Sweden—Description of Phenomena and Messages

SOURCE: *Einiges über die rufenden Stimmen oder die sogenannte Predigtkrankheit in Småland in den Jahren 1842 und 1843*, von einem Augenzeugen. Aus dem Schwedischen (“Something Concerning the Calling Voices or the So-called Preaching-Sickness in Småland in the Years 1842 and 1843, by an Eyewitness”) (Leipzig: Leopold Michelsen, 1843), pages as indicated below.

[a. Physical Phenomena Accompanying the Preaching]

[p. 36] As far as outward circumstances were concerned, the genuine voices lie in a state of insensibility for half an hour, at times a whole hour, before the drive to cry out

opens the mouth. What happens to them as soon as they fall asleep is a remarkable sight—how the convulsive movements begin in the tips of the fingers and feet and proceed through the limbs to the chest, which comes into motion, and eventually rise to the mouth. Some lie still, pale as a corpse, completely motionless, except that the chest is moving before the cry begins, a circumstance true of all. Respiration is not observable, although, without doubt they breathe. The voices know nothing of what goes on while the unconsciousness and the convulsive movements continue.

[b. General Tenor of Teachings]

[p. 27] Brandy they call wine of wrath, and describe the drinking of brandy in terrible pictures and warn against partaking of the Lord's supper unworthily. Dancing parties they designate as damnable for Christians. They condemn hypocrisy and repeatedly insert calls to sincere and earnest repentance, adding that the time is short, and urging the people to test themselves by the standard of the ten commandments.

The voices say that they are by no means preachers, but they are sent by the Saviour to give the call to repentance; that no one, including the angels know when the final judgment will come; that those who set the time are false voices, as are those who speak solely of clothing, gold and silver, complexion and pearls; that the beggar in his rags can as easily go to hell as the one clothed in silk reasonably can go to heaven; that the people should rend their hearts and not their garments, and should permit Jesus to come into their hearts; then of itself would vanish outward splendour.

[c. Claim Fulfillment of Joel's Prophecy]

[p. 38] The voices believe that the prophecy of the prophet Joel (the second chapter), "The Lord will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh," continues, and that therefore God's holy Spirit must not have ceased to express Himself in wonderful ways, because He had revealed Himself already in a wonderful way to the apostles and disciples at the feast of Pentecost. They themselves call attention to the fact that it is not mentioned in Acts that at that time also "sons and daughters, servants and handmaids" received the Holy Spirit. The voices believe that Joel's prophecy reaches to the end of the world.

[d. Reported Message of a Two-Year-Old Child]

[p. 20] But she had nothing further to say except, "Behold, how the heaven is streaming! Oh! heaven is so beautiful." She repeated this for a quarter of an hour, then awakened perfectly fresh.

[e. Reported Message of a Four-Year-Old Girl]

[p. 18] The beginning is always, "In the name of the Father and of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit." She says, "God in Heaven open the hearts of all sinners for this hour. Dear souls! Have you read the Bible of your heart? Repent, the time is short. Dear souls, go to Golgatha; there lie our wedding garments. No one can come to the great supper without wedding garments. When Jesus prepares his table, the devil prepares his also; but his table must stand in the background; Jesus' stands in the foreground. Dear souls, do not go to the table in the back, but press forward where you can find Jesus. Dear souls, believe on Jesus. It is of no value [p. 19] to seek God with locked hearts. If you do not believe the Bible, you will not believe our calls. If Jesus did not tell me what to cry out, what would I have to say? Tell me that!

[f. Reported Message of a Twenty-one-Year Old Servant Girl]

[p. 23] Dear Pilgrims! what kind of companions do you have in this short time? Here earnestness in the matter is what counts. A half conversion is thoroughly worthless. Here

prayer upon prayer, cry upon cry on the name of Jesus is what counts. We are surely living in the third woe.

[g. Warning of False Voices Among the Genuine]

[p. 27] They say that there must be false voices among the true, that weeds have always grown among the wheat, and must grow till the harvest; that, however, the weeds had taken over, and that is why the Lord had sent the voices, and that it did not depend upon them what they wished to speak.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The author identifies himself simply as a man who was prompted by a love for truth and who aimed to share some of the reports concerning the calling voices of Småland, or the so-called preaching-sickness, after he had sought information at the source, partly through the personal testimonies of the calling ones and other reliable persons, and partly from painstaking research before, during, and after listening to their speeches, which were accompanied by peculiar phenomena.]

1501. Second Advent, Crown of Glory Awarded at (Calvin on)

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. 3, chap. 25, sec. 6, trans. by John Allen (7th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 2, p. 253.

Scriptures uniformly commands us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ, and defers the crown of glory which awaits us till that period.

1502. Second Advent, Crowning Event of Redemption

SOURCE: A. J. Gordon, *Ecce Venit: Behold He Cometh* (New York: Revell, 1889), pp. 2, 3.

[p. 2] The second coming of Christ is the crowning event of redemption; and the belief of it constitutes the crowning article of an evangelical creed. For we hold that the excellence of faith is according to the proportion of the Lord's redemptive work which that faith embraces. Some accept merely the earthly life of Christ, knowing Him only after the flesh; and the religion of such is rarely more than a cold, external morality. Others receive His vicarious death and resurrection, but seem not to have strength as yet to follow Him into the heavens; such may be able to rejoice in their justification without knowing much of walking in the glorified life of Christ. Blessed are they who, believing all that has gone before,—life, death, and resurrection,—can joyfully add this confession also: "*We have a great High Priest who is passed through the heavens;*" [p. 3] and thrice blessed they who can join to this confession still another: "*From whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.*" For it is the essential part of our Redeemer's priesthood that, having entered in, to make intercession for His people, He shall again come forth to bless them.

1503. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Emphasized by Religious Leaders of the Past

SOURCE: John McNicol, "The Hope of the Church," in *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, Vol. 6 (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, [1910]), pp. 126, 127.

[p. 126] The great leaders who have left their impress on the history of the Church did not discard this doctrine, but made it a real hope in their own lives. Martin Luther, in the midst of the throes of the Reformation, wrote, "I ardently hope that, amidst these internal dissensions on the earth, Jesus Christ will hasten the day of his coming." The acute and learned Calvin saw that this was the Church's true hope. "We must hunger after Christ," he said, "till the dawning of that great day when our Lord will fully manifest the glory of his kingdom. The whole family of the faithful will keep in view that day." ... [p. 127] John Wesley believed this same truth, as is shown by his comment on the closing verses of Revelation: "The spirit of adoption in the bride in the heart of every true believer says, with earnest desire and expectation, 'Come and accomplish all the words of this

prophecy.” It formed the burden of Milton’s sublime supplication: “Come forth out of Thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth; put on the visible robes of Thy imperial majesty; take up that unlimited scepter which Thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed Thee. For now the voice of Thy bride calls Thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed.” ... And if we would follow in the steps of these men, we will return to the simple, unmistakable New Testament type of experience, and, with faces uplifted towards the veil, within which the Lord of glory waits, and with hearts all aglow with a personal love for Him, we will carry on through all our life and service the same apostolic prayer.

1504. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Apostles’ Creed)

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 45.

He ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

1505. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Athanasian Creed)

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 69.

39. He [Christ] ... sitteth on the right hand of the Father God [God the Father] Almighty.

40. From whence [thence] he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Brackets in translation.]

1506. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Nicene Creed)

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 29.

From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

1507. Second Advent, Hope of, in Early Church

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Christian Outlook*, p. 189. Copyright 1948 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

To many of the early disciples, perhaps to the overwhelming majority, the early return of their Lord was an inspiring hope. That return would mean the victory of Christ. Right would prevail and God’s will would be fully done. Of that they had no doubt. A new heaven and a new earth would appear in which righteousness would dwell. But had any one suggested that this would come by slow stages and without the sudden irruption of divine judgment they would have looked at him in puzzled incomprehension. The gradual evolution of a perfect order would have been to them an entirely alien idea.

1508. Second Advent, Hope of the Christian Today

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 51–53. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 51] The Christian who is spiritually linked to the timeless life of God, and who is, not by courtesy title but in reality, a son of God, cannot escape a certain painful tension throughout his earthly life. He is only a temporary resident here; his home, his treasure, the final fulfillment of his hope do not lie in this transitory life at all. He must resist the temptation to withdraw from this benighted, sin-infected world and spend all his spare time in pietistic reflection of the world to which he is bound. He must hold fast to the belief that God is active and contemporary, working wherever He is given opportunity, in the present passing scene. “My Father is busy up to this very moment,” said Christ, “and so am I.” The servant is in the same position as his Master. He too must be busy as his Father is busy. His love and concern must be to some degree a reflection of the God Who “so loved the world” that He would go to any length to rescue and redeem it. But if the world rejects the truth, if the world willfully refuses to follow the revealed pattern of living, the Christian need not for one moment think that the Faith to which he is

committed has failed, even if to the very end of what we call time upon this planet those who own allegiance to the Unseen King remain a small minority. This does not disprove the truth and validity of the Christian Faith... It would indeed be difficult to find any evidence in the New Testament that the end of this earthly experiment that we call life is the world-wide acceptance of Christ and [p. 52] the universal establishment of His Kingdom. Many excellent Christians seem to regard this as the ultimate goal of Christian teaching, preaching, worshiping, and witnessing. Yet as far as I can discover, apart from cheery hymns usually sung in optimistic periods between world wars, this rosy view belongs entirely to isolated texts of Scripture. One is, "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." I for one am rather doubtful whether that is meant to be a prophecy of the universal acceptance of Christ. Another comes from that strange book in which John is told in one of his visions that "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." But this prophecy, if studied in its context, is a prophecy not of universal acceptance but of universal judgment. Truth has finally judged error, and that this is no popular event is shown in verse 18 when we read that "the nations were angry."

It is impossible without being dishonest to dismiss the question of New Testament hope without mentioning the Second Coming of Christ... The hope may have become deferred in its fulfillment, but it is still a very real hope. New Testament Christians may well have modified their early views as to the im- [p. 53] mediacy of Christ's return, yet the fact of His coming again in judgment of the world is always implicit in their thinking and hoping. We need to remember that among the early Christians were quite a number who were actually present when the Son of God ascended back to Heaven—a symbolic action, of course, but historically true. Such men would not readily forget the words of the heavenly messenger who told them quite plainly that "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

1509. Second Advent, Koran on

SOURCE: Koran, Sura xliiii. 61–64, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, p. 1337. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D. C.

61. And (Jesus) shall be ⁴⁶⁶²

A sign (for the coming
Of) the Hour (of Judgment):
Therefore have no doubt
About the (Hour), but
Follow ye Me: this
Is a Straight Way.

62. Let not the Evil One
Hinder you: for he is
To you an enemy avowed.

63. When Jesus came
With Clear Signs, he said:
"Now have I come
To you with Wisdom," ⁴⁶⁶³

And in order to make
Clear to you some
Of the (points) on which
Ye dispute: therefore fear God
And obey me.
64. "For God, He is my Lord
And your Lord."

[Note 4662:] This is understood to refer to the second coming of Jesus in the Last Days just before the Resurrection, when he will destroy the false doctrines that pass under his name, and prepare the way for the universal acceptance of Islam, the Gospel of Unity and Peace, the Straight Way of the **Qur-an**.

[Note 4663:] True wisdom consists in understanding the unity of the Divine purpose and the Unity of the Divine Personality. The man Jesus came to reconcile the jarring sects in Israel, and his true teaching was just the same as that which was expounded in a wider form by Islam.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The notes express the views of the translator and form no part of the Koran itself.]

1510. Second Advent, Nearness of, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: George Bell and Sons, 1902), pp. 7, 8, 90. [See **FRS** No. 44.]

[p. 7] I hope the last day will not be long delayed. The darkness grows thicker around us, and godly servants of the Most High become rarer and more rare. Impiety and licentiousness are rampant throughout the world, [p. 8] and we live like pigs, like wild beasts, devoid of all reason. But a voice will soon be heard thundering forth: *Behold, the bridegroom cometh*. God will not be able to bear this wicked world much longer, but will come, with the dreadful day, and chastise the scorners of his word...

[p. 90] The prophets spoke and preached of the second coming of Christ as we do now; we know that the last day will come yet we know not what and how it will be after this life, but only in general, that we, who are true Christians, shall have everlasting joy, peace, and salvation. The prophets held likewise, that soon after the coming of Christ, the last day would appear. First, they named the day of the Messiah the last day. Secondly, they set the signs of the first and second coming both together, as if they would happen at one time.

1511. Second Advent, Nearness of, Luther's Belief in

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Luther's Church Postil Gospels*, ed. by John Nicholas Lenker (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in all Lands Co., 1905), pp. 62, 63. [**FRS** No. 46.]

[p. 62] These words [Luke 17:24, 26–30] abundantly show that people will rest so secure and will be so deeply buried beneath the cares of this life, that they will not believe the day is at hand.

4. There is now no doubt that Christ did not foretell these signs in the expectation that no one would note nor recognize them when they should appear; although few indeed will do so, just as in the days of Noah and Lot but few knew the punishment in store for them. Were this not true, the admonition of Christ would have been in vain: "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh." Then, "Lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh." There must then be some, at least, who do recognize the signs, and lift up their heads and wait for their redemption, although they do not really know on what day that will come. We should be careful, therefore, to note whether the signs are being fulfilled now, or have been or will be in the future.

5. I do not wish to force any one to believe as I do; neither will I permit anyone to deny me the right to believe that the last day is near at hand. These words and signs of Christ compel me to believe that such is the case. For the history of the centuries that have passed since the birth of Christ nowhere reveals conditions like those of the present. There has never been such building and planting in the world. [p. 63] There has never been such gluttonous and varied eating and drinking as now. Wearing apparel has reached its limit in costliness. Who has ever heard of such commerce as now encircles the earth? There have arisen all kinds of art and sculpture, embroidery and engraving, the like of which has not been seen during the whole Christian era.

6. In addition men are so delving into the mysteries of things that today a boy of twenty knows more than twenty doctors formerly knew. There is such a knowledge of languages and all manner of wisdom that it must be confessed, the world has reached such great heights in the things that pertain to the body, or as Christ calls them, “cares of life,” eating, drinking, building, planting, buying, selling, marrying and giving in marriage, that every one must see and say either ruin or a change must come. It is hard to see how a change can come. Day after day dawns and the same conditions remain. There was never such keenness, understanding and judgment among Christians in bodily and temporal things as now—I forbear to speak of the new inventions, printing, fire-arms, and other implements of war.

7. But not only have such great strides been made in the world of commerce, but also in the spiritual field have there been great changes. Error, sin, and falsehood have never held sway in the world as in these last centuries. The Gospel has been openly condemned at Constance, and the false teachings of the Pope have been adopted as law though he practiced the greatest extortion. Daily mass is celebrated many hundred thousand times in the world, and thereby the greatest sin committed. By confession, sacrament, indulgence, rules and laws, so many souls are driven to condemnation that it seems God has given the whole world over to the devil. In short it is not possible that there should be greater falsehood, more heinous error, more dreadful blindness, and more obdurate blasphemy than have ruled in the church through the bishops, cloisters, and universities. As a result Aristotle, a blind heathen, teaches and rules Christians more than does Christ.

1512. Second Advent, Nearness of, Luther’s Estimates of the Time

a. In 300 Years

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther*, trans. by Henry Bell (a new ed., rev. by Joseph Kerby; London: Baldwin, Craddock, and Joy, 1818), pp. 7, 8.

[p. 7] I hope the last Day of Judgment is not far, I persuade myself verily it will not be absent full three hundred years longer; for God’s Word [p. 8] will decrease and be darkened for want of true shepherds and servants of God. The voice will sound and be heard ere long: Behold, the Bridegroom cometh. God neither will nor can suffer this wicked world much longer, but must strike in with the dreadful day, and punish the contemning of his Word, and so will quite beat out the barrel’s head.

b. In 100 Years at Most

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: George Bell and Sons, 1902), p. 325.

The world cannot stand long, perhaps a hundred years at the outside.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Luther is quoted also as mentioning (in 1536) a hundred years as the maximum interval he expected before the end. He said, “In the Revelation we have come to the white horse. The

world cannot stand long; if God will, not over one hundred years. The Lord deliver us from evil, Amen” (*Tischreden*, chap. 51, sec. 4, in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, Walch, ed., vol. 22, col. 1334).]

c. *In Luther’s Day*

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther*, trans. by Henry Bell (a new ed., rev. by Joseph Kerby; London: Baldwin, Craddock, and Joy, 1818), pp. 407.

Ah, loving God come once; I wait continually for that day... The name of the Lord be praised, who hath taught us to sigh and yearn after that day... I hope, truly, that day is not far off.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: According to the *Tischreden* in his *Sämmtliche Schriften* (Walch ed.), vol. 22, col. 1331, Luther is quoted as saying: “I hope that day is not far off and we shall still see it.” Again, Luther is reported to have expected the end in a very few years: When Melancthon remarked that the Emperor (according to astrology) would live until 1548, Luther argued from Ezekiel that the world would not last that long. This incident is not included in the traditional *Table Talk*, but in the more recently published source material from which the *Table Talk* was compiled (*Conversations with Luther*, ed. by Preserved Smith and Herbert Percival Gallinger [New York: Pilgrim Press, 1915], p. 229).]

1513. Second Advent, Nearness of, Widely Taught in Early 19th Century

SOURCE: Mourant Brock, *Glorification* (American ed.; Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1847), p. 135, note.

It is not merely in Great Britain that the expectation of the near return of the Redeemer is entertained, and the voice of warning raised, but also in America, India, and on the continent of Europe. I was lately told by one of our German missionaries that in Wirtemburgh [*sic*] there is a Christian colony of several hundreds, one of the chief features of which is the looking for the Second Advent. And a Christian minister from near the shores of the Caspian Sea has told me, that there is the same daily expectation among his nation. They constantly speak of it as “the day of consolation.” In a little publication, entitled “The Millennium,” the writer says that he understands in America about 300 ministers of the Word are thus preaching “the Gospel of the kingdom;” whilst in this country, he adds, about 700 of the Church of England are raising the same cry.

1514. Second Advent —No Opportunity to Choose Sides Then

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case of Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 55, 56. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 55] Another possible objection is this: Why is God landing in this enemy-occupied world in disguise and starting a sort of secret society to undermine the devil? Why isn’t he landing in force, invading it? Is it that He isn’t strong enough? Well, Christians think He’s going to land in force; we don’t know when. But we can guess why He’s delaying. He wants to give us the chance of joining His side freely. I don’t suppose you and I would think much of a Frenchman who waited till the Allies were marching into Berlin and then announced he was on our side. God will invade. But I wonder whether people who ask God to interfere openly and directly in our world quite realise what it will be like when [p. 56] He does. When that happens, it’s the end of the world. When the author walks on to the stage the play’s over. God’s going to invade, all right: but what’s the good of saying you’re on His side *then*, when you see the whole natural universe melting away like a dream and something else—something it never entered your head to conceive—comes crashing in; something so beautiful to some of us and so terrible to others that none of us will have any choice left? For this time it will be God *without* disguise; something so overwhelming that it will strike either irresistible love or irresistible horror into every creature. It will be too late then to *choose* your side. There’s

no good saying you choose to lie down when it has become impossible to stand up. That won't be the time for choosing: it will be the time when we discover which side we really have chosen, whether we realised it before or not. *Now* is our chance to choose the right side. God is holding back to give us that chance. It won't last for ever. We must take it or leave it.

1515. Second Advent, No Probation After (Belgic Confession)

SOURCE: W. J. Grier, *The Momentous Event* (Belfast: The Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), p. 25. Used by permission.

The "Belgic Confession," which was widely adopted in Holland, Belgium, and Germany, guards the statement respecting the second advent of Christ by teaching that the time of its occurrence is unknown to all created beings, and that it will not take place *until the number of the elect is complete*. This guards against one of the worst features of the common pre-millenarian scheme [see No. 1073n], namely, that there will be people saved *after* Christ comes.

1516. Second Advent, Not at Death, but Future

SOURCE: D. L. Moody, *The Second Coming of Christ* (rev. ed.; Chicago: Revell, 1877), pp. 10, 11.

[p. 10] "Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." Some people say that means death; but the Word of God does not say it means death. Death is our enemy, but our Lord hath the keys of Death; He has conquered death, hell and the grave... Christ is the Prince of Life; there is [p. 11] no death where He is; death flees at His coming; dead bodies sprang to life when He touched them or spoke to them. His coming is not death; He is the resurrection and the life; when He sets up His kingdom there is to be no death, but life forevermore.

1517. Second Advent—Personal and Visible (Luther on)

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Luther's Church Postil Gospels*, ed. by John Nicholas Lenker, (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in all Lands Co., 1905), pp. 74, 75. [FRS No. 46.]

[p. 74] "*And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.*"

36. Here power may again signify the hosts of angels, saints, and all creatures that will come with Christ to judgment (I believe this is the correct interpretation); or it may mean the special power and might which will characterize this coming of Christ in contradistinction to his first coming. He says not only that he will come, but that they shall see him come. At his birth he came also, but men did not recognize him. He comes now through the Gospel in a spiritual manner, into the hearts of believers. This is also is not by observation. But his last coming will be such that all must see him as Rev. 1, 7 says, "And every eye shall see him." And they shall see that he is none other than the man Christ Jesus, in bodily form, as he was born of the virgin Mary and walked upon this earth.

He might have said they shall see me, but that would not have clearly indicated his bodily form. But when he says: "They shall see the Son of man," he clearly indicates that it will be a bodily coming, a bodily seeing in bodily form: a com- [p. 75] ing in great power and glory, accompanied by the hosts of heaven. He shall sit upon the clouds and be accompanied by all the saints. The Scriptures speak much of that day and everywhere point to the same. This, then, is said concerning the signs. The Saviour adds words of comfort for Christians in the presence of these signs.

1518. Second Advent, a Precious Doctrine (Moody)

SOURCE: D. L. Moody, *The Second Coming of Christ* (rev. ed.; Chicago: Revell, 1877), pp. 6, 7.

[p. 6] To my mind this precious doctrine—for such I must call it—of the return of the Lord to this earth is taught in the New Testament as clearly as any other doctrine in it; yet I was in the Church fifteen or sixteen years before I ever heard a sermon on it. There is hardly any church that doesn't make a great deal of baptism, but in all of Paul's epistles I believe baptism is only spoken of thirteen times, while it speaks about the return of our Lord fifty times; and yet the Church has had very little to say about it. Now, I can see a reason for this; the devil does not want us to see this truth, for nothing would wake up the Church so much. The moment a man takes hold of the truth that Jesus Christ is coming back again to receive his followers to himself, this world loses [p. 7] its hold upon him. Gas stocks and water stocks and stocks in banks and railroads are of very much less consequence to him then. His heart is free, and he looks for the blessed appearing of His [i.e. his] Lord, who, at His coming, will take him into His blessed Kingdom.

1519. Second Advent—Premillennialist View of

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 5–7. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 5] God's redemptive purpose involves not only the salvation of individuals; God has a purpose and a goal for mankind as a society inhabiting the earth. The Bible teaches that throughout the entire course of this age, the power and reign of Satan manifests itself not only in the sinfulness and the physical sufferings and mortality of individuals, but also in the evils of corporate historical experience. Satan offered to our Lord authority over the nations, "for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it" (Luke 4:6). While God is sovereign and Satan can do nothing apart from the will of God, there is truth in this declaration of the Evil One. God has permitted Satan to exercise his power in human history. Our generation has witnessed diabolical evils which the preceding generation would have said were impossible for enlightened, civilized men. The demonic element in history is increasingly manifesting itself.

God will not permit Satan to exercise his power in human history forever. Man will not destroy himself from the face of the earth, nor will this planet become a cold, [p. 6] lifeless star. The day is surely coming when the knowledge of God shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, when peace and righteousness shall prevail instead of war and evil. The day is surely coming when God will take the reins of government into His hands and the kingdom of God will come on earth [see No. 1073n] and His will be done even as it is in heaven. This glorious destiny for man will be achieved only by the personal, visible, glorious return of Christ. He is destined to be Lord of lords and King of kings. The second coming of Jesus Christ is an absolutely indispensable doctrine in the Biblical teaching of redemption. Apart from His glorious return, God's work will forever be incomplete. At the center of redemption past is Christ on the cross; at the center of redemption future is Christ returning in glory...

[p. 7] The kingdom of God in its outward manifestation will not come until the Lord Jesus returns in glory. The present mission of the Church is not to save the world and thus establish the kingdom of God but to evangelize the world by the proclamation of the Gospel. The second coming of Christ is thus both the Blessed Hope of the Church and the hope of human history. His coming will mean both salvation and judgment. To this glorious truth the author steadfastly holds; it may be designated by the term *premillennialism*.

1520. Second Advent—“Rapture,” as Defined Literally and Theologically

SOURCE: *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933). Used by permission.

Rapture... 4. The act of conveying a person from one place to another, esp. to heaven; the fact of being so conveyed... 5. Transport of mind.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The root verb means to seize or carry off. In the Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary the entry for the related adjective *rapt* gives the derivation: “L[atin] *raptus*, past part. of

rapere to seize”; and definition number 2 for *rapture*, classified as “now rare” in general modern usage, has the idea of movement, of being transported. This is precisely the theological meaning as used in the phrase “secret rapture,” referring to the saints’ being “caught up” together to meet the Lord at His second coming (1 Thess. 4:17). The rapture, then, means nothing more or less than the taking up of the resurrected and transformed saints by Christ. But its use is confined almost entirely to the futurist-dispensationalist wing of premillennialism, where it appears as a technical term for an alleged removal of the church from the earth before the final tribulation that precedes the Second Advent. See Nos. 1253, 1740.]

1521. Second Advent—“Rapture” (i.e., the Taking Up of the Saints) Not Separate From the Visible Coming

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 181–185. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 181] I. *The Words for Rapture and Revelation or Appearing*. ...

a. The New Testament Usage of these Words

(1) By Paul

(a) “Coming” (*parousia*) is used by Paul 14 times, 8 of which refer to the coming of Christ. 1 Thess. iv.15, which speaks of the catching up of living believers, clearly refers to the rapture [see No. 1520]; likewise 2 Thess. ii.1, which speaks of our “gathering together unto him.” On the other hand, 1 Thess. iii.13 [p. 182] speaks of the “coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints.” If “saints” means or includes the Church, as all Dispensationalists believe, this verse speaks quite as plainly of the appearing. In 2 Thes. ii.8, which clearly refers to the appearing, since it speaks of the slaying of Antichrist, the expression used is “the manifestation” (or “brightness,” epiphany) of his “coming” (*parousia*). Consequently, we must recognize that Paul uses *coming* both of the rapture and of the appearing and even combines the two expressions in 2 Thess. ii.8, to describe what is apparently one and the same event.

(b) “Revelation” (apocalypse) is used 13 times by Paul. In 1 Cor. i.7 it is used of the rapture. It is what the Christian waits for. In 2 Thess. i.7 the reference is as plainly to the appearing, the coming in glory.

(c) “Appearing” (epiphany). This word is used only by Paul. In 1 Tim. vi.14, the reference to the rapture seems unmistakable. In 2 Tim. iv.1, 8 the allusions to judgment as in Tit. ii.13 to glory favor the reference to the appearing...

Paul uses all three words and he uses them am- [p. 183] biguously. Particularly clear is the fact that he uses *parousia* both of the rapture and of the appearing... How is this to be explained, if he had been told by the Lord that there was an important difference between these two events? ...

[p. 184] The question which confronts us is this. If the distinction between the rapture and the appearing is of a great moment as Dispensationalists assert, how are we to explain Paul’s failure to distinguish clearly between them? And the failure of other

writers, Peter, James, and John, to do the same? Paul was a logician. He was able to draw sharp distinctions. If he had wanted, or regarded it important, to distinguish between these events, he could have done so very easily. Why did he use language which Dispensationalists must admit to be confusing? Feinberg recently made the following surprising statement regarding the three words we have been discussing: “We conclude, then, [p. 185] that from a study of the Greek words themselves the distinction between the coming of the Lord for His saints and with His saints is not to be gleaned”²¹ [Note 21: *Premillennialism or Amillennialism?*, p. 207]. Such an admission raises the question whether the distinction itself is valid. If the distinction is of importance, Paul’s ambiguous language is, we say it reverently, inexcusable. If the distinction is negligible, accuracy of statement would be quite unnecessary. We conclude, therefore, that the usage of the New Testament and especially of Paul not merely fails to prove the distinction insisted on by Dispensationalists but rather by its very ambiguity indicates clearly and unmistakably that no such distinction exists.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The attempt to distinguish between the “rapture” and the “appearing” (see Nos. 1524, 1525) on the basis of the meaning of the two Greek words involved is no longer a mainstay of pretribulationist writers (see above quotation from Feinberg). The above extract is included merely because some readers may encounter this theory without knowing that it is obsolete.]

1522. Second Advent—“Rapture,” Secret, Impossible, for There Is Only One Second Coming

SOURCE: W. J. Grier, *The Momentous Event* (Belfast: The Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), pp. 55, 56. Used by permission.

[p. 55] Paul associates with the second coming both the resurrection and ensuing glory of the saints *and* the sudden destruction of the wicked. Without the shadow of a doubt, “that day” has its reference to both parties:—believers are to look for it (1 Thessalonians 5:4–10), for *then* they shall obtain salvation in all its fullness (verse 9), *then* they shall “live together with Him” (verse 10); while that *same* day will bring the false security of unbelievers to an end in their “sudden destruction.” ...

[p. 56] We may notice that when the Saviour comes for the deliverance of His troubled saints, He comes “in flaming fire”—no *secret* rapture [see No. 1520] here! But it is even more important still to notice how the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are interwoven with each other *as to time*, and made to follow, both of them, immediately on the coming of the Lord.

Surely this passage [2 Thess. 1:7–10] should make perfectly clear that there is no secret rapture to be followed at an interval of several years by an open revelation of the Lord and His glory to the world.

Surely it is perfectly clear also that since the coming of the Lord brings upon the wicked “eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord,” there are no wicked who will survive His coming to be ruled over in a millennium to follow. But there must be wicked people surviving, according to the pre-millennial scheme [that is, the majority view; for the Adventist exception (Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist view), see No. 7n].

1523. Second Advent, Theories of—Postmillennialism Separates Events of the Second Coming

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 307, 308. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 307] The separation of the second advent of Christ from the destruction of the beast and the false prophet [is a postmillennialist “dislocation”]. The antichristian character of these beasts is usually recognized, and therefore they are commonly held to be essentially the same as the antichrist of whom John speaks in his Epistles, and also with the man of sin and son of perdition of whom Paul speaks in II Thess. 2. Indeed, the marks of identification are so plain, that it would be needlessly multiplying the eschatological factors to assume that the course of history will produce a man of sin next to an antichrist and both next to the apocalyptic beast...

[p. 308] Brakel was a Postmillenarian and expected a millennium subsequent to the destruction of the antichristian power which he identified with the beast and with the papacy. But he denied a visible return of Christ to our earth while history is still continuing. To his mind, this was altogether too earthly a conception to entertain of our glorified Lord. For that reason he broke the connection which II Thess. 2 so clearly establishes and transposed the return of Christ from the beginning to the end of the millennium. He adduced a whole string of arguments in support of this operation. They are: a return of Christ for the destruction of antichrist would take Him away from the blessed in heaven; it would limit the enjoyment of His presence upon earth to but few; it militates against His priesthood which according to Hebrews must be exercised in heaven; it would deprive the believers of their advocate in heaven; and Scripture knows of only one return of Christ for the judgment and the resurrection of the dead.

This is definitely poor argumentation... I have still to meet a good exegetical reason for this separation of Christ’s visible return from the destruction of antichrist.

1524. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism, as Related to Premillennialism

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 8, 9. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 8] However, the program of prophetic events which they [many modern premillennialists] taught included important elements which are not found in the early church. Among these were the teachings of the Rapture of the Church [see No. 1520] at the beginning of the Tribulation and the expectation of an any-moment secret coming of Christ for the purpose of rapturing the Church. Since the coming of Christ would precede the appearance of Antichrist and the Tribulation, it would be unheralded by any preceding signs and could therefore occur at any moment after His ascension to heaven. The coming of Christ is “imminent”; i.e., it can take place at any moment. “Imminence” means that no prophesied event must take place before Christ’s return to rapture the Church.

We may designate this teaching by the word *pretribulationism*, because it teaches a pretribulation rapture of the Church so that it escapes the Tribulation. Premillennialism and pretribulationism hold much in common... Both expect a short period of fearful tribulation at the end of the age. Both are looking for the glorious coming of Christ to

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

establish His millennial kingdom. Pretribulationism adds several other features which are not essential to the main outlines of premillennial truth. Thus premillennialism and pretribulationism are not synonymous. All pretribulationists will be premillennialists, but not all premillennialists will be pretribulationists. Many premillennialists believe that the Scriptures do not teach that Christ will return secretly to rapture the Church before the Tribulation. However, this teaching has been spread widely throughout American Fundamentalism through the godly influence of such men as James M. Gray, A. C. Gaebelein, R. A. Torrey, W. B. Riley, I. M. Haldeman, H. A. Ironside, L. S. Chafer, and many others.

[p. 9] No instrument has been more influential than the Scofield Reference Bible in implanting this view in the thinking of millions of Christians. Most of the Bible schools which have trained a host of young people in the Word of God have been devoted to this pattern of prophetic teaching, and the prophetic conference movement along with many summer Bible conferences has propagated this view. So deeply entrenched has it become that many pastors and Christian leaders have been led to assume that this teaching has been an essential doctrine in the history of the Church extending back to apostolic times and has prevailed widely in all ages among believers who have had a sincere love for the Word of God and who have cherished the Blessed Hope of Christ's return.

During the first half of the present century, occasional voices were raised within the circle of premillennial interpretation in defense of a modification of some of the details of this prophetic program. Honored leaders such as Robert Cameron, W. J. Eerdman, Rowland Bingham and Henry Frost were compelled from their further study of the Word to dissent from pretribulationism. Holding steadfastly to the premillennial coming of Christ to establish His kingdom, they felt they could no longer accept the teaching of a secret return of Christ to rapture the Church before the Tribulation. If the Tribulation were to precede Christ's return, it was obvious that the doctrine of an any-moment coming was impossible. Some of these men were sharply criticized for their deviation from the teaching of an any-moment coming of Christ to remove the Church from the world before the Tribulation begins. They were nevertheless recognized to be men of God who were true to the Gospel and unswerving in their defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, and men who loved His appearing. Although they were thought to be in error in their teaching about the Rapture and the Tribulation, this deviation was not considered to be ground for attacking their essential soundness, orthodoxy, and loyalty to the Word of God.

1525. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism Defined and Leading Advocates Identified

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 23–26. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 23] About a hundred years ago a man named J. N. Darby, founded a group of Christians who have become known as "The Brethren," or "Plymouth Brethren." His followers, Wm. Kelly, W. Trotter, and C. H. M., were the pioneers of the movement, but in more recent times W. E. Blackstone, in "Jesus is Coming," F. W. Grant, James M. Gray, A. C. Gaebelein, F. C. Ottman, and particularly C. I. Scofield, the author of the "Scofield Reference Bible," have popularized what we may call a new view of the events preceding and following the Coming of Christ. It is important to note that [p. 24] there is

a vast difference between the teachings of these men and the teachings of the old historic premillennialists.

1. Instead of one Second Coming of Christ, there are two distinct stages, so that in reality we should speak of the Second and Third Comings of Christ. The Second Coming [i.e., of Christ *for* His saints, the “rapture”] will concern the church alone, and will occur at the beginning of the Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:24–27, when Christ comes for His church. the Third Coming [i.e., of Christ *with* His saints, the “appearing”] will concern Israel and the world, and occurs at the close of the Seventieth Week, when Christ comes *with* his church. Between the Second and Third Comings of Christ there will be at least seven years, the Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:24–27.
2. At the Second Coming of Christ the Righteous dead of New Testament times with the Righteous dead of the Old Testament, and the living Church of Christ, will be transfigured, after the first resurrection, and raptured [i.e., snatched away; see No. 1520] to be with Christ during the seven years, where they receive rewards at the Marriage Feast of the Lamb. (Most of this group hold that the Rapture will be a *Secret Rapture*, while this group again breaks up into those who believe that only those who are *looking* for the Second Coming will be raptured, while other Christians who are not looking for it will be left behind to go through the Great Tribulation. The other group hold that all Christians who are in the Church of Christ will be raptured at that time.)
3. After the rapture of the church, the Antichrist sets up his kingdom, and institutes the Great Tribulation. The church which has already been raptured, therefore, will not pass through the Great Tribulation.
4. The Holy Spirit is removed from the world at the time of the Second Coming... After the Second Coming, the Jews return to Palestine, mostly in unbelief. However, there is a small *Remnant* who remain faithful to the true God, though they do not [p. 25] accept the saving work of Christ. During the latter part of the week they preach the *Gospel of the Kingdom* far and wide according to the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19. An immense number of the inhabitants of the world believe this *Gospel of the Kingdom*, and pass through the Great Tribulation, though they are not yet true believers or a part of the true Church of Christ.
5. At the close of the seven years there will be another resurrection of the martyred saints of the tribulation period, though these resurrected saints will not be connected with the Church of God.
6. At the close of the seven year period the Antichrist gathers his hosts against the Remnant and those Gentile believers who have not been martyred, at the Battle of Armageddon (Rev. 16:16). Christ then comes in glory *with* the church, holds the Sheep and Goat judgment, (the basis of which is how the nations have treated the Jews, who are the “brethren” of the Lord, the separation thus being on the basis of good works). The living Remnant, and the Gentile “nations,” then enter the Millennial Kingdom set up by Christ, but with unglorified bodies...
8. The millennial kingdom is set up with the Jews in the chief authority, with the temple and its worship again established in Jerusalem. The believing Jews and the “nations” who are ruled over with “the rod of iron,” still have natural bodies, but sin is sternly repressed, and though the nations are rebellious at heart, they are forced to bow the knee to Christ who rules from Jerusalem.

[p. 26] 9. Satan was of course bound at the close of the seven year period, but at the end of the millennium he is loosed from his prison, gathers the rebellious nations to war against the saints, and these nations are destroyed by fire from heaven. This is followed by the resurrection of the wicked, the Great White Throne Judgment and the setting up of the eternal kingdom of God.

10. During the millennium it is not quite clear what the relationship of the Church is to the unglorified believers in the earth. Most probably would say that their real home is in heaven but that they could visit the millennial kingdom at will. Some would doubtless say that the church will join in the millennial reign of Christ.

It is seen at a glance that this whole scheme is totally different from that of the old historic premillennialism.

1526. Second Advent, Theories of Pretribulationism, Rise of

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 40, 41, 43–45, 58. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 40] A second out-growth of the prophetic awakening of the early nineteenth century was Darbyism, or Dispensationalism, which had its birth within the Plymouth Brethren movement. A pretribulation rapture [see No. 1520] is an essential element of this system. The Brethren movement had its beginnings in Dublin in 1825 when a small group of earnest men, dissatisfied with the spiritual condition of the Protestant church in Ireland, met for prayer and fellowship. Soon others joined the fellowship and other similar groups sprang up. In 1827, J. N. Darby entered the fellowship. Although there was an interest from the start in prophetic truth, the center of emphasis was “The Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ” (the title of Darby’s first tract) in reaction to the deadness and formalism of the organized church and the ordained ministry. Outstanding among the new groups which arose in Ireland and England was the fellowship in Plymouth, from which the movement derived its name. Leader of the Plymouth fellowship for many years was B. W. Newton, a man of considerable learning and scholarship. Two other outstanding Brethren were S. P. Tregelles, recognized by the entire world of Biblical scholarship for his contribution to the study of the history of the Greek text of the New Testament, and George Muller, the great man of prayer.

We have already mentioned the Albury Park conference and the Powerscourt meetings. Darby and other leaders of the new movement attended the meetings at Powerscourt, and Darby’s leadership in the area of prophetic interpretation here became evident. It was at Powerscourt that the teaching of a pretribulation rapture of the Church took shape. Tregelles, a member of the Brethren in these early days, tells us that the idea of a secret rapture at a [p. 41] secret coming of Christ had its origin in an “utterance” in Edward Irving’s church, and that this was taken to be the voice of the Spirit. Tregelles says, “It was from that supposed revelation that the modern doctrine and the modern phraseology respecting it arose. It came not from Holy Scripture, but from that which falsely pretended to be the Spirit of God.” This doctrine together with other important modifications of the traditional futuristic view were vigorously promoted by Darby, and they have been popularized by the writings of William Kelly.

Not all of the Brethren accepted the teaching of a pretribulation rapture. In 1842, B. W. Newton of Plymouth published a book entitled *Thoughts on the Apocalypse* in which he taught the traditional view that the Church would go through the Tribulation. There arose a sharp contention over the issue of pretribulationism between the two men. Newton “considered Mr. Darby’s dispensational teaching as the height of speculative

nonsense” (H. A. Ironside). He was supported in his posttribulation views by Tregelles. A rift followed which was never healed. This was the first of a series of many contentions which marred the history of the Brethren movement.

Within early Brethrenism, we find two types of prophetic interpretation: The traditional futurism, and Darbyism or Dispensationalism. The influence which has extended to prophetic study in America has been the latter. Doubtless Newton’s views on the Church and the Tribulation were discredited because he was accused of holding unsound views on the person of Christ. [p. 43] ... Against this background of prevailing postmillennialism and a groping search for a more satisfying interpretation of prophecy, it is easy to see how Darbyan futurism possessed such attraction and impelling power. It came with a freshness and vitality which quite captured American Christians. Darby visited America six times between 1859 and 1874 and was warmly welcomed. His system of prophetic interpretation was eagerly adopted... Darbyism to many Christians meant the rediscovery of the precious Biblical truth of Christ’s glorious second coming, even though the basic truth was accompanied by some important details which were not essential to the premillennial return of Christ and which many later came to feel were not in the Word of God. Once more, as in the early church, the return of Christ became a living and vital expectation in the lives of Christian people and in the pulpit ministry of many a preacher. Little wonder that the view has been cherished and defended with such deep emotional overtones. Darbyism in fact restored something precious which had long been lost.

This new prophetic emphasis at once found expression in the prophetic and Bible conference movement. A. C. Gaebelien, telling the story of the Scofield Reference Bible, finds its background within this movement. Interest in premillennialism grew to a point where a great prophetic conference was suggested by Nathaniel West. A call was issued by a committee of eight men, among whom were [p. 44] James H. Brookes and A. J. Gordon, with the indorsement of one hundred and fourteen “Bishops, Professors, Ministers and Brethren.” The conference was called to meet in the church of the Holy Trinity (Episcopal) in 1878. A second prophetic conference was held in Chicago in 1886. Prominent in these conferences were such men as Stephen Tyng, W. R. Nicholson, Nathaniel West, S. H. Kellogg, A. J. Gordon, James H. Brooks, W. J. Erdman, W. G. Moorehead and A. T. Pierson.

Another series of meetings of even greater importance was that which met at Niagara on Lake Ontario from 1883–1897. This conference was the outgrowth of a small Bible study fellowship initiated in 1875 by a handful of men among whom were Nathaniel West, J. H. Brookes and W. J. Erdman. They were joined the next year by A. J. Gordon. This group met from place to place until the conference at Ontario was undertaken. Among the leading teachers of the Ontario conferences, according to A. C. Gaebelien, were James H. Brookes, A. J. Gordon, W. J. Erdman, Albert Erdman, George C. Needham, A. C. Dickson, L. W. Mundhall, H. M. Parsons, Canon Howitt, E. P. Marvin, Hudson Taylor, J. M. Stifler, Robert Cameron, W. G. Moorehead and A. T. Pierson. After this pioneer of American Bible conferences was discontinued, a new conference at Seacliff, Long Island, was opened in 1901, and it was here that the plan for the Reference Bible embodying the dispensational system of interpretation occurred to Dr. C. I. Scofield.

In view of the modern notion that pretribulationism has been one of the foundational tenets of a sound presentation of prophetic truth, it is important to note that many of the leaders of this early prophetic, Bible conference movement either were or became posttribulationists [for definition see editors' note below]. Many of the teachers at the Niagara Conference accepted J. N. Darby's [p. 45] pretribulation rapture along with the doctrine of Christ's return. Of the men named above, James H. Brookes, A. T. Pierson, and C. I. Scofield have been among the most influential supporters of this view. However, other teachers did not accept it, and still others accepted it at first only to give it up after more mature study of the Word of God. Since it is often thought that all good and godly premillennialists must be pretribulationists, we shall note the views of several of these leaders who did not adhere to the pretribulation teaching [i.e., Nathaniel West, A. J. Gordon, W. J. Erdman, Robert Cameron, Henry W. Frost, W. G. Moorehead, Charles R. Erdman, Philip Mauro, Rowland V. Bingham, G. Campbell Morgan, Bishop Frank Houghton, Oswald J. Smith, Harold John Ockenga; see pp. 45–57 of the work cited]...

[p. 58] These men, like those of the earlier generation, passed through the experience of accepting dispensational teaching but of being driven to conclude that it did not coincide with the teachings of the Word of God. But who is to say that Mauro, Bingham, Morgan, Houghton, Smith and Ockenga are any less men of God and true to the Word? The author is personally acquainted with other Christian leaders who have given up pretribulationism; but they have not gone on record and so cannot be quoted.

Pretribulationism has not been and never ought to be a test of a sound view of prophetic truth. Pretribulationism is a recent view which was formulated 125 years ago by one wing of the Plymouth Brethren and accepted in America by a circle of devout and godly men but rejected by others who were equally devout and godly and equally devoted to the propagation of the truth of the Lord's return.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Posttribulationism is the view that the church remains on this earth through the final tribulation, and is taken to heaven at the Second Advent. It is held by amillennialists, postmillennialists, and all premillennialists except the pretribulationists.]

1527. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism's Secret Rapture Refuted

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 157–159. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 157] The second coming of Christ and the expectation of entering into a perfected fellowship with Him when we shall see Him face to face is the Blessed Hope of the Church. Perhaps the most common objection raised against a posttribulation teaching is this. The second coming of Christ is no longer a Blessed Hope if the Church must first pass through the Tribulation. If we must look for tribulation rather than for a rapture [see No. 1520] before the Tribulation, then the Blessed Hope has lost its blessed character and becomes instead a day of dread and fear.

In answer to this position, two things are to be said. First, we have already demonstrated that the Church will not experience the wrath of God. The Great Tribulation so far as it involves the outpouring of God's wrath will not engulf the Church. If that were not the case, the Tribulation would be an experience of unimaginable horror. However, God has not destined us to wrath but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Secondly, the Word of God *does not teach that the Blessed Hope of the Church is a hope of deliverance from persecution*. The coming of Christ is described as the Blessed

Hope in one verse: Titus 2:13. "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Did the Spirit of God know what He was doing when He inspired these words? Did He give to Paul a vague thought leaving him to confuse it with inaccurate language? We think not. The Blessed [p. 158] Hope is not deliverance from tribulation; it is not even the Rapture itself; it is the epiphany [appearing], the outshining of the glory of our great God and Savior. If this verse is any guide, the Blessed Hope is not a secret coming of Christ; it is not the resurrection of the dead; it is not the transformation of the living; it is not the catching up of the Church; the Blessed Hope is the glorious epiphany of *Our Lord Himself*, which occurs at the end of the Great Tribulation.

To insist that the Blessed Hope must be escape from the Great Tribulation is to place the emphasis where the Scripture does not place it; it is in fact to impose an interpretation upon the Scripture in place of what the Word of God actually says. As we indicated in an earlier chapter, the Word of God everywhere assures us that in this age we are to expect tribulation and persecution. The last great persecution of Antichrist [see No. 1740] will indeed be worse and more fearful than anything the world has ever seen; but when we contemplate the history of martyrdom, why should we ask deliverance from what millions have already suffered? When we read in the books of the Maccabees of the tortures inflicted upon the Jews who were faithful to the teachings of the Law by the manifestation of antichrist in the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes; when we recall the thousands of Christians who fell in torture and death and did it gladly in the name of Christ at the hands of the manifestation of the spirit of antichrist in the Roman emperors; when we are reminded of the Inquisition with its rack and wheel and flame; when we remember from our own generation the liquidation of several millions of Jews by a modern antichrist, and even more recently the martyrdom of tens of thousands of Korean Christians, what kind of a faith does the Church of today exemplify and what sort of a gospel is it which we proclaim if we insist that God must deliver us from the hands of the last manifestation of antichrist at the end of the age?

[p. 159] There is one very sobering question which weighs heavily upon the writer's heart, and he would ask his readers to share it. Many of God's people are being assured today that the Rapture will take place before the Tribulation and that the Church will not experience those terrible days...

Suppose that suddenly the people of God find themselves engulfed in a horrible persecution at the hands of the Antichrist when they had been assured repeatedly on the authority of the Word of God that this experience would never befall them. What will be the result? We leave it to the reader's imagination.

1528. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationist View, Errors of

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, p. 309. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

They [the Darbyites; see No. 1526] assume a rapture [see No. 1520] of the believers prior to the manifestation of the Son of Man for the destruction of antichrist... A rapture [or taking up] of the believers at Christ's second coming is plainly taught in I Thess. 4:13–18 and has found recognition as early as Ireneus. But the assumption that that rapture will precede the appearance of the Son of Man in public on the clouds of heaven so clearly contradicts the order of events as indicated in Matth. 24:30, 31, that it is puzzling to meet with the theory as often as one does without a word of explanation. In Matth. 24:30, 31, the order is very distinctly and unmistakably indicated as being first the

public appearance of the Son of Man at which all the nations shall mourn, and then in that appearance of the Son of Man at which all the nations shall mourn, and then in that appearance the ingathering of His elect by His angels.

The Darbyites are not the only ones who commit this violence to the biblical order of the eschatological events, but, apparently under their influence, many others [i.e., the dispensationalists] do the same. An ingathering of the elect prior to Christ's public appearance would necessarily partake of the nature of secrecy as far as the world at large is concerned; and by many such secrecy is actually ascribed to the rapture. For the Darbyites and all who with them hold to the belief that the great tribulation intervenes between the rapture, whether secret or not, and the appearing of Christ, this dislocation is of course a necessity. Without it, they would not be able to save the believers from passing through the great tribulation. Again the dislocation is dictated by the view. Since this view identifies the great tribulation with the appearance of the beast and the false prophet, it leaves no room for their appearance and identification until the secret rapture shall have taken the believers away. In other words, this view dictates also a futuristic understanding of the Apocalypse, in which book the antichrist comes on the scene as early as chap. 13.

1529. Sennacherib, Two Campaigns of, Against Jerusalem

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "New Light From Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah," *BASOR*, 130 (April, 1953), 8, 9. Used by permission.

[p. 8] The account of Sennacherib's war with Hezekiah in II Kings 18–19–Isa. 36–37 suggests that there was only one campaign, in the 14th year of the king of Judah (701 B.C., according to the clear-cut Assyrian evidence); but since George Rawlinson first proposed the two-campaign theory in 1858, there have not been lacking proponents of the latter alternative...

According to the protagonists of the one-campaign theory, the reference to the advance of Tirhakah (Taharqo) northward against Sennacherib in II Kings 19:9–Isa. 37:9 either refers to the military activity of the Ethiopian twelve years before he became king of Egypt or is based on some later confusion. The biblical story of the destruction of the Assyrian army by pestilence is, they declare, either later fiction or gross exaggeration.

Laming Macadam's belated publication of the important inscriptions of Tirhakah from Kawa in Nubia, completely transforms the state of our knowledge of Tirhakah's early life. In these inscriptions it is repeatedly stated that he first came from Nubia to be associated with his brother Shebteko when he was twenty years old. Macadam has proved convincingly that Tirhakah was then coregent with Shebteko for six years before the death of the latter. During these six years he was obviously in control of the situation. Since Borchardt has shown that Tirhakah became king in 690/689 B.C., it follows that he was born about 710/709 and was not over nine years of age at the time of Sennacherib's campaign of 701. It was, in fact, impossible for him to take part in any military activity directed against the Assyrians until 688 or later.

I have for a long time dated the accession of Hezekiah (in accord with the Assyrian dating of the events of his 14th year in 701) in the year 715/4. This is also Mowinckel's date, and nearly Thiele's. The 29 years of his reign are very well attested in the Hebrew sources, and it is virtually certain that the regnal years were by this time computed according to Assyrian postdating practice, as against Egyptian antedating custom in this period. Hezekiah's reign would then fall into the years 715–686. In 691 Sennacherib was defeated at Khalul^u by the Babylonian and Elamite allies; news of his defeat would

unquestionably stir the West to thoughts of new revolt, especially when accompanied (as they had been before 701) by incitation from Babylonia. If revolt broke out in 690 or 689, it would not be until 688 that Sennacherib was free to turn westward. Meanwhile he had leveled Babylon to the ground (689), eliminating this dangerous threat to his rear before moving west. Other arguments in favor of inserting a second campaign against Hezekiah in the period between 689 and 686 (scarcely later) have been advanced elsewhere. Sidney Smith's variant proposal, to date the pestilence in Esarhaddon's reign, c. 675 B.C., would carry with it a complete rewriting of the biblical tradition, which would be taken out of Hezekiah's reign and put into that of Manasseh. The present text is altogether too precise and correct in its historical background (cf. II Kings 19:12–13–Isa. 37:12–13, which mentions nine distinct historical events of the ninth-eighth century, nearly all of which can be validated from the Assyrian records!) to admit of such distortion. That the Deuteronomic compiler telescoped two parallel campaigns is now certain, but there is no evidence that he distorted the material which had come down to him.

1530. Seventh-day Adventist Church

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 27–29.

[p. 27] *History*. The religious denomination known as Seventh-day Adventists had its rise about the middle of the nineteenth century. The name is based upon two of the distinctive beliefs they hold, namely, the observance of the Sabbath of the Scriptures, and the imminent, personal second advent of Christ.

In those years, not only in the United States, but in other countries of the world, many students of Bible prophecy became convinced that the second advent was drawing near, and this belief resulted in a great religious awakening, in Britain, in some countries of the Continent of Europe, and in North America. "Whether this doctrine is orthodox or not," wrote the historian Macaulay, in 1829, "many who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability. It is preached from pulpits both of the Scottish and of the English church." One English writer of the time estimated that in the years just before 1840 about 700 clergymen of the Church of England were taking part in the awakening movement.

In the United States and Canada came a parallel movement, in which were represented Christians of all the churches. Among prominent leaders in the publishing and evangelistic work of this second advent evangelism were William Miller, a Baptist layman, of Low Hampton, N. Y., and Joshua V. Himes, a clergyman, of Boston. Monthly and weekly papers devoted to this work were issued in Boston, New York, and many other parts.

It was from among the Adventists engaged in this movement in America that there arose a small group in 1844, in Washington, N. H., who began to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, as they found it enjoined in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. Thus came the first Seventh-day Adventists, though the name was not formally adopted until later years.

Prominent among those who pioneered the work were Joseph Bates, James White, his wife, Mrs. Ellen G. White, Hiram Edson, Frederick Wheeler, and S. W. Rhodes. Later came J. H. Waggoner, J. N. Loughborough, J. N. Andrews (who was the first Seventh-day Adventist missionary to be sent overseas from the United States), Uriah Smith, and S. N. Haskell.

By 1860 the movement had grown until, in connection with the organization of the first publishing house in Battle Creek, Mich., the denominational name was assumed. The

following year saw the beginning of the organization of State conferences of churches, and in 1863 the General Conference was organized, with John Byington as its first president. In order to decentralize and distribute administrative responsibility, local State conferences are grouped in fairly large areas as a union conference, with a union corps of officers. The union conferences in continental areas are grouped again as divisions—as North American, South American, southern Asia, Australasian, etc., covering all continents—each division having its staff of officers... Representatives from each division make up the General Conference committee, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. For about half a century the headquarters had been at Battle Creek, Mich., where the first equipped publishing house was built, also their first medical sanitarium (with which grew up the early health food promotion), and their first college. In 1903, however, the general offices were removed to Washington [where they are still situated].

Doctrine. Very briefly stated, the main features of Seventh-day Adventist teaching are as follows:

1. Holy Scripture the rule of faith and practice. (2 Tim. 3:15–17.)
2. The Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, the Son of the Eternal Father, through whom all things were created, the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, the great regenerating power in the work of redemption. (Matt. 28:19.)
3. Jesus Christ is very God. While retaining His divine nature He took upon Himself the nature of the human family, died for our sins, rose from the dead, and in heaven ever lives to make intercession for us. (John 1:1, 14; Heb. 2:9–18; 8:1, 2; 7:25.)
- [p. 28] 4. The new birth, through faith, by the recreative power of God. (John 3:3, 16.)
5. Baptism of believers, by immersion. (Mark 16:16; Rom. 6:1–6.)
6. The ten commandments, the moral law of God, the standard of the judgment. (Ex. 20:1–17; Matt. 5:17–19; Eccl. 12:13, 14.)
7. The fourth commandment of God’s law enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord our God, made holy for all mankind. (Gen. 2:1–3; Ex. 20:8–11; Mark 2:27, 28.)
8. “Sin is the transgression of the law.” (1 John 3:4.) “The wages of sin is death.” (Rom. 6:23.) Having sinned, man cannot save himself, nor can the law justify him. God so loved the world that He gave His Son, even Jesus Christ, to die in man’s stead; accepting Christ by faith, as his substitute, the sinner is justified by the Saviour’s grace, who cleanses from sin, creates the new heart, and abides within by His Spirit, to work obedience. Thus the gospel becomes “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” (Rom. 1:16.)
9. Man is by nature mortal. God “only hath immortality.” (1 Tim. 6:16.) Immortality and eternal life come to redeemed man only as the free gift in Christ; and “this mortal shall put on immortality” at the second coming of Christ. (1 Cor. 15:51–55.)
10. The condition of man in death is that of unconscious sleep. All men, good and evil alike, in death remain in the grave until the resurrection. (Eccl. 9:5, 6; Ps. 146:3, 4; John 5:28, 29.)
11. The resurrection of the just takes place at the second advent of Christ (1 Thess. 4:13–18), that of the unjust, a thousand years later, at the close of the millennium. (Rev. 20:5–10.)
12. The impenitent, including Satan, the author of sin, are destroyed, brought to a state of nonexistence. (Rom. 6:23; Mal. 4:1–3; Rev. 20:9, 10; Obadiah 16.)

13. The Christian is to live and act and eat and drink to the glory of God, recognizing his body as the temple of the Holy Spirit. Thus the believer will clothe the body in neat, modest, dignified apparel, and will be led to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, tobacco, and other narcotics. (1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 9:25; 10:31; 1 Tim. 2:9, 10; 1 John 2:6.)
14. Gospel work is to be supported by the Scripture plan of tithes and offerings. (Lev. 27:30; Mal. 3:8–12; 1 Cor. 9:9–14; 2 Cor. 9:6–15.)
15. Seventh-day Adventists believe that the Bible and the Bible alone is the authority for all faith and doctrine, and the standard by which all religious teaching is to be judged. Believing also in the impartation of the Holy Spirit to the church for all time, they accept the Scriptural teaching regarding the manifestation of spiritual gifts as a means by which the church is edified and built up—the gifts of apostleship, prophecy, teaching, evangelism, etc. (1 Cor. 12:28–30; Eph. 4:11–14.) As the gift of prophecy is among these gifts listed, they accept the admonition of Paul, “Despise not prophesyings. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” From the beginning of the movement they have had constant and cumulative evidence that through the counsels and writings of Ellen G. White, the Holy Spirit has given special help to the church. The counsel and instruction thus received, has been a potent factor in the maintenance of unity of doctrine and of organization for world-wide service.
16. The second coming of Christ is the hope of the church, the climax of the plan of salvation, spoken of by all the prophets “since the world began.” (Acts 3:19–21.) While no man knows the day and the hour, Christ and all prophecy have foretold signs by which it may be known when it “is near, even at the doors.” The gospel message in these times, it is believed, must call attention to the signs of the times and to the message of preparation to meet the Lord. The closing ministry of Jesus in heaven, before He comes, is a work of judgment, which will determine between the just and the unjust. (Dan. 7:9, 10.) When that judgment begins in the heavenly temple, the gospel message is due to the world; “The hour of His judgment is come.” (Rev. 14:6, 7.) Seventh-day Adventists believe it is their work to carry that message to every people and tongue.
17. The order of events of the second advent are understood to be as follows: The voice of Christ calls forth the just of all the ages from their graves, the living righteous being translated. All ascend with Jesus to heaven. The glory of His coming has consumed the unjust. The earth is desolated, uninhabited by men for a thousand years, the prison house of Satan. (1 Thess. 4:16, 17; 1:7–9; Rev. 20:1–3, 5.)
18. The millennial reign of Christ covers the period between the first and second resurrection, during which the saved live with Him in heaven. At the end of the thousand years, the Holy City, with Christ and the saved, descend to earth, [p. 29] the wicked are raised in the second resurrection; led by Satan they come up against the Lord and the city. Final judgment is pronounced upon them, and fire consumes them utterly. Death itself is destroyed, and the grave. Satan is no more. All traces of sin are removed by the purifying fires, and the earth comes forth, recreated, restored to the purity and beauty of the original Eden. “The meek shall inherit the earth.” It becomes the eternal home of the redeemed of Adam’s race. (Rev. 20:7–15; 21:1–5.) There is then no sin or pain in all the universe, and every creature gives praise to God. (Rev. 5:13.)

Organization. The local church.—The local church is congregational in its government, although under the general supervision of the conference of which it is a member...

Local, union, and General Conference.—A number of churches are united to form a conference or mission. The conference meets biennially and is composed of delegates elected by the churches. The conference has general supervision of the churches and their work. In some large States there are two or more of these conferences, and as a matter of convenience the term “local conference” has come into use. The local conferences or missions are united into groups to form union conferences, which hold sessions quadrennially, and to which delegates are elected by the local conferences. The union conferences and union missions throughout the world are united in the General Conference, which holds quadrennial sessions composed of delegates from union conferences and union missions throughout the world. For convenience in administering the work of the General Conference, the world field is divided into 12 divisions [now 13], each with its staff of division officers, presided over by a vice president of the General Conference.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The 1960 membership for North America as reported by the Statistical Department of the General Conference of SDA is 332,364. The world membership in 1960 is reported at 1,245,125.]

1531. Seventy Weeks, Continuity of

SOURCE: George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies*, pp. 99–104. Copyright 1948 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 99] The angel Gabriel, having given Daniel a general statement of the events that should come to pass during the seventy weeks, then proceeded to tell him when the seventy weeks were to begin and how they were to be divided and punctuated by events of unsurpassed importance...

The seventy weeks were to be divided into three periods. The first period consisted of seven weeks, or forty-nine years, during which the city of Jerusalem was to be rebuilt. From the time that the city should be rebuilt until the coming of the Messiah should be sixty-two weeks. The seven weeks of years required for the rebuilding of the city and sixty-two weeks of years extending from that time until the day of Christ account for sixty-nine prophetic weeks, “and after threescore and two weeks” (in addition to the first seven) “shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself” (Daniel 9:26). It is scarcely necessary to comment on the meaning of this passage. We all know that the Messiah was cut off. The question that is difficult to answer is why, when Messiah was cut off after the sixty-ninth week, dispensationalists deny that it happened in the seventieth week. The teaching of dispensationalism is that while sixty-nine of the seventy weeks were fulfilled in proper and natural chronological order, the seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine by twenty centuries. The logic employed here is, we believe, without precedent. It has neither precedent nor pattern in the Word of God, and is hardly in keeping with the vaunted literalism of our dispensational brethren. Let us suppose for a moment that this manner of interpretation were applied to other parts of Scripture. God told Abraham that his seed should be in bondage in Egypt for four hundred years, but there is no record of any believer manipulating those figures to include an extra twenty centuries for good measure. God told Jeremiah that the captivity in Babylon would last seventy years, and Daniel understood by the writings of Jeremiah that the captivity was about to end. Suppose Daniel had in dispensational fashion believed that an unreckoned period of time should separate the seventieth year from the sixty-ninth year of the captivity in Babylon—say a period of twenty centuries—then surely prophecy would become an absurdity. It is contended that the angel separated the seventieth week of Daniel’s prophecy from the rest for no other purpose than that there

should be “a great parenthesis” between them. We answer, however, that the angel separated the first seven weeks of years were notable because of the events which transpired during those weeks. Likewise, the seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine because that seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine because that seventieth was the most eventful in all of human history and was, in fact, the week that so divided human history that henceforth events became dated *A.D. Anno Domini, the year of our Lord* instead [p. 101] of *B.C. Before Christ*. Men are surely taking strange liberties with the truth of God when they laboriously build a mountain of doctrine upon a molehill of symbolism or conjecture.

There is no authority in Scripture for the assumption that the seventieth week of Daniel is still in the future. On the contrary, there is satisfactory and abundant proof that the seventieth week followed the sixty-ninth without any break, as every rule of logic and history would demand. Surely if any man, to say nothing of an angel acting as the spokesman of the Most High, were to guarantee and to determine something to happen within seventy weeks, it could not reasonably be interpreted as meaning seventy weeks plus twenty centuries. It is universally agreed that the events predicted for the seven-week period and the sixty-two weeks period following it have taken place; yet in some quarters it is denied, regardless of evidence to the contrary, that the events of the seventieth week have followed those of the sixty-ninth...

[p. 102] Speculation reaches a climax and history is utterly disregarded in the interpretation of the latter part of Daniel 9:26: “... the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.” There are few events recorded in all the annals of human history more dreadful than the literal fulfillment of these words, as seen in the utter destruction of Jerusalem under the Roman general Titus in the year seventy A.D. Dispensational conjecture is at its best in interpreting this verse. It admits the undeniable, that the Romans did destroy Jerusalem in the year seventy A.D. by the people of “the prince which is to come,” but insists that the prince himself is still in the future...

[p. 103] The closing verse of Daniel nine has long been a stronghold for dispensationalism. Here, it is alleged, the angel describes and predicts the coming of Antichrist. Instead of reading out of the passage what it contains, the tendency is to read into it what some people think it ought to teach. Dispensationalism maintains that Daniel 9:27 teaches that a great prince shall rise in the last days with whom apostate Jews will make a covenant under which they will be permitted to continue their sacrificial rites. “In the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease,” and shall compel men to worship himself...

[p. 104] It seems clear to us that the seventieth week of Daniel’s prophecy is very distinctly marked here by this unmistakable event which took place in the midst of the week and which so marvelously fulfilled Gabriel’s prediction. In the midst of the week our Lord, by His death, abolished the necessity of further sacrifice. During the remainder of the seventieth week the Gospel continued to be preached to the Jews whose hearts were being constantly hardened in consequence of their rejection of the Messiah, and whose desolation was now hastening on as determined.

As we follow these great events of the Gospel age in this prophecy, we cannot but be impressed and solemnized as we see God’s faithfulness to His Word. The events of the

seventieth week are not in the future. They followed the events of the sixty-ninth week in natural and logical sequence.

1532. Seventy Weeks, Dispensationalist Theory of

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Re. formed, 1945), pp. 115–118, 122. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 115] (1) The Events of Verse 24 [of Dan. 9] still Future

[p. 116] According to the “traditional” interpretation of this prophecy there is, as we have seen, good warrant for the view that all the events described in vs. 24 have been fulfilled. The claim to the contrary is based largely on that literalistic method of interpretation which is insisted upon by Dispensationalists. If, for example, “to make an end of sins” means to eliminate moral evil completely from this world, then it is quite obvious that the accomplishment of the prophecy must lie in the future. But the expression need not mean this; and the emphasis placed in vs. 26f. on the atonement may properly be regarded as indicating that the reference is to it. The special reason that Dispensationalists must insist that vs. 24 refers to the future is quite clear. If the fulfillment of the prophecy is still incomplete, and if the predictions relating to the 69 weeks had their fulfilment centuries ago, then the 70th week must be still future. Hence there must be an interval between the end of the 69th week and the beginning of the 70th week; and the entire Church age can be regarded as forming a parenthesis at this point...

According to Dispensationalists the 69th week ends with the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem a few days before His death. The only basis for this claim is the expression “unto the anointed one, the prince.” But the word “prince” (*nagid*) is far too indefinite an expression to warrant such an inference...

There are several weaknesses [p. 117] in this mathematical demonstration [of 483 years ending with the triumphal entry]...

The question whether the “cutting off” of the Anointed One is to be regarded as taking place in the last week depends entirely upon whether the 70th week follows immediately on the 69th or not. That it would do so, is a natural and proper inference from the statement that 70 weeks are included in the scope of the prophecy. Dispensationalists have become so accustomed to the idea of hidden intervals or parentheses in prophecy and have found them so helpful in solving the problems which beset the path of the literalist interpreter that it is easy for [p. 118] them to overlook the difficulty which confronts them at this point. It is a very serious difficulty. Is it credible that this prophecy, which speaks so definitely of 70 weeks and then subdivides the 70 into 7 and 62 and 1, should require for its correct interpretation that an interval be discovered between the last two of the weeks far longer than the entire period covered by the prophecy itself? If the 69 weeks are exactly 483 consecutive years, exact to the very day, and if the 1 week is to be exactly 7 consecutive years, is it credible that an interval which is already more than 1900 years, nearly four times as long as the period covered by the prophecy, is to be introduced into it and allowed to interrupt its fulfilment? ... $483+7$ is 490, no more and no less. $483+x+7$ is a very different total, especially if x is an “unknown,” already proved to represent more than 1900. Furthermore, the fact that the 62 weeks are regarded as following directly on the 7 would indicate that the last week is to follow immediately on the 62...

Dispensationalists are fond of the illustration of a clock. The ticking clock, they tell us, represents “Jewish” time. The mystery parenthesis is “time out.” God only counts

time in dealing with Israel, when the people are in the land. Some add to this the further specification, when “they are governed by God.” Neither of these requirements is met by the interval which they find here in the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. Consequently, the clock ceased to tick at the time of the triumphal entry. It will not tick again until that moment, still future, when God resumes His direct dealings with Israel. This will be when the people are once more in their own land. It will follow the rapture and be marked by the appearance of [Antichrist]...

[p. 122] According to Dispensationalists, ... [the Antichrist] is yet to make a covenant for seven years with the Jews and permit them to ... rebuild the temple, and restore the Mosaic ritual of sacrifice; and then, in the midst of the week, he will break the covenant, abolish the temple worship and inaugurate that reign of terror which is commonly called the great tribulation.

1533. Seventy Weeks—Traditional Interpretation as Presented by Allis

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 113, 114, 122, 123. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission. [Brackets, except for page numbers, in the original.]

[p. 113] The “Traditional” Interpretation of the Seventy Weeks [of Dan. 9].

(1) According to this view, all of the great transactions referred to in vs. 24 are to be regarded as having been fulfilled at the first advent and, more specifically, in what is to be regarded as the climactic event of the prophecy, the redemption at Calvary, which is referred to literally in vs. 26 and figuratively in vs. 27. Thus the words, “to finish transgression and to make an end of (or seal up) sins and to make reconciliation for iniquity,” are to be regarded as referring to that atonement for sin which was accomplished, fully and completely, once for all, on the cross...

[p. 114] (2) According to this view, the 69th week ended with the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus; and the 70th week followed immediately upon it. Consequently, the “cutting off” of the Anointed One which occurred “after the threescore and two weeks” must be regarded as having taken place in the 70th week; and a reference to it is to be found in the words, “in the midst [half] of the week, he [the Messiah] shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.” That Christ by His death put an end to the Jewish ritual of sacrifice, substituting for bulls and goats “a sacrifice of nobler name and richer blood than they,” is the great argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. So interpreted, it is the Messiah who makes firm or confirms the covenant for the one (the 70th) week; and the crucifixion which takes place in the midst of it is the great event of that week and may be regarded as the climax of the entire prophecy...

[p. 122] The words, “and he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease,” find a very appropriate fulfilment in the atoning work of Christ on the cross. The same applies to the words, “and he shall confirm [or, cause to be strong, or, to prevail] covenant [or, a covenant] for many (for) one week.” ... This may properly be taken to mean that during the brief period of His earthly ministry Jesus fulfilled the terms of the ancient covenant made with the seed of Abraham (cf. Rom. xv. 8), that He secured its benefits to “many,” that is “to the believers in Israel,” for the period up to the stoning of Stephen, or perhaps, in mercy, until the time of the destruction of Jerusalem...

The superiority of the older interpretation of this prophecy is clearly indicated by the arguments in its favor stated above. They may be summarized as follows:

- (a) The view that Messiah is the subject of the verb “make firm” regards the 70th week as following immediately on the 69th week. It does not destroy the chronological sequence and value of the prophecy by inserting between a predicted period [p. 123] of exactly 483 years, which is completely past, and a period of exactly 7 years, which it regards as wholly future, an indefinite period of time which is already more than 1900 years (*i.e.*, almost four times the length of time covered by the prophecy) and which may even now be very far from ended.
- (b) It gives to the death of Christ its proper and climactic place as central in the last week; it does not place it outside the compass of the weeks altogether and make it of minor importance as compared with a far less important event, the triumphal entry.
- (c) It does not involve the inconsistency of declaring that the “coming prince” will “make firm” a covenant for a week and declaring also that he will break it (by causing sacrifice and oblation to cease) in the midst of the week.
- (d) It recognizes that the abolishing of sacrifice and oblation took place at Calvary, as Hebrews tells us so plainly was the case. It does not involve and require the future restoration of “Jewish” ordinances by the Roman Prince, in order that they may then be speedily abolished by him.
- (e) It seeks to explain and does explain the events of the last week as actual events of history. It does not refer them to a future, the course of which is dark and mysterious.

So interpreted Daniel ix. does not skip over the Church age as a hidden parenthesis between the 69th and 70th weeks of the prophecy. On the contrary, it finds in the 70th week the prediction of that great climactic event upon which the Christian Church is founded, the atoning death of the Messiah as the fulfilment and authentication of the types and prophecies of the Old Testament.

1534. Sin, Defined as Breaking of Ten Commandments

SOURCE: Billy Graham, quoted in Sherwood Eliot Wirt, *Crusade at the Golden Gate* (New York: Harper, [1959]), pp. 174, 175. Copyright 1959 by Sherwood Eliot Wirt. Used by permission.

[p. 174] The Bible teaches, “For all—all—A-L-L—have sinned”; whatever your social standing, whatever your financial accounting, whatever your racial background; whoever you are, “For ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” That’s your trouble. That’s my trouble. We are sinners. You say, “Now wait a minute, Billy. You can say all of that in New York; we know they’re sinners back there. But this is the Bay Area, and we’re not so bad out here.” The Bible says that the best of you have sinned against God.

Do you know what sin is? Sin is the breaking of the Ten [p. 175] Commandments. It is the transgression of the Law. And every person in this audience today has broken the Ten Commandments. But suppose you had kept all the commandments and had only broken one: the Bible says you are guilty of all. But in addition to that, sin means that you have come short of God’s moral requirements. We have failed to live up to the Sermon on the Mount. We have failed to live up to the teachings of Christ. We have all sinned. We have failed. The Bible says that God, being a Holy God, cannot look on sin. And so we find ourselves separated from God by sin.

Now God loves us. God wants to help us. But God can do nothing for us until we come to Him.

1535. Sin, Original, Definition of, in Augsburg Confession

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (Lutheran, 1530), art. II, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 8.

ART. II.—Of Original Sin.

Also they [the Lutherans] teach that, after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in him, and with fleshly appetite; and that this disease, or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit.

1536. Spiritualism—Beliefs Spiritualists Hold in Common

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), p. 13. Used by permission.

A Spiritualist is a person who is convinced (1) that human personality survives beyond bodily death, and (2) that the surviving spirits can, and constantly do, communicate with living people through the intermediacy of especially endowed individuals known as "mediums."

1537. Spiritualism—Catholic Church Has Not Declared on Diabolic Theory

SOURCE: p. J. Gearon, *Spiritism: Its Failure* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1931]), pp. 116, 117. Used by permission.

[p. 116] As we have remarked in an opening chapter, the Catholic Church does not view every extraordinary happening as being of a miraculous nature. In the investigation of abnormal phenomena she examines each case with unflinching care, admitting nothing as miraculous until she has clearly proved it to be beyond the power of natural causes. She has thus set us an example which it would be a matter of wisdom to follow in our search for the origin of Spiritistic phenomena.

There are those who, after rejecting the fraudulent occurrences at séances, maintain that the abnormal happenings are due to Satan. Others, however, hold that only a certain substratum is due to diabolical intervention.

No one can deny that, at first sight, the Diabolic Theory [see Nos. 1538, 1539] is exceedingly persuasive. That the medium sometimes utters blasphemies, propounds immoral doctrines, and, in general, exhibits certain signs which would seem to point to the direct action of Satan, is undeniable.

We consider that it is impossible to hold the diabolic theory in general without implying that all mediums in question are possessed.

[p. 117] This is not the place to enter into a full discussion of the nature of diabolic possession.

The devil could, if God permitted, so act on a man, for diabolic possession is an historic fact that cannot be called in question.

What seems to increase the force of the arguments put forward by those maintaining the presence of a certain residuum of diabolic origin is that the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore seems, at least at first sight, to urge it. But we are disposed to question whether any conclusive proof can be deduced from this source.

The Council meant, doubtless, in the document in question, to denounce Spiritistic practices, but, I fear, it willed in no sense to give definite witness on behalf of any diabolic intervention.

The Catholic Church has not declared that it is the spirits, disembodied or evil, who communicate with us by way of the mediums.

1538. Spiritualism, Catholic Warning Against

SOURCE: Bernard Vaughan, Foreword, in Elliot O'Donnell, *The Menace of Spiritualism* (London: T. Werner Laurie, [1920]), pp. 1–3. Used by permission of the publishers and J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

[p. 1] Although I do not subscribe to all the doctrine and teachings expressed between the covers of this brochure, yet do I gladly recommend it to the public as an exposition of the menace of Spiritualism in our midst. The public has plenty of temptations to encounter on the road of life without its being enticed and drawn into these side-shows where freaks, frauds, and fiends may rob them not only of their money, but, perhaps, even leave them stripped of their physical outfit and of their moral attributes.

Naturally I do not place all under the same damnation because I can but judge of the ruin wrought though Spiritualism by the cases that have come under my own observation. But you may depend upon it that the Catholic Church would not forbid her children to have anything at all to do with this insidious form of necromancy unless she was satisfied that harm only and no good comes out of it. Her experience of [p. 2] Spiritualism covers nearly two thousand years, and she seems to regard it, not as a means of getting into communion with saints, but as a snare trapping you into communion with devils...

It looks as if the penalty of trying to force the hand of God, and of lifting the veil to communicate with the Great Beyond was total loss of that childlike and clinging faith which is the priceless inheritance of the sons of God—"Unless you become as a little child." ...

[p. 3] To some of us who have studied Spiritualism in many of its phases, the wonder is that any persons, with common sense and appreciation of life's values, can allow themselves to be sucked into such a vortex.

Firstly, let me remind you that no one attending a séance in which spirits from the vast deep make themselves heard or seen can prove that their spirit visitants are the creatures they claim to be. How can anyone disprove them to be satanic spirits? You may be sure that evil spirits can quite as cleverly personate the dead as music-hall artists do the living.

Secondly, let me ask, what have spirits, after thousands of years practice, revealed to mankind calculated to be of any practical service to humanity? As yet they have not even solved the problem as to what is a sardine, or what a new-laid egg.

There is a great deal to say against Spiritism, but not much that I know of for it.

1539. Spiritualism—Catholic Writer on Diabolic Theory

SOURCE: Donald Hole, *Spiritualism and the Church* (Milwaukee, Wis.: Morehouse, 1929), pp. 65–67.

[p. 65] There is a strong inclination among Catholics who feel constrained to admit the genuineness of spirit-messages to assert that these are produced by the agency of the devil; that the message does not come from any departed friend, but from an evil spirit personating him.

This diabolic theory, like the telepathic theory, is certainly one which will cover the facts, and is one which, from the nature of the case, is incapable of either proof or disproof. Our knowledge of the power and capabilities of evil spirits is as vague as our knowledge of telepathy. We know that Satan is capable of transforming himself into "an angel of light," and he is presumably capable of transforming himself into the likeness of my Uncle John, of mimicking his voice and of reproducing his handwriting. If it be objected that the message contains high and lofty and even Christian sentiments, it may be replied that the evil spirit is deliberately adopting this rôle in order to deceive us and lead us on so as to ruin our souls.

The diabolic theory affords an explanation which can be made to cover all the facts. The only question is, Is it the most *probable* explanation? Judging the tree by its fruits, can [p. 67] it be said that the results of resorting to mediums are uniformly evil, and such as would lead us to infer diabolic agency?

1540. Spiritualism, Catholics Warned Against Participation in

SOURCE: p. J. Gearon, *Spiritism: Its Failure* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1931]), pp. 126, 127. Used by permission.

[p. 126] Although we do not favour the diabolic theory in connection with that residuum of abnormal happenings at séances, no greater calamity could befall the reader than to believe that the practice of Spiritism involves no moral or physical danger. No device of Satan would be more crafty than to lead the reader to such a conclusion.

Mother Church, it is true, has not declared whether there are any spirits in the matter, either disembodied or demoniacal. Nevertheless, Rome has definitely forbidden her children to take part in Spiritistic gatherings.

We may rest assured that the Catholic Church would not forbid her children to have anything to do with this insidious form of necromancy were she not fully satisfied that only harm would come from it.

We find in Holy Scripture an express condemnation of the practice of consulting the dead through sorcerers, necromancers, magicians and similar agencies. Thus we have it: “The soul that shall go aside after magicians and soothsayers... I will set My face against that soul, and destroy it out of the midst of its people.” (Leviticus xx, 6). And in Exodus (xxii, 18) we find something more than pro- [p. 127] hibition and malediction: “Wizards thou shalt not suffer to live.”

Let us remark in passing that Holy Writ does not say that the dead are really put in communication with those who evoke them. It is the attempted communication with the dead for the purpose of gaining knowledge of occult things which is thus referred to.

1541. Spiritualism—Declaration of Principles of the National Spiritualist Association

SOURCE: *National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book*, 1946, pp. 6–8.

[p. 6] 1. We believe in Infinite Intelligence.

By this we express our belief in a supreme Impersonal Power, everywhere present, manifesting as life, through all forms of organized matter called by some, God, by others, Spirit and by Spiritualists, Infinite Intelligence.

2. We believe that the phenomena of Nature, both physical and spiritual, are the expression of Infinite Intelligence.

In this manner we express our belief in the immanence of Spirit and that all forms of life are manifestations of Spirit or Infinite Intelligence, and thus that all men are children of God.

3. We affirm that a correct understanding of such expression and living in accordance therewith constitute true religion.

A correct understanding of the laws of nature, on the physical, mental and spiritual planes of life, and living in accordance therewith will unfold the highest aspirations and attributes of the Soul, which is the correct function of True Religion.

4. We affirm that the existence and personal identity of the individual continue after the change called death.

(Quote) Life here and life hereafter is all one life whose continuity of consciousness is unbroken by that mere change in form whose process we call death. Lilian Whiting.

[p. 7] 5. We affirm that communication with the so-called dead is a fact, scientifically proven by the phenomena of Spiritualism.

Spirit communication has been in evidence in all ages of the world and is amply recorded in both sacred and profane literature of all ages. Orthodoxy has accepted these manifestations and has interpreted them in dogma and creed in terms of the supernatural. Spiritualism accepts and recognizes these manifestations and interprets them in the understanding and light of Natural Law.

6. We believe that the highest morality is contained in the Golden Rule. "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye also unto them."

This precept we believe to be true. It points the way to harmony, peace and happiness. Wherever tried it has proven successful, and when fully understood and practiced, will bring peace and happiness to man on earth.

7. We affirm the moral responsibility of the individual, and that he makes his own happiness or unhappiness as he obeys or disobeys nature's physical and spiritual laws.

Man himself is responsible for the welfare of the world in which he lives; for its welfare or its misery, for its happiness or unhappiness and if he is to obtain Heaven upon Earth, he himself must learn to make that heaven, for himself and for others. Individually man is responsible for his own spiritual growth and welfare. Sins and wrongdoing must be outgrown and overcome. Virtue and love of good must take their place. Spiritual growth and advancement must be attained by aspiration and personal striving. Vicarious atonement has no place in the philosophy of Spiritualism. Each one must carry his own cross to Calvary's Height in the overcoming of wrong doing and replacing it with the right.

[p. 8] 8. We affirm that the doorway to reformation is never closed against any human soul, here or hereafter.

We discard entirely the terrible wrong and illogical teachings of eternal damnation, and in place thereof we accept and present for consideration of thinking people the thought of the continuity of life beyond the change called death.

A natural life, where the opportunity for growth and progress to better, higher and more spiritual conditions are open to all, even as they are here on the earth plane of life. We accept no such teaching as a "Hell Fire," but we do teach that sin and wrong doing will necessarily bring remorse and suffering that would be difficult to describe in words and which can only be relieved by the individual's own efforts if not here, then in the hereafter. If we make our own lives better while here, and that of our neighbors happier, we shall unfold that happiness or heaven on earth which we shall carry with us into the Spirit World.

9. We affirm that the Precepts of Prophecy contained in the Bible are scientifically proven through Mediumship.

We thus affirm our belief in and acceptance of the truths which are contained in the Bible and assert that Prophecy and Mediumship are not unique nor of recent occurrence alone, but that they are universal and everlasting, and have been witnessed and observed in all ages of the world.

1542. Spiritualism, Defined—What It Is and Does

SOURCE: *National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book*, 1946, p. 14.

It teaches personal responsibility.

It removes all fear of death, which is really the portal of the spirit world.

It teaches that death is not the cessation of life, but mere change of condition.

It teaches, not that a man has a soul, but that man is a soul, and has a body.

That man is a spiritual being now, even while encased in flesh.

That as man sows on earth he reaps in the life to come.

That those who have passed on are conscious—not asleep.

That communion between the living and the “dead” is scientifically proved.

It thus brings comfort to the bereaved, and alleviates sorrow.

Spiritualism is the Science, Philosophy and Religion of continuous life, based upon the demonstrated fact of communication, by means of mediumship, with those who live in the Spirit World.

It brings to the surface man’s spiritual gifts, such as inspiration, clairvoyance, clairaudience and healing powers.

It teaches that the spark of divinity dwells in all.

That as a flower gradually unfolds in beauty, so the spirit of man unfolds and develops in the spirit spheres.

Spiritualism is God’s message to mortals, declaring that There Is No Death. That all who have passed on still live. That there is hope in the life beyond for the most sinful.

That every soul will progress through the ages to heights, sublime and glorious, where God Is Love and Love Is God.

It is a manifestation, a demonstration, and a proof of the continuity of life and of the truth of the many Spirit manifestations recorded in the Bible.

It demonstrates the many Spiritual gifts with which mankind is endowed but which through want of knowledge have been allowed to lie dormant, or through prejudice have been violently and unjustly suppressed.

1543. Spiritualism—Definitions by National Spiritualist Association, Adopted October, 1914, 1919, 1930

SOURCE: *National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book*, 1946, p. 30.

1. Spiritualism is the Science. Philosophy and Religion of a continuous life, based upon the demonstrated fact of communication, by means of mediumship, with those who live in the Spirit World.
2. A Spiritualist is one who believes, as the basis of his or her religion, in the communication between this and the spirit world by means of mediumship, and who endeavors to mould his or her character and conduct in accordance with the highest teachings derived from such communion.
3. A Medium is one whose organism is sensitive to vibrations from the spirit world and through whose instrumentality intelligences in that world are able to convey messages and produce the phenomena of Spiritualism.
4. A Spiritualist healer is one who, either through his own inherent powers, or through his mediumship, is able to impart vital, curative force to pathologic conditions.

“Spiritualism Is a Science” because it investigates, analyzes and classifies facts and manifestations demonstrated from the spirit side of life.

“Spiritualism Is a Philosophy” because it studies the laws of nature both on the seen and unseen sides of life and bases its conclusions upon present observed facts. It accepts

statements of observed facts of past ages and conclusions drawn therefrom, when sustained by reason and by results of observed facts of the present day.

“Spiritualism Is a Religion” because it strives to understand and to comply with the Physical, Mental and Spiritual Laws of Nature, “which are the laws of God”.

1544. Spiritualism—Explanation of Objects of

SOURCE: *National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book*, 1946, p. 22.

The objects of the organized movement of Spiritualism may be stated in part as follows:

To teach the truths and principles expressed in the Declaration of Principles and in the Definitions of “SPIRITUALISM,” “A SPIRITUALIST,” “A MEDIUM,” and “A SPIRITUALIST HEALER,” as adopted by the National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America.

To teach and proclaim the science, philosophy and religion of modern Spiritualism, to encourage lectures on all subjects pertaining to the Spiritual and Secular Welfare of mankind. To protest against every attempt to compel mankind to worship God in any particular or prescribed manner. To advocate and promote spiritual healing and to protect and encourage spiritual teachers and mediums in all laudable efforts in giving evidence or proof to mankind of a continued intercourse and relationship between the living and the so-called dead. To encourage every person in holding present beliefs always open to re-statement as growing thought and investigation reveal new truth, thereby leaving every individual free to follow the dictates of reason and conscience in spiritual as in secular affairs.

1545. Spiritualism, Introductory Statement Concerning, by a Spiritualist

SOURCE: Ernest Thompson, *The History of Modern Spiritualism* (Manchester [new address, St. Andrews House, 32/36 Holborn Viaduct, London, E.C.1.]: The Two Worlds Publishing Company Ltd., 1948), Introduction, pp. 11–13. Copyright 1948 by the Author. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 11] Modern Spiritualism commenced with spontaneous spirit manifestations in a cottage, inhabited by an ordinary working man and his family, in Hydesville, New York State, America, in 1848. This was the beginning of a wave of psychical phenomena which spread over the entire surface of the earth.

Arising from the facts of these phenomena the rudiments of a new science (psychics) gradually emerged. Later it was realised that these phenomena had philosophical implications and these, in turn, a religious content.

Religious teachings were given through mediums by the communicating spirits revealing a fundamentally different spiritual approach to God, human destiny and morality. These teachings were so contradictory to orthodox beliefs that those who accepted them realised the necessity for an organisation for the propagation of the new revelation, and gradually the Spiritualist Movement came into being.

This Movement is primarily a religious Movement and differs from orthodox religions chiefly because it is basically a spiritual revelation from within, and not fashioned upon an external pattern. It is not *a* religion, it *is* religion, because it brings experience, to those who embrace it, of the main factors in all religious beliefs. Survival of the human spirit and the existence of a spiritual world become an experience and not a belief.

It is important to appreciate this opposition between the beliefs of orthodoxy and the facts of Spiritualism in order to fully understand the developments which have taken place during these last hundred years.

What are these fundamental differences? The idea of God has always been the dominating principle of all religions. Like all other aspects of human thought this idea has changed and evolved as Man's knowledge of himself and his environment has increased. Spiritualists regard God as the life-giving principle or power which manifests in every aspect of natural phenomena. He is the Eternal Indwelling Spirit of the whole Universe.

Natural phenomena are therefore a constant demonstration to us of His Being and a manifestation of the working of His Spirit. The Eternal Spirit of the Universe, manifesting through natural phenomena, is consequently a God of whom we can have direct and personal experience, for he is not only within us but within everything around us, and by a study of natural law we can try to understand Him in order to serve Him more perfectly.

[p. 12] This is in direct opposition to the orthodox concept of an external, anthropomorphical God (a God in the likeness of man) who possesses not only the human attributes of love but also those of hate and vengeance—a God who kills his enemies. Santayana, the American philosopher, makes an interesting observation in this respect—“It is pathetic to observe how lowly are the motives that religion, even the highest, attributes to deity, and from what a hard pressed and bitter existence they have been drawn. To be given the best morsel, to be remembered, to be praised, to be obeyed blindly and punctiliously; these have been thought points of honour with the gods, for which they would dispense favours and punishments on the most exorbitant scale.”

Brotherhood is the next most important principle in any religion. A Universal Brotherhood of all men, incarnate and discarnate, is made a living reality by means of mediumship which daily links us, in loving co-operation, with our spiritual brothers and sisters. This is in direct opposition to the attitude of orthodoxy which condemns spirit communications, on biblical authority, as the work of the Devil.

The communion of spirits and the ministry of angels, being a living experience, have a profound influence upon the life of the individual whether incarnate or discarnate.

By means of spirit guidance we are helped along the road of life whilst those lost spirits, who stray into our home circles, are directed by us to happier states of existence. There is no reference to such practical expressions of love between the departed and ourselves in the teachings of orthodoxy.

The continuous existence of the human soul becomes a fact to the sensitive in mental phenomena, and also to the ordinary person by the evidence of spirit messages and of spirit materialisations which can be directly perceived by the normal senses.

Whereas psychical experiences can become the common experience of all people, the orthodox hope of continuous existence is founded upon a somewhat distorted account of the individual experiences of one man who lived nearly 2,000 years ago, and which were unrecorded until many decades after his “resurrection” appearances.

Spiritualists believe in personal responsibility for all our thoughts and actions, and it is in this principle where we find the contradiction most developed between orthodox beliefs and the teachings of Spiritualism. The facts of the life hereafter, given to us by those who have had experience of them, confirm that our spiritual progress is only the net result of our own efforts, and that our sins cannot be forgiven or remitted by the vicarious atonement of a Saviour.

To perpetuate this idea by the practice of religious ceremonies such as the eating of bread (the body) and the drinking of wine (the blood) is to demonstrate before the world a continuing belief [p. 13] in the miraculous nature of the human sacrifice of Jesus, and to proclaim a denial of the principle of personal responsibility.

The idea that we receive compensation for all our good works, and experience retribution for all our evil deeds, done whilst on the earth, is proved by the operation of the spiritual law of gravitation when we pass into spirit life. This causes advanced spirits to rise to the more refined, happier and higher vibratory spheres of existence, and forces backward spirits to remain in the more dense, more miserable and lower vibratory planes.

This is a fundamental change to conditions operating on earth where the wise and ignorant, good and evil, share the same material plane together. Whereas this conception is based on the experiences of spirits, who dwell in this spirit world, the belief in a judgement by an anthropomorphical God is merely the opinion of the founders of the orthodox church, which cannot be proved.

All the facts of Spiritualism support the principle that eternal progress is the opportunity of every human being.

As the Church denies the facts of Spiritualism, it can offer no case whatsoever which could satisfy the agnostic that he is a spirit, with eternal progress as his natural inheritance. Without such a glorious destiny however, personal endeavour would be robbed of its purpose; for to contemplate that all we create is eventually destroyed is to give life an appearance of ultimate uselessness.

Finally Spiritualism, through an intelligent interpretation of its Seven Principles, reveals to the understanding, the deepest significance of service to others, and transforms life from selfishness to unselfishness, from individualism to social co-operation.

Only on such a foundation can love and truth and all other spiritual values have any practical meaning or reality.

As this is an approved text book for the National Education Scheme of the Spiritualists National Union, the chapters have been divided into lecturettes for the convenience of the students and discussion groups. It covers briefly the history of the Spiritualists' Movement over a period of exactly one hundred years, 1848–1948.

1546. Spiritualism—Origin in Animism

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 9.

Spiritualism has its roots in savage and infantile psychology. As a religious belief it antedates all others. Immature minds everywhere conceive of Nature, especially of those aspects which are mysterious, as being animated by spirits responsible for their manifestations. Even Pythagoras thought that it was its spirit which shrieked with pain when a brass gong was struck; and to this day we speak of methylated spirits, etc., as a survival of the days when spirits were supposed to constitute the essences of the various elements in use.

1547. Spiritualism, Origin of, in America

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), pp. 45–48. Used by permission.

[p. 45] In 1848 a small wooden house in the village of Hydes- [p. 46] ville, part of the little town of Arcadia, in the State of New York, was occupied by John D. Fox, a Methodist farmer. His household consisted of his wife and two daughters, Margaretta,

aged fifteen, and Catherine (Katie), aged twelve. A third daughter, at that time named Mrs. Fish (she later became Mrs. Brown and, still later, Mrs. Underhill), lived not far away in Rochester. On the evening of March 31 the two little girls were in bed; their parents were about to join them, in the same room, when mysterious raps were heard. It is impossible to discover from contemporary accounts why these rappings were attributed to a spirit, but they were. A code was agreed upon: the alphabet was recited until a rap selected the appropriate letter. Thus addressed, the spirit answered, giving information especially about local events. It was soon accepted that the raps were made by the spirit of a man who was buried in the cellar; and this theory was later amplified by a legend that raps had been heard in the house before the Foxes occupied it.

Shortly after the beginning of these experiences, Margaretta went to Rochester to stay with her sister, Mrs. Fish, and Katie paid a visit to Auburn, another neighbouring township. Wherever they went raps were heard. Mrs. Fish and others became mediums also, and the contagion spread with amazing rapidity. In three or four years communication with spirits through the intermediacy of mediums was established up and down the Atlantic coast and inland. By 1851 it was estimated that there were a hundred mediums in New York alone, and fifty in Philadelphia. The three Fox sisters travelled [p. 47] widely, giving demonstrations to large audiences. Their claims were frequently investigated, and they were accused of fraud several times, in particular by a committee of doctors in Buffalo in February, 1851; on the other hand, many prominent and intelligent people declared themselves unable to explain the phenomena except by some supernormal cause.

In that same year, 1851, Mrs. Culver, a believer in the spirit raps, became suspicious of Katie Fox, and the latter, it is said, showed her how to produce raps with the joints of her knees and toes. In 1888 both Katie and her sister Margaretta made a public confession that the whole of their supposedly supernormal phenomena had been produced by fraud, the raps being made principally by cracking their toe-joints—a feat which, by the way, very many people can perform. But by that time both sisters were far gone in alcoholic excess, from which they soon died, and this confession need not be taken as wholly authentic: indeed, they afterwards retracted it.

There are hints, however, of admissions by Margaretta in letters written to her by her husband, Dr. Kane, the Arctic explorer. After his death his widow, who became a Roman Catholic from 1856 to 1867 and during that period gave no sittings, published a volume, now exceedingly rare, called *The Love-Life of Dr. Kane*, and consisting mainly of his letters to her. In these occur such passages as: “Oh, Maggie, are you never tired of this weary, weary sameness of continual deceit? Are you doomed thus to spend your days, doomed never to rise to better things?” And again: “Do avoid ‘spirits.’ I cannot bear to think of you as engaged in a course of wickedness and deception. Maggie, you have no friend but me, whose interest in you is disconnected from this cursed rapping. Pardon my [p. 48] saying so; but is it not deceit even to listen when others are deceived?” It should be mentioned that Kane was not a Roman Catholic.

Genuine or not, these confessions and hints of confessions have one remarkable feature in common with the confessions and exposures of countless mediums in more recent years: they produced little effect, so far as the believers were concerned, on the status either of the mediums concerned or of the Spiritualist Movement as a whole. To

this day the Fox sisters are spoken of by ardent Spiritualists in the highest terms, and regarded by them as endowed with a special mission to humanity.

1548. Spiritualism—Origin of Modern Movement

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 40, 41.

[p. 40] Although its roots are found in primitive animism, according to Professor Hyslop, Spiritualism derives its modern fillip from the work of Swedenborg. But it was the magnetic force which was brought before the educated section of the public in the eighteenth century by Galvani and Volta which really paved the way to the acceptance of Spiritualism in later years. This animal magnetism, as it was called, was conceived as a fluid stored in metals, animals and human beings. It was believed to perform wonders. As certain persons were supposed to possess more of this electric or magnetic fluid than others, circles were started to develop phenomena now associated with seances. All over Europe in the decade before 1780 animal magnetism was engaging the interest of many men and women. This mysterious force or fluid was believed to account for the movements of the tables until an epidemic of table-turning spread from the Continent to England, becoming particularly acute about 1847.

This prepared the way for the news in 1848 that mysterious raps had been heard in the house of a farmer named Fox, who lived in an obscure hamlet called Hydesville, situated about 250 miles from New York, U.S.A. In February of 1848 uncanny raps sounded on the floor and furniture of any room occupied by the two daughters of Fox. Loud raps occurred as they lay in bed, but neither Margaretta, aged fifteen, nor Katherine, aged twelve, seemed perturbed, although we read that the mother's hair turned white in a week. A code was established and a message rapped out relative to the story of a murdered pedlar, the name of the murderer being given. Bones were then reported to have been found in the creek nearby, and the neighbours used to assemble to listen to the messages of the "spirit" of the victim. Information was rapped out regarding the age and condition of the people present, and before very long a veritable contagion of rappings was spread, after which the sisters separated, one to live with her married sister at Rochester, and the other [p. 41] to live with relatives at Auburn. Their friends and relatives caught the contagion and other visitors spread it to their towns. Within a few months the epidemic was all over the State of New York and modern Spiritualism was founded.

1549. Spiritualism, Origin of—Rejection of Fox Sisters' Admission of Fraud by Leaders

SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, p. 283. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

Arthur Conan Doyle believed what he said about a divine purpose in spiritualism in spite of what Margaret Fox wrote in a signed story in *The New York World* for October 21, 1888. In the story she said, "Spiritualism is a fraud and a deception. It is a branch of legerdemain, but it has to be closely studied to gain perfection." Sir Arthur did not believe her. Neither was the confession of fraud by Margaret Fox acceptable to Henry J. Newton, the president of The First Spiritual Society of New York. His reply to the Fox article was, "Nothing that she could say in that regard would in the least change my opinion, nor would it that of any one else who had become profoundly convinced that there is an occult influence connecting us with an invisible world."

1550. Spiritualism, Peter Marshall as a Young Man Warned Against Toying With

SOURCE: Catherine Marshall, *To Live Again* (Carmel, N.Y.: Guideposts Associates, Inc.), pp. 201, 202. Copyright, 1957, by Catherine Marshall. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

[p. 201] When Peter [Marshall] was eighteen, before he emigrated to America, [p. 202] he and two friends went one night to visit a man who had what the Scots call “second sight.” That evening the man claimed that he could receive messages through table-rapping. There were various messages, including one said to be from a man who had lived in France 200 years before. He told his name (Peter always remembered it; I do not), some facts about his life, where he was buried.

Then the table rapped out the name “Peter Marshall.” Some facts followed which jibed with what Peter knew of his father’s early life ... the date of his marriage to Peter’s mother in Switzerland; the full names and certain facts about long-dead relatives. Then came this message for Peter: “You must never again toy with spiritualism. For you, it is very dangerous.” That was all.

Peter took that as authoritative and obeyed it to the letter—not because he was certain that the message really had come from his father, but because an instinct told him that the warning was authentic. Though to the end of his life he found the subject compelling, thereafter he never went outside the framework of the Christian church to investigate it.

1551. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Doubted as Proof That the Dead Are Alive

SOURCE: Hamlin Garland, *Forty Years of Psychic Research* (New York: Macmillan, 1936), pp. 385–387. Copyright 1936 by Hamlin Garland. Used by permission of Isabel Garland Lord and Constance Garland Lord.

[p. 385] While it would not be quite true to say that as an investigator I am at the point from which I started forty-five years ago, I shall no doubt disappoint some of my readers when I confess to a state of doubt...

Already the larger part of my generation have become intangible, and many of those who remain on the earth are seeking, like myself, some evidence, some assurance of a life beyond the black deep whose waters they must [p. 386] soon cross. That I should welcome a hail from that dim other shore, is true, but the voice must be real and not imaginary.

As I bring this record of many personal experiments to a close, I am urged by my friends to state my conclusions. To them I must reply: “I have no conclusions. I am still the seeker, the questioner.” I can only put into this final chapter some of my convictions along with a candid statement of the intellectual barriers which have thus far prevented me from an acceptance of the spirit hypothesis...

[p. 387] I should like to share this faith. I should like to believe that my father and mother, in restored youth, are walking a new and lovely country, feeding on astral fruits and grains while waiting for me to join them—but alas! I can not compass such a belief. I can not find the passage through the hill-side into the changeless “realm of the Shee.”

In writing of my doubts, I have no wish to weaken any other man’s faith; I am merely stating the reasons which prevent me from accepting the spiritist interpretation of psychic phenomena, phenomena which I have abundantly proven to exist—I am still questioning the identity of the manifesting intelligences. My dissent is not upon the phenomena but upon their interpretation.

1552. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Hallucination Defined

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 43.

Under a variety of circumstances the senses register misleading impressions, and the reason draws faulty inferences. In classifying anything we see, not only are the eye and the optic nerve involved, but memory and reason are called upon to help to designate correctly that reflection of the rays of light which are registered on the retina as the impression of a table or other object. The art of recognition is more than a mere sensation, and a general stock of ideas is essential before classification is possible. What is termed “psychic blindness” is operative in persons who may retain eyesight unimpaired but who, owing to the disorganization of some portion of the cortex, are unable to derive any meaning from what is seen. In addition, even in more or less normal people, hallucinations, illusions and delusions may occur to falsify the facts of life.

We speak of an illusion in the case of one whose sensations are mistaken regarding some real object, as for example when an oar half immersed in water appears to be bent; hallucination is present when we receive the sensation in the complete absence of the objective stimulation, as when thirsty travellers in the desert are confident that they can see an oasis although none is actually in sight; delusion occurs not only in respect to mistaken impressions of the senses but when the mind draws wrong conclusions from the data provided by the senses, as when a charwoman is convinced she is the Queen of England and is being kept from her rightful inheritance by the attendants of the asylum.

1553. Spiritualism—Phenomena of, Not Accepted as Proof of Immortality

SOURCE: Corliss Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* (2d ed.; New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), pp. 155–160, 162, 163. Copyright 1950 by Corliss Lamont. Used by permission of the publisher and author.

[p. 155] Historically connected to some extent with the Swedenborgian movement, but offering what purports to be evidence of a future life far more weighty and empirical, are the divers varieties of Spiritualists and psychic researchers.* [Note *: It should be noted that on the whole the Societies for Psychical Research are more scientific in their methods and more restrained in their conclusions than the Spiritualist groups. Among the psychic researchers are many who do not agree that the theory of personal survival is the best explanation of the strange and uncanny facts which they have uncovered; and others who do not think that *any* explanation so far offered is satisfactory.] Their experiments have resulted in an imposing amount of what appear to be [p. 156] at least supernormal phenomena and have constituted real contributions to the field of abnormal psychology. But their findings have not carried a great deal of conviction as proving the survival of the dead. The phenomena that occur are one thing, while the interpretation given to them as establishing immortality is another. Such phenomena are not characteristic simply of recent times, though only in recent times have they been recorded with any considerable degree of accuracy. As a matter of fact, ghosts, clairvoyancy, appearances at a distance, telepathy, conversing with apparitions, a sense of the presence of the dead and many other such occult occurrences have been variously reported as far back in history as the mind of man can reach. The hypothesis of existence beyond the grave has traditionally been a favorite explanation of these wonders. But today, as in the past, that suspiciously easy and sweeping hypothesis is subject to the very gravest doubts by all who have respect for scientific method and objective thinking.

No scientist worthy of the name considers an hypothesis proved until it is shown beyond all reasonable doubt to be the only possible explanation of the phenomena under examination. The Spiritualists, however, are very far from having demonstrated that the hypothesis of personal survival is the sole and certain explanation of the data they have gathered. In the first place it is generally admitted, even by leading Spiritualists themselves, that a very large proportion of the results obtained are contaminated by conscious or unconscious fraud on the part of the mediums or others participating. To the ordinary layman it will always seem suspicious that most of the Spiritualist experiments must be carried on in darkness or with very dim lights and that the greater part of them can be repeated in broad daylight by professional magicians like the late Harry Houdini and Joseph Dunninger.

This is not to imply that all the performances of mediums can be reduced to the art of expert magicians or that some mediums do not possess the most extraordinary psychic powers. Undoubtedly, some of the things that mediums do are at present not wholly intelligible according to any known scientific laws. But if a detective in a murder case is unable to find the murderer, he does not at once claim that a ghost must have done the deed. And the Spiritualists are surely not justified in calling in so promptly supernatural spirits to explain even the most baffling phenomena. This is equivalent to the argument from ignorance, to saying that because we do not for the time being know the exact cause of a phenomenon, therefore it must be due to the influence of the dead.

There can be no doubt that much of what goes on during the seances of the Spiritualists can be understood in terms of purely naturalistic modern sciences such as abnormal psychology, religious psychology and psychiatry. For example, the common occurrence of a supposedly departed spirit taking control of a medium's mind or vocal apparatus and issuing thereby all sorts of statements seems to be closely akin to what happens in the case of dissociated or multiple personality. There is a temporary submergence or splitting off of the medium's normal personality and an arising from the psychic depths of a strangely unfamiliar and different personality. The process may be entirely unconscious; but the secondary personality speedily learns to play its role with singular skill, carries over from the normal state clews of knowledge suitable for its purposes and is quick to make the most of hints dropped by those present during its period of activity.

Studies of human dream-consciousness, of hypnotic trances, of hysteria, of epilepsy, of high-fever delirium and of the regular patients in mental hospitals suggest that the behavior and revelations of the ordinary medium have natural rather than supernatural causes. The additional fact that, for various reasons, close to four-fifths of the mediums or "Sensitives," as they are sometimes known, are members of the female sex is likewise not without significance. Two or three centuries ago women who did things like present-day Spiritualist mediums were burnt as witches. And the witchcraft hypothesis is in a number of ways just as sensible as the Spiritualist interpretation.

Also, what is revealed through the medium is ordinarily so much a part of the regular furniture of the average mind that we hardly need resort for explanation to the talkative inhabitants of some other world. That communications from the beyond are, in general, so earth-bound and conventional is accounted for by the Spiritualists on the ground that it is very difficult for the departed to transmit complex and coherent messages about their new circumstances. But if immortal souls can dictate pages and pages of detailed

description concerning the future life, showing how very similar it is to this one; if they can get across tedious two-volume dissertations on the higher philosophy and metaphysics; if they can produce, through the automatic writing of a medium, whole books of plays and poetry signed by spirits purporting to be William Shakespeare and other great literary geniuses; if they can do all this, the excuse of the Spiritualists does not appear to be very substantial.

For if the best minds of the other world can deliver themselves of such lengthy remarks, often complicated though almost always commonplace, there seems to be no good reason why they should not be able to make real contributions to human knowledge [p. 159] and to the solution of earthly problems, especially since they are supposed to have grown in wisdom since their sojourn here below. And if spirits can, as claimed, locate lost jewelry and sundry knick-knacks for friends and relatives still on earth, then surely they should be able to locate murderers, in at least a few cases where they were victims, for the police. Yet no criminals have as yet been apprehended in this manner. And desperadoes continue to operate successfully on the basis of the age-long assumption that dead men tell no tales.

But assuming for the sake of argument that the medium actually gets in touch with and transmits from something that objectively and independently exists outside of her won conscious and subconscious mind, does this necessarily indicate that she has come into contact with an immortal soul? Considering how freakish and mischievous are many of the communications and physical manifestations that occur at séances, the hypothesis that impish and non-human demons or elfs are the cause is not without merit. The traditional belief of the Church in diabolical possession, still held in many quarters, is possibly more plausible than the theories of the Spiritualists. Or perhaps the medium is dipping into a great impersonal sea of consciousness or reservoir of memory that holds the psychic life of the past and of every deceased individual intact within it. It is also well known that human beings radiate energy and it has been suggested that somehow mediums sense and interpret the enduring traces of human vibrations which have left their mark on material objects and in familiar places. This might also account for the appearance of apparitions to persons of especial sensitiveness. But these apparitions would no more be conscious and organized personal- [p. 160] ities than are material reminders of dead persons in the form of photographs.

It is possible, too, that mediums might be in touch with faintly surviving personalities which go on for a time beyond death but gradually fade out completely. A temporary after-existence of this sort is hardly the same as the life everlasting of immortality. Or, as Mr. H. G. Wells suggests, perhaps there is survival of *fragments* of personal will and memory. "Suppose," he writes, "a medium to produce some trivial secret between myself and some departed intimate known to no one else; that no more proves that my friend is still mentally alive than a corrupting fragment of his face, with a characteristic scar, would prove his bodily survival." Professor Broad, the English philosopher, proposes a similar theory. He believes that there may be a persistence after death of a "psychic factor" formerly an element in the living personality of the deceased. This "mind-kin," as he calls it, "may become temporarily united with the organism of an entranced medium."

...

[p. 162] But even if the Spiritualist findings be taken as reliable testimony of an after-existence for the personality, the kind of future life indicated and the methods used to

establish it are far from agreeable to the great majority of immortalists. The reasons for this are not difficult to discern. The whole atmosphere surrounding the Spiritualists' attempt to prove empirically a hereafter is likely to repel the sensitive [p. 163] and reverent immortalist. The common taint of fraud, the unpleasant odor of sensationalism, the inevitable association with morbid emotionalism, combine to create a general impression that this is not exactly a movement for the truly religious and high-minded. For not a few there is something inherently undignified in dear departed grandfather's indulging himself in table-rapping, playing weird tunes on cheap musical instruments or telling the secrets of his past to strange women mediums. For others, the whole business is deplorable because it gives over to public gossip the most intimate of private affairs.

As to the nature of the immortality promised by the Spiritualists, it was William James, long a most sympathetic student of psychic phenomena, who wrote: "The spirit-hypothesis exhibits a vacancy, triviality and incoherence of mind painful to think of as the state of the departed." The great English scientist, Thomas H. Huxley, held a similar opinion. "Supposing the phenomena to be genuine," he declared, "they do not interest me. If anybody would endow me with the faculty of listening to the chatter of old women and curates in the nearest cathedral town, I should decline the privilege, having better things to do... The only good that I can see in a demonstration of the truth of 'Spiritualism' is to furnish an additional argument against suicide. Better live a crossing-sweeper than die and be made to talk twaddle by a 'medium' hired at a guinea a séance."

1554. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Not All Fraudulent

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 232.

On the other hand professional "thought-readers" have an obvious inducement to manipulate codes and mechanical devices so as to produce what appear to be genuine phenomena. This has been done on a prodigious scale. Obviously, even if some genuine clairvoyant power is possessed, as this cannot always function at the word of command, it has to be eked out with some more reliable method in the case of those who are obliged to provide "phenomena" at every performance. This applies, although perhaps to a less extent, in the case of professional mediums who accordingly frequently introduce spurious "phenomena" on those occasions when psychic power is not available. In neither case does trickery, prevalent on some occasions, justify us in dismissing the possibility of genuine phenomena, however much a discovery of fraud lessens our faith in the alleged powers of that particular exponent. Indeed, we are not justified in declaring all the phenomena of a medium or clairvoyant are fraudulent, even if on several occasions he has been detected in trickery. It may be mentioned that Dr. Hereward Carrington, who has written a standard work on the fraudulent aspect of all kinds of phenomena, *The Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*, in which he gives hundreds of pages of explanation as to the means employed, is nevertheless quite convinced of the genuine nature of telepathy and clairvoyance. And Mr. W. W. Baggally, the author of *Telepathy: Fraudulent and Genuine*, in his title implies his own belief.

1555. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Trickery Common in

SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, pp. 231–233. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 231] "Our experience during the past thirty years in supplying mediums and others with the peculiar effects in this line enable us to place before you only those which are practical... Remember that we guarantee everything just as represented..."

“We can furnish you with the explanation and, where necessary, the materials for the production of any known public ‘tests’ or ‘phenomena’ not mentioned in this, our latest list.

[p. 232] “You are aware that our effects are being used by nearly all prominent mediums, entertainers and others of the entire world, and you can, therefore, be assured of receiving fraternal and honest treatment in all transactions. To those who have not dealt with us [we] would call your attention to the fact that in listing many effects the word ‘Spirit’ is used in describing them. It should be borne in mind that this is only the customary name used to explain the effect, as ‘Spirit,’ in the general acceptance of the name, are not a factor in their presentation, although, ‘for the good of the cause,’ that impression has been fostered by many...”

With this introduction in a well-illustrated printed catalog one of the old supply houses of equipment for tricky mediums offers seventy items... [p. 233] I have many such catalogs and the total number of “effects” they offer run well into the hundreds... When one knows such a dealer well it is not hard to get permission to inspect his list of patrons. One such dealer in a Mid-Western city allowed me to go over his list most carefully. [The author is a magician.] The list contained two thousand names of mediums of various degrees of renown. It was particularly interesting to me to note that in many cases a description of their séances read quite like the description in the catalog of the “effects” which they had purchased. A number of the mediums were well known in various associations of mediums and spirits. I took the trouble to go to a few of them and to mention that the manifestations of their séances were most reminiscent of the tricks of my dealer acquaintance. All but one of the mediums protested their ignorance of the dealer and declared that it was utterly impossible to duplicate fraudulently their manifestations. The one medium told me that he knew the dealer and as a matter of fact had purchased several pieces of his apparatus in order to be quite familiar with the methods of “those fakers whom every true medium despises.”

1556. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Trickery or Genuineness Not Readily Provable by Ordinary Observer

SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, pp. 300, 303, 305. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner’s Sons.

[p. 300] Most of the followers of mediums have become convinced of the reality of the phenomena because they “saw it with their own eyes.” During meetings of spiritists people give testimony about what they “saw,” and “heard” during a time when the medium was “under complete control.” I am perfectly willing to have the people believe that they are accurate in their impressions but as a magician I state that I am in a position to prove that they cannot know.

A magician depends upon the fact that if something which he has to do can be made to seem quite unimportant, no one in his audience will see him do it...

[p. 303] Mind you, I do not say that all mediums use trickery. I am only attempting to point out that: first, it takes a large amount of knowledge and special training to observe correctly a mediumistic exhibition; second, that the layman’s opinion of the way a magician works is not according to fact; third, that merely because one does not suspect that a medium knows how to do tricks, or that he has had an opportunity to learn them, is not proof that he is not a trickster.

People believe the evidence of their senses, yet nothing is more deceptive. Even those trained to observe certain things may be faulty in the observation of other things which they have not studied...

[p. 305] A magician is trained in his subject and he is apt to notice indications of trickery that a person knowing nothing of either the psychology or method of magic would pass over. He cannot make a blanket statement, however, and have it mean anything more than any other blanket statement would mean.

Another thing I feel should be noted is that because a magician seemingly can duplicate a phenomenon, the medium is not thereby proven a fraud. An oasis is no less real because some people think that they see one when all they see is a mirage. When, however, a medium can produce his phenomenon only under the conditions necessary for the performance of a feat of magic, it seems to me that he is asking for a stretching of credulity when he desires that it be accepted as genuine. A mirage is no less a mirage because some one is able to prove the existence of an oasis.

One more thing which should be mentioned is that while our senses are most untrustworthy there are occasionally found people with some sense particularly acute. These people have developed a sense which was naturally very sensitive. I have seen and tested people who could, by the sense of touch alone, tell how many playing cards or tickets they held.

1557. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Unreliability of Human Testimony

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 17, 18, 20.

[p. 17] To the student of psychology there is no more outstanding fact than the unreliability of human testimony. Even in the normal events of life, where no particular emotions are greatly involved, the accounts given by two different persons regarding what has occurred will vary enormously even to the point of contradiction. When intense personal interests and emotional stresses are introduced, or reasons in explanation of occurrences are demanded, the testimony varies almost in relation to the idiosyncrasies of the persons concerned, objective facts being coloured to almost any hue.

Without considering the divergent estimates put upon any historical event by the partisans of different religious and political faiths, one need only remember how the reports of a visit to Soviet Russia, or the logic of a statesman's speech, vary according to the sympathies of the persons who are questioned. A visit to a law court emphasises the inability of the average man or woman to describe any event as it objectively happened, illiteracy being one but by no means the only reason.

In spite of the confidence placed in them by the average man, the senses cannot always be trusted to register correct impressions. Indeed, contrary to popular belief, we do not see only with the eyes, or hear with the ears, but rather with the brain. Philosophers have argued for centuries regarding the possibility of becoming acquainted with objective reality. It is now admitted by even the most materialistic thinkers that all we can know about any object is not the thing in itself but only states of consciousness regarding its appearances and attributes. And these perceptions and conceptions may not only be quite differently registered in the minds of various individuals, but are probably in all cases inexact reproductions of [p. 18] the object considered. The most dispassionate and accurate conception provides not reality as it is, but only what Herbert Spencer called a "transfigured reality" based upon the incapacity of our senses to assimilate that which is behind all appearances. We cannot accommodate any tangible object in either the brain or

the mind, but only a mental photograph which is affected by individual variations of the cerebral lens and the other apparatus of the brain and senses. Waves of light or sound, etc., impinge upon the optical nerve and tympanum and induce sensations or vibrations which are translated into ideas, conceptions and memories, affected not only by the strength of the original stimulus, but by the preferences and antipathies latent in the previous acquisitions. And it is obvious that our general views of reality would be completely altered if human organs of sense were reduced from five to two or increased to ten.

The fact is, apart from individual variations in the acuteness of the organs of sense, we see largely with the eye of the mind, and the other senses have also their mental analogues. Thus, frequently, we see not what is, but what we expect or hope to see, as when we are awaiting the arrival of a person at the railway station and in the distance imagine a stranger is the friend we are awaiting, or in the seance room, when a generalised description of a spirit is claimed as the dead father of several unrelated members of the company...

[p. 20] How unreliable the one sense may be when not checked or helped by another was demonstrated by Professor Munsterberg in a series of experiments. One person, for example, thought the sound from a tuning fork was like the growl of a lion, while another declared it was more like a fog-horn. Amusing results have been recorded of the transformation undergone by a sentence when repeated by a hundred tongues, the last version frequently being a complete perversion of the first. When the opinions or emotions of any narrators are concerned, the probability of grotesque transformation is still more likely. How erroneous a description may be without emotional encouragements to falsification is illustrated by the following example. At a conference of psychologists held in Göttingen a clown forced his way into the hall with a negro in close pursuit. A fight ensued between the two which was terminated by a pistol shot, whereupon the clown rushed out of the room again pursued by the negro. The President then said that as legal proceedings might have to be taken he would be obliged if each member present would furnish a report stating exactly what had transpired. The whole affair, which occupied less than twenty seconds, had been carefully rehearsed and photographed in advance. Of the forty reports made by extra-competent observers, only one contained less than twenty per cent. of mistakes as to the chief facts; fourteen contained between twenty and forty per cent. and thirteen contained over fifty per cent. of mistakes. Twenty-four of the reports contained ten per cent. of details which were pure inventions. Thus ten of the accounts were quite false, twenty-four were half legendary, and only six were even approximately accurate. This example helps us to recognise how unreliable the reports given of a seance are likely to be when the whole atmosphere is charged with mystery and among the sitters are strong emotional urges to encourage falsification of impressions.

1558. Spiritualism, Seen as Breaking Down Barriers Between Sects

SOURCE: Arthur Conan Doyle, Letter, quoted in John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, p. 283. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

“The ultimate merit of that revelation [spiritualism], which came in so humble a shape [to the Fox sisters], will be the simplification of religion, the breaking down of the barriers between sects, and a universal creed which will combine the ethics of real Christianity with direct spiritual communication, receiving our teaching not from bygone

traditions and documents, but from actual contact with beings higher than ourselves. I pray that God may bless you, and that the great cause which is committed to your care may ever progress, discarding its lower manifestations and extending its higher ones, until the divine purpose has been fulfilled.”

1559. Spiritualism—Summary of an Investigation

SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 458, 459.

[p. 458] In concluding this attempt to unearth the natural roots of Spiritualism I have had no intention of dealing with the general problem of whether or not man survives death. Instead I have tried to explain what modern psychology has to say in explanation of certain mysterious happenings which are interpreted by the [p. 459] mystics on a spiritual basis. That supernormal phenomena do occur in the absence of trickery, certainly in connection with matters psychological and probably in matters physical, has been admitted, although the wide ramifications of fraud make it impossible to say accurately how far the phenomena are genuine. It is not contended that the interpretations in this volume are at every point final; nor is it argued that Spiritualism as a hypothesis can be dogmatically dismissed as unsound. The Spiritualists have a plausible theory which may indeed to many minds seem overwhelming, especially to those unfamiliar with naturalistic explanations. I do not say that spirit communication is impossible; but merely that in my opinion the balance of probabilities is against it. No explanation deals satisfactorily with all the data. We need more investigators upon those aspects of Nature called supernormal by the psychical researcher and supernatural by the Spiritualist. Sceptical denial of unpleasant facts or credulous acceptance of medieval interpretations are alike useless if all the expressions of matter and mind are to be correlated in one orderly scheme satisfactory to those who are prepared to banish preconceived opinions in favour of generalisations wedded to the data. The present volume is intended to be suggestive and not conclusive. It attempts to apply reason in realms where in the nature of the case, since fundamental emotions are involved, sentimentality on the one side and sceptical impatience on the other have too frequently intervened. Here, then, for what it is worth, is another attempt to peep behind the scenes into Spiritland.

1560. Spiritualists, Religious Bodies

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 1593.

General Statement. In 1906 the only organized Spiritualist body was the National Spiritualist Association. It was claimed by this association and by others that there were numbers of individuals, and even of small communities, that were not included in its enrollment, and later a new body was formed under the name “Progressive Spiritual Church.” In 1913 another group was formed, the National Spiritual Alliance, and in 1936 the General Assembly of Spiritualists was reported, both holding doctrines so similar to the two older bodies that it has seemed appropriate to combine them all under one head.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The largest Spiritualist religious body at present is the International General Assembly of Spiritualists, with a membership (1956) of 164,072 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). For statements of the beliefs and principles of Spiritualism, see Nos. 1541, 1544, 1545.]

1561. Spiritualists—Religious Service of, Described

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), pp. 18–22. Used by permission.

[p. 18] It will be helpful, before entering on the more analytical task of this book, to describe a service in a Spiritualist church, and see how it compares with services in more

orthodox churches. Naturally there are degrees and kinds of Spiritualist services; the one I have synthetically selected would take place in a richer and better staffed church in a large manufacturing town.

We find ourselves in a hall solely devoted to its present purpose. On a platform at one end sit three persons: the chairman, the speaker, and the clairvoyant. The chairman, a member of the local community, begins by announcing the names of the two others, for here, as in most Spiritualist churches, they change from week to week. Then we are asked to sing a hymn:

“I’ve beautiful home on the other shore,
A home on the golden strand;
Some dear ones have gone to that home before,
My home in the spirit-land.
“They come to me now since their souls are set free,
And gently they press my hand;
They say there are treasures in store for me
At home in the spirit-hand...
“I’ve a father and mother and sisters dear,
Who form there a happy band!
O, when shall I see that bright mansion fair,
My home in the spirit-land?”

The speaker, a prominent lecturer known by name to most of his audience, offers up an improvised prayer, similar in many ways to those heard in any religious community, but emphasizing the rôle of departed spirits as the sources of hope and inspiration. The prayer is [p. 19] followed by a reading from the Bible, though in many Spiritualist churches, somewhat out of harmony with official Christianity, chapters from a Spiritualist or other work are substituted for the Bible. The speaker next reads a list of members of the church for whom the Congregation’s prayers are requested, and himself prays for them, again invoking the consolation and protection of the spirits. Another hymn is sung:

“Who says there is no future life?
Who says that Death ends all?
The fool, whose view is circumscribed,
Whose mind is cramped and small.
The lowliest insect doth provide
Against a future time.
Shall man no further vision have,
His mind no further climb?”

During the singing of this hymn a collection is taken which, in wealthy churches, often produces a large sum. The speaker offers up thanks for the collection, praying that good use be made of it, and proceeds to his address, of which the following will serve as a fair summary: “I wonder, dear friends assembled here this morning, if we all recognize as fully as we should the wonderful nature of the revelation which has been given to us. Do we realize the marvellous meaning that lay behind those rappings in the house of the Fox family at Hydesville eighty years ago? When those simple farmers heard the knockings, they knew that at last the barrier of death had been broken, and that one human spirit at least had survived into a better and fuller life and had returned to tell [p. 20] them of this great truth. How wonderfully would this truth revolutionize the world, if

only the world understood its implications! Would not the politicians and statesmen lay aside their wordy warfare? But we cannot blame them for their indifference, if we ourselves do not show them an example.

“We, who know the truth, who know what it is to realize that our beloved ones have passed on into the brighter realms, we ought to show in our day-to-day conduct our knowledge that our dear ones are ever with us, doing their best to help us when we need aid, to cheer us when we are downcast, to lead our erring footsteps when these would stray. My own dear wife, who passed on nearly ten years ago, has many a time told me through a psychic channel—through the wonderful medium whom we are privileged to have with us this morning as our clairvoyant—how the spirits of our dear ones are always trying to come in contact with our inner spiritual selves, only too often to be repelled by the dense wall of our materialism. If only we would realize that, when we have ended the few years which remain to us here, we have before us the prospect, nay, the absolute certainty, the acknowledged and experienced certainty, of our loved ones awaiting us to be eternally united with us! When I think of that world which awaits us, of the ever radiant warmth, of the twenty-four daily hours of joy,* [Note *: Spiritualists assume that sleep, being a function of the physical body, does not exist in the spirit world.] of the beautiful cities spotlessly white, of the broad avenues, the noble houses, the honest intercourse and commerce—when I think of these things, how impatiently my soul aspires upwards and seeks to rid itself of this fleshly envelope!

“It is for us, who have received the greatest truth of all [p. 21] time, to show ourselves worthy of it. Let us show in our lives that we seek to foreshadow in this world the glory and the beauty and the wonders everlasting of that eternal world to which we know we shall attain.”

This address, no more or less eloquent—though certainly shorter—than hundreds delivered every Sunday at Spiritualist services, is followed by “clairvoyance.” The public clairvoyant is a somewhat different type from the private medium, though many people combine the two offices. We will imagine a typical medium at this service, a woman of self-assured personality, quick and shrewd, and we will show her functioning with at least average success. “I desire,” she says, “to bring something for that lady in the middle of the hall—yes, that lady with the large hat.” She addresses her directly. “I see, standing by you, two spirits. One is a tall, elderly gentleman with white hair; the other is a little girl with blue eyes, who looks sad. Do you recognize them?” The woman hesitates; after all, she has known many elderly men and little girls. “Well, don’t think about it now; you will recognize them afterwards. I just want to tell you that the elderly gentleman says he has just welcomed the little girl and is looking after her. When you go home and think about it, I am sure you will recognize them both. I can’t be wrong, for I see them standing by you and hear them speak. You see, friends,” the medium tells her whole audience, “it often happens that people do not at once recognize the spirits I see, but afterwards they always remember.

“Now a spirit wants me to bring a message to that gentleman over there, in the third row, on the left. Have you a lady in the spirit connected with you?” The man nods. “I can see her looking down at you very lovingly. She is rather above middle height and has grey eyes, and [p. 22] her hair is worn long.” A puzzled look may appear on the man’s face. “That’s not quite right? Oh, well, I am not concerned so much with their physical appearance before they passed on—we can easily make mistakes about that—as with

their messages. This lady says that you must not be too anxious to join her yet, because you have still many years of active work for the great cause. Do you understand that? Yes? Thank you so much.

“Now I have a message for the lady in the front row, at the end on the right, in the blue dress. I hear the voices of two spirits connected with you. Their names are Emily and Frederick. Do you recognize those names? No? That’s strange; I’ll listen again. That’s what they say—Emily and Frederick—they are very insistent. Is there anybody in this hall to whom those names apply? Ah, the gentleman in the gallery! I’m so glad; they are anxious to tell you that they are happy; they want you to be happy too, and to stop worrying about the little money difficulty. That will come right. Do you understand this? Yes? Thank you.” (One cannot help wishing that the spirit messages were not so uniformly optimistic. What a relief it would be if, sometimes at least, they announced that the little money difficulty would get worse!)

The medium returns to her chair, and the chairman advances. He calls upon his audience to rejoice at this example of spirit intervention and to join him in a prayer wherein he begs the spirits to strengthen our faith, to open our eyes to the great truths of Spiritualism, to bless the work of the mediums through whom they communicate, and to hasten the day when Spiritualism shall triumph throughout the earth.

1562. Sun, Babylonian Kings Compared With

SOURCE: Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, pp. 307–309. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 307] In Mesopotamia, as in Egypt, the ruler is often compared with the sun. Hammurabi stated in the preamble of his law (Code, V, 4–9): “I am the sun of Babylon who causes light to rise over the land of Sumer and Akkad.” The deified Amar-Sin calls himself “a true god, the [p. 308] sun of his land.” If in the translation of Hammurabi’s epithet we have used “sun” rather than “sun-god,” while the Akkadian *Shamshu* may mean either, we have done so precisely because we consider these expressions to be metaphors. Moreover, the qualifications “of his land,” “of Babylon,” agree better with the translation “sun” than with the notion implied in the English “sun-god.” In Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom we find similar expressions. However, these do not occur in older inscriptions but appear when Pharaoh’s rightful dominion over the whole earth had been challenged by strong Asiatic peoples. Tuthmosis III is called “Ruler of Rulers, Sun of All Lands”; Seti I, “Re of Egypt and Moon of all Lands,” or “King of Egypt, Re of the Nine Bows”—the latter being the traditional formula for foreign peoples. These expressions are unusual in Egypt, where the normal way of comparing Pharaoh with the sun is based on the intimate relation between prototype and successor, progenitor and offspring. . . . Hammurabi states, a little before the quotation we have given, that Anu and Enlil, when they chose Marduk as ruler over all men, also named him “to make legislation appear in the land, to destroy the evil and the wicked, so that the strong should not harm the weak, so that I should appear like the sun to the black-headed people and make light the land, and create well-being for mankind” (Code, I, 32–48).

In dealing with Egyptian beliefs, we have described how the sun quite universally appears to be symbolical of order and hence also of the order of justice; and in this respect the king could be viewed, in Mesopotamia as elsewhere, as an image of the sun-god. Hence the prayer “May Ur-Ninurta, like Shamash, rule the country for many years,” which re- [p. 309] sembles the words spoken nowadays in Westminster Abbey before the

enthronement of the king of England, when the archbishop prays that God may establish his throne in righteousness, that “it may stand fast for evermore, like as the sun before him, and as the faithful witness in heaven.”

When the Mesopotamia king was compared with the sun, the essential distinction between the earthly prince and the sun-god was not ignored; and the same qualification applies to a number of phrases which were applied to the ruler as well as to the gods. None of these expresses an identity; all merely proclaim that, from the point of view of the subject, the king seems godlike. Hence we read in the prayer of an ill-fated Babylonian:

May the god who rejected me help me!

May the goddess who [resented me] have pity on me!

May the shepherd, the sun of men (the king), who is like a god (be gracious to me)! In this derived sense the comparison of the king with the sun is common throughout the ancient Near East, but only in Egypt is there a precise theological concept implied in the view that the king is the image of the sun upon earth.

1563. Sun—Solstice Festivals—June 24

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 98, 99.

[p. 98] The festival of Fortuna, “the goddess who brings” (*fero*), was held on the twenty-fourth of June. Difficult as is the question of the original significance of the cult, there is no doubt of an early connection with agriculture. We know that the farmers regarded Fortuna as a power who could bring them good crops or on the other hand manifest her displeasure by a lean year. Moreover, the time of year at which the festival took place and the nature of the festivities support the theory of an agricultural connection. It was the season of harvest and rustic celebrations were appropriate. Whether the fact that this was the time of the summer solstice was an element in determining the date of the festival is not certain, but in all probability it had something to do with it. The occasion was one of great merriment and the festival has sometimes been described as a summer Saturnalia.

The twenty-fourth of June is now St. John [p. 99] the Baptist’s Day, and the modern festival may owe its date to the pagan celebration. It is almost certain that it does if the summer solstice was a factor in the dating of the Roman holiday. Some even claim that the midsummer fires and other quaint customs till recently so common at this season in Great Britain and Ireland and on the Continent may be traced back to this festival. This contention, however, hardly admits of demonstration in detail. To be sure both the ancient and modern customs belong to the sphere of rustic merrymaking, and the practice of leaping over a fire cited by Brand for various places in Great Britain has ancient Roman precedent. But neither of these facts bears directly on the question of actual influence of the ancient on the modern festival. For in the first place we have no evidence that the lighting of bon-fires was a part of the Roman festival; and secondly the leaping over a fire was a feature not of the festival of Fortuna on the twenty-fourth of June but of the feast of Pales (Parilia) on the twenty-first of April.

1564. Sun-gods—Babylonian Shamash as Upholder of Truth and Justice

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 28, 29. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 28] Shamash, the sun-god, was thought of as the son of Sin [the moon-god]. Here again, while the cult of the sun-god may have been brought into Mesopotamia by [p. 29]

the invading Semites, since Shamash is a Semitic name, he is also found in the early Sumerian lists under the name of Babbar, or Utu.

Shamash is frequently represented on Babylonian seals as rising from the mountains with rays coming out of his shoulders, while at night he was thought to descend again through the mountain gates and to traverse the underworld either on foot, or in a chariot drawn by fiery mules. He was worshipped by all classes of people, and his special function was that of upholder of truth and justice in the life of the community. On the stele which contains the famous Code of Hammurabi, Shamash is represented as giving the Laws to the king. Together with Adad he was regarded as specially concerned with the giving and interpretation of oracles. His sacred number was 20, and the usual symbol by which he is represented on seals and monuments is the solar disk with a four-pointed star inside it and rays emerging from between the points of the star. In Assyria his symbol, which seems to have been also a symbol of royalty, was a winged disk, closely resembling the Egyptian winged solar disk. The chief seat of the cult of Shamash in northern Babylonia was Sippar, and in south Babylonia Larsa. In Ashur he shared a temple with Sin.

1565. Sun-gods, Other Gods Changed to, in Hellenistic-Roman Times

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, "The Frontier Provinces of the East," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), pp. 643, 646, 647. Used by permission of Cambridge University Press.

[p. 643] The solar theology of the 'Chaldaeans' [that is, of "the Babylonian priests of the Hellenistic age" and after] had a decisive effect upon the final development of Semitic paganism...

[p. 646] In the great temples [of Syria] an educated priesthood which meditated on the nature of divine beings and the meaning of the traditions inherited from far-off ancestors, could not escape from the influence of the science of the Chaldaeans. At the same time as it accepted their astrology and their fatalistic view of the world ..., it followed them in seeing in the sun the directing power of the cosmic system. All the Baals were thence forward turned into suns, the sun being the mover of the other stars, like it eternal and 'unconquerable.' ... Such was the final form reached by the religion of the pagan Semites, and, following them, by that of the Romans when [p. 647] Aurelian, the conqueror of Palmyra, had raised *Sol invictus* [the Invincible Sun] to the rank of supreme divinity in the Empire [see No. 1572].

1566. Sun-gods,—Sol Invictus as Ancestor of Constantine and Later Emperors

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 55.

With [Constantine's father] Constantius Chlorus (305 A.D.) there ascended the throne a solar dynasty which, connecting itself with Claudius II. Gothicus, a votary of the worship of Apollo, professed to have *Sol Invictus* [the Unconquered Sun] as its special protector and ancestor. Even the Christian emperors, Constantine [see No. 530] and Constantius, did not altogether forget the pretensions which they could derive from so illustrious a descent, and the last pagan who occupied the throne of the Caesars, Julian the Apostate, [was a sun worshiper].

1567. Sun Worship, Accusation of, Faced by Early Christians

SOURCE: Tertullian, *Apology*, chap. 16, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 31.

Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god... The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer [see No. 1409e]. But you, many of you, also under pretence sometimes of worshipping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing, from a far different reason than Sun-worship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant.

1568. Sun Worship, as Dominant Cult in Early Egypt

SOURCE: Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux, eds., *Never to Die: The Egyptians in Their Own Words* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), p. 18. Copyright, 1938, by Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux. Used by permission.

From earliest times, when the sun-god was pictured as a hunter standing in his boat, poling his way among the marshes, until long after Ikhnaton philosophized about a universal god embodied in the life-giving energy of the sun, the Egyptians were sun-lovers. Every Pharaoh was an earthly incarnation of the sun, and every city worshipped its favourite form of the sun-god. The course of Egypt herself is like the course of the sun as it rises out of darkness in the east, shines long and high over the Nile, and sinks behind the tombs in the Valley of the Kings.

1569. Sun Worship, as Employed by Roman Emperors

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 53, 54.

[p. 53] The triumph of Oriental religions [in the Roman Empire] was simultaneously the triumph of astral religion, but to secure recognition by all pagan peoples, it needed an official sanction. The influence which it had acquired among the populace, was finally assured when the emperors lent it an interested support...

The Oriental clergy ... preached doctrines which tended to elevate sovereigns above mankind, and they supplied the emperors with a dogmatic justification of their despotism... [p. 54] The emperor is the image of the Sun on earth, like him invincible and eternal. [See No. 1345.]

1570. Sun Worship, as Official Cult of Roman Empire—Abortive Attempt of Elagabalus

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 224. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by Permission.

An astral hierarchy, ruled by the sun, now contended with and finally superseded the official deities of the Roman empire. The first apostle on the imperial throne to preach the new gospel to an amazed and soon infuriated Roman public was a grandnephew of Philostratus' patroness, Julia Domna, the grandson of her sister, Maesa, the sun priest Elagabalus [ruled A.D. 218–222].

1571. Sun Worship, as Official Cult of Roman Empire, Derived from Chaldea

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. 134.

Solar pantheism, which grew up among the Syrians of the Hellenistic period as a result of the influence of Chaldean astrolatry [Babylonian star and sun worship], imposed itself upon the whole Roman world under the empire... That theological system shows incidentally the last form assumed by the pagan idea of God. In this matter Syria was

Rome's teacher and predecessor. The last formula reached by the religion of the pagan Semites and in consequence by that of the Romans, was a divinity unique, almighty, eternal, universal and ineffable, that revealed itself throughout nature, but whose most splendid and most energetic manifestation was the sun.

1572. Sun Worship, Final Form of Roman Paganism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960) pp. 73, 74.

[p. 73] From astronomical speculations the Chaldeans had deduced a whole system of religious dogmas. The sun, set in the midst of the superimposed planets, regulates their harmonious movements...

[p. 74] By a succession of emissions and absorptions he [the Sun] will alternately cause these fiery emanations to descend into the bodies which they animate, and after death will gather them up and make them reascend into his bosom. This coherent and magnificent theology, founded upon the discoveries of ancient astronomy in its zenith, gradually imposed on mankind the cult of the "Invincible Sun" as the master of all nature, creator and preserver of men.

This Sun-worship was the final form which Roman paganism assumed. In 274 the emperor Aurelian, as we have seen [see No. 1344], conferred on it official recognition ...; and in the following century, the Claudian emperors [including Constantine; see No. 1566] worshipped the almighty star not only as the patron but also as the author of its race. The invincible Sun ... tends to absorb or subordinate to himself all the other divinities of ancient Olympus.

1573. Sun Worship, Final Phase of Roman Paganism

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), p. 276. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

This solar faith was the culmination of Hellenistic-Oriental and Roman Paganism. It was the vitalizing power in pagan theology and afforded the most convincing symbol of that light which was the aim of philosophy and religion. It was the source of a mystical devotion in which peasant and philosopher could participate.

Heliolatry, the last refuge of monotheism in heathenism, which refused to accept the religion of Galilee, swept all the great worships of strong vitality into its system, softened their differences, accentuated their similarities, by every effort of fancy, false science, or reckless etymology, and in the end, 'Sol Invictus' and Mithra were left masters of the field.³ [Note 3: Dill, *Rom. Society from Nero*, p. 556.]

1574. Sun Worship, in Early Christian Period

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 192.

Cults of the sun, as we know from many sources, had attained great vogue during the second, third, and fourth centuries. Sun-worshippers indeed formed one of the big groups in that religious world in which Christianity was fighting for a place. Many of them became converts to Christianity and in all probability carried into their new religion some remnants of their old beliefs. The complaint of Pope Leo in the fifth century that worshippers in St. Peter's turned away from the altar and faced the door so that they could adore the rising sun is not without its significance in regard to the number of Christians who at one time had been adherents of some form of sun-worship. It is of course impossible to say precisely in what way their influence manifested itself. We do know, however, of analogues between Christ and the sun; he was designated the Sun of Righteousness; and our Christmas falls on the date of the festival of a popular sun-god in Rome.

1575. Sun Worship, in Late Astrological Pantheism

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 274, 275. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 274] In the hot plains of Mesopotamia the Moon had the premier place, but as Babylonian celestial lore moved westwards and northwards to colder climates where the Sun was not so overpowering, it was inevitable that the Sun should secure its place of primacy. But other factors were working towards the practice of adoration of the Sun. The scientific influence of Greek astronomy working on Oriental astrology was bound to recognize the natural superiority of the Sun. Further, Stoic hylozoism, with its deification of the world, and its theory of a universally penetrating principle, easily lent itself to the advance of astral pantheism, which also recognized a "heart of the world." ... [p. 275] As men looked upon the external world as divine and replete with symbols of divinity, it was inevitable that the Sun should be accepted as the supreme symbol of the divine unity. It might—with that ancient disregard of the distinction between symbol and that beyond the symbol common to Pagans and Christians—be regarded indifferently as the symbol of the Supreme God or the Supreme God Himself.

1576. Sun Worship, in Mithraism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, trans. by Thomas J. McCormack (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 190, 191. [FRS No. 95.]

[p. 190] The rites which they [the Mithraists] practised offered numerous analogies. The secretaries of the Persian god, like the Christians, purified themselves by baptism; received, by a species of confirmation, the power necessary to combat the spirits of evil; and expected [p. 191] from a Lord's Supper salvation of body and soul. Like the latter, they also held Sunday sacred, and celebrated the birth of the Sun on the 25th of December, the same day on which Christmas has been celebrated, since the fourth century at least. They both preached a categorical system of ethics, regarded asceticism as meritorious, and counted among their principal virtues abstinence and continence, renunciation and self-control. Their conceptions of the world and of the destiny of man were similar. They both admitted the existence of a Heaven inhabited by beatified ones, situate in the upper regions, and of a Hell peopled by demons, situate in the bowels of the earth. They both placed a Flood at the beginning of history; they both assigned as the source of their traditions a primitive revelation; they both, finally, believed in the immortality of the soul, in a last judgment, and in a resurrection of the dead, consequent upon a final conflagration of the universe.

1577. Sun Worship, Permanent Results of

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greek and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 89, 90.

[p. 89] Concerning the worship which was paid to the stars in the West we possess very few data, even for the most important of all, that of the Sun... We shall only mention some liturgical practices which have had permanent results.

It was customary to worship the rising Sun (*Oriens*) at dawn, at the moment when its first rays struck the demons who invaded the earth in the darkness. Tacitus describes to us how, at the battle of Bedriacum in 69 A.D., the soldiers of Vespasian saluted the rising sun with loud shouts after the Syrian custom.² [Note 2: Tacit., *Hist.*, iii., 24.] In temples thrice a day—at dawn, at midday, and at dusk—a prayer was addressed to the heavenly source of light, the worshipper turning towards the East in the morning, towards the

South at midday, and towards the West in the evening. Perhaps this custom survived in the three daily services of the early Church.

A very general observance required that on the 25th of December the birth of the “new Sun” should be celebrated, when after the winter solstice the days began to lengthen and the “invincible” star triumphed again over darkness... The pre-eminence assigned to the *dies Solis* also certainly [p. 90] contributed to the general recognition of Sunday as a holiday. This is connected with a more important fact, namely, the adoption of the week by all European nations.

1578. Sun Worship, Roman Official Cult in Constantine’s Day

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 4. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

A star cult, sun-worship, became (in the third century A.D.) the dominant official creed, paving the road for the ultimate triumph of Judaeo-Christian monotheism. So strong was the belief in the Invincible Sun (*Sol Invictus*) that for example Constantine I (d. 337), himself at first a devotee of the sun cult, found it, indeed perfectly compatible with his pro-Christian sympathies to authorize his own portrayal as Helios. And in 354 the ascendant Christian church in the reign of his pious but unsavory son, Constantius II, found it prudent to change the celebration of the birth of Jesus from the traditional date (January 6) to December 25, in order to combat the pagan Sun god’s popularity—his “birthday” being December 25.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: December 25 is mentioned here, but an earlier example of the influence of this official sun worship on Christianity is Constantine’s law of A.D. 321 uniting Christians and pagans in the observance of the “venerable day of the sun” (see Nos. 1642, 1644). It is to be noted that this official solar worship, the final form of paganism in the empire (see No. 1571), was not the traditional Roman-Greek religion of Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and the other Olympian deities. It was a product of the mingling Hellenistic-Oriental elements, exemplified in Aurelian’s establishment of Eastern Sun worship at Rome as the official religion of the empire, and in his new temple enshrining Syrian statues of Bel and the sun (see Nos. 154, 1344). Thus at last Bel, the god of Babylon, came into the official imperial temple of Rome, the center of the imperial religion. It was this late Roman-Oriental worship of one supreme god, symbolized by the sun and absorbing lesser divinities as by the sun and absorbing lesser divinities as subordinates or manifestations of the universal deity, that competed with young Christianity. This was the Roman religion that went down in defeat but infiltrated and colored the victorious church with its own elements, some of which can be seen to this day.]

1579. Sun Worship, Sacred Days of, in Christianity

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 60. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Remains of the struggle are found in two institutions adopted from its rival by Christianity in the fourth century, the two Mithraic sacred days, December twenty-fifth, *dies natalis solis* [birthday of the sun], as the birthday of Jesus, and Sunday, “the venerable day of the Sun,” as Constantine called it in his edict of 321.

1580. Sunday, and Pagan Origin of Name

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, p. 19. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

This word [Sunday] is of heathen origin. It, or a corresponding term in languages and cultures other than Anglo-Saxon, indicates a day dedicated particularly to the worshipful recognition of some deity in the particular pantheon involved. Obviously the exact name indicates the day devoted to the worship of the sun. In pagan use the name, whatever it may be, does not indicate exaltation of this deity above all others, nor exclusive worship

of that deity on that day, but only special emphasis on his worship. When in the Roman Empire the sun gained prominence as the symbol of highest divinity this constituted a preparation for the political and ecclesiastical identification of the Lord's Day for Sunday... With the expansion of Christianity in Europe the day for special Christian worship falling on that of sun worship the name was simply taken over. It has no direct reference to the Hebrew Sabbath. And, of course, there is no close connection between the origin of the name and Christian practice.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as "the Christian's Lord's Day."]

1581. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship

SOURCE: William L. Gildea, "Paschale Gaudium," *The Catholic World*, 58 (March, 1894), 809. [FRS No. 100.]

The church took the pagan philosophy and made it the buckler of faith against the heathen. She took the pagan, Roman Pantheon, temple of all the gods, and made it sacred to all the martyrs; so it stands to this day. She took the pagan Sunday and made it the Christian Sunday. She took the pagan Easter and made it the feast we celebrate during this season.

Sunday and *Easter* day are, if we consider their derivation, much the same. In truth, all Sundays are Sundays only because they are a weekly, partial recurrence of Easter day. The pagan Sunday was, in a manner, an unconscious preparation for Easter day. The Sun was a foremost god with heathendom. Balder the beautiful, the White God, the old Scandinavians called him. The sun has worshippers at this hour in Persia and other lands. "Some of you," says Carlyle, "may remember that fancy of Plato's. A man is kept in some dark, underground cave from childhood till maturity; then suddenly is carried to the upper airs. For the first time he sees the sun shining in its splendor overhead. He must fall down, says Plato, and adore it." There is, in truth, something royal, kingly about the sun, making it a fit emblem of Jesus, the Sun of Justice. Hence the church in these countries would seem to have said, "Keep that old, pagan name. It shall remain consecrated, sanctified." And thus the pagan Sunday, dedicated to Balder, became the Christian Sunday, sacred to Jesus. The sun is a fitting emblem of Jesus. The Fathers often compared Jesus to the sun; as they compared Mary to the moon, the beautiful moon, the beautiful Mary, shedding her mild, beneficent light on the darkness and night of this world—not light of her own; no Catholic says this; but—light reflected from the sun, Jesus.

1582. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship in 3d Century

SOURCE: Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*, bk. 1, chap. 13, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 123.

Do not many among you [pagans], with an affection of sometimes worshipping the heavenly bodies likewise, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day [Sunday], in preference to the preceding day, as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and for banqueting. By resorting to these customs, you deliberately deviate from your own religious rites to those of strangers.

[EDITORS' NOTE: See also No. 1409e.]

1583. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship in 4th Century

SOURCE: Porphyry, *On the Oracle of Apollo*, quoted in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* ("The Preparation of the Gospel"), bk. v, chap. 14, *MPG*, Vol. 21. col. 348. Greek.

Remember to invoke in private prayer at the same time Mercury, and the sun on the day sacred to the sun, and the moon when its well-known day will have come, then Saturn, and then Aphrodite [Venus].

1584. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Mithraism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, trans. by Thomas J. McCormack (reprint: New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 167, 191. [FRS No. 95.]

[p. 167] Each day in the week, the Planet to which the day was sacred was invoked in a fixed spot in the crypt; and Sunday, over which the Sun presided, was especially holy...

[p. 191] [The worshippers of Mithra] held Sunday sacred, and celebrated the birth of the Sun on the 25th of December.

1585. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Mithraism

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 499, 512, 513. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. p. Wells. [See FRS No. 110.]

[p. 499] The observance of the Jewish Sabbath, again, transferred to the Mithraic Sun-day, is an important feature of many Christian cults...

[p. 512] During this indefinite time [the 1st and 2d centuries] a considerable amount of a sort of theocrasia seems to have gone on between the Christian cult and the almost equally popular and widely diffused Mithraic cult, and the cult of Serapis-Isis-Horus. From the former it would seem the Christians adopted Sun-day as their chief day [p. 513] of worship instead of the Jewish Sabbath.

1586. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Power of Mithras Cult

SOURCE: H. Lamer, "Mithras," *Wörterbuch der Antike* (2d ed.; Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1933). Used by permission. German.

Concerning the power of the Mithras cult we still have evidence in the fact that it is not the Jewish in the fact that it is not the Jewish Sabbath that is the sacred week-day, which Christianity, coming out of Judaism, had nearest at hand, but Sunday, dedicated to the Sun-god Mithras.

1587. Sunday, and Pagan Sun's Day

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 257, 258, 260. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 257] Modern Christians who talk of keeping Sunday as a "holy" day, as in the still extant "Blue Laws" of colonial America, should know that as a "holy" day of rest and cessation from labor and amusements Sunday was unknown to Jesus... It formed no tenet of the primitive Church and became "sacred" only in course of time. Outside the Church and became "sacred" only in course of time. Outside the Church its observance was legalized for the Roman Empire through a series of decrees starting with the famous one of Constantine in 321, an edict due to his political and social policies rather than, as Eusebius thought, to religious ones. For he took the day not because of the Christian custom of meeting then to commemorate the Resurrection but from "the venerable day of the Sun" (Mithra), and especially in order to give to Roman slaves respite from labor which their Semitic brothers had enjoyed for centuries. So much confusion in identifying Sunday and the Sabbath has been inherited by Britain and America through Puritan influence that it seems well to recapitulate the well-known facts...

As the Jewish element in the Church waned the Christians came to feel the need of a fixed day for [p. 258] meetings to replace the Sabbath. Then Sunday, like other pagan

festivals such as Christmas, came gradually into being, first as a fit day for worship and later one for rest...

[p. 260] Parallel to the Church movement ... but independent of it another had been developing in the State which after an obscure past culminated in Constantine's decree of 321 when the observance of the "day of the Sun" was imposed on the Empire, a decree marking an epoch in the history of Sunday as the beginning of both civil and later of ecclesiastical legislation. Now *dies Solis*, sacred in various solar cults and notably in Mithraism, was to play a role as the Christian Sunday as Christmas did a little later.

1588. Sunday, and Semi-Pagan Manichaeic Sun Worship

SOURCE: *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeic* xviii. 5, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 4, p. 238. [FRS No. 65.]

We are not afraid to meet your scoff at the Sabbath, when you [Faustus] call it the fetters of Saturn. It is a silly and unmeaning expression, which occurred to you only because you are in the habit of worshipping the sun on what you call Sunday. What you call Sunday we call the Lord's day, and on it we do not worship the sun, but the Lord's resurrection. And in the same way, the fathers observed the rest of the Sabbath, not because they worshipped Saturn, but because it was incumbent at that time; for it was a shadow of things to come, as the apostle testifies. The Gentiles, of whom the apostle says that they "worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator," gave the names of their gods to the days of the week. And so far you do the same, except that you worship only the two brightest luminaries, and not the rest of the stars, as the Gentiles did.

1589. Sunday—Anglican Archbishop Declares Tradition as Its Origin

SOURCE: News Item, *Albertan* (Calgary, Alberta, Canada), Oct. 28, 1949. Used by permission.

TORONTO, Oct. 27 (BUP).—Rev. Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, sent local clergymen into a huddle today by saying outright that there was nothing to support Sunday being kept holy.

Carrington defiantly told a church meeting in this city of straight-laced protestantism that tradition, not the Bible, had made Sunday the day of worship.

He quoted the biblical commandment which said the seventh day should be one of rest, and then stated: "That is Saturday."

"Nowhere in the Bible is it laid down that worship should be done on Sunday," the Archbishop told a hushed, still audience.

Local parsons read his comments today with set, determined looks. They refused comment [see, however, No. 1605].

1590. Sunday, as Part of Church's Policy of Adopting Pagan Festivals

SOURCE: Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity*, p. 145. Copyright 1928 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

The Church made a sacred day of Sunday ... largely because it was the weekly festival of the sun; for it was a definite Christian policy to take over the pagan festivals endeared to the people by tradition, and to give them a Christian significance.

1591. Sunday, Authority for—A Human Ordinance

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *The History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Henry John Rose (Philadelphia: James M. Campbell & Co., 1843), p. 186. [FRS No. 31.]

The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions 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 labouring on Sunday as a sin...

The Jewish Christian Churches, [i.e., Churches consisting of Jewish converts,] although they received the festival of Sunday, retained also that of the Sabbath; and from them the custom spread abroad in the Oriental Church, of distinguishing this day, as well as the Sunday, by not fasting and by praying in an erect posture; in the Western Churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The brackets are in the original. This is the translation from Neander's first German edition. Later editions have omitted the statement that Sunday was only a human ordinance.]

1592. Sunday—Authority for—Catholic Church

SOURCE: Richard Challoner, *The Catholic Christian Instructed* (New York: E. Dunigan and Brother, 1853), pp. 209, 211. [FRS No. 19.]

[p. 209] Q. What are the days which the Church commands to be kept holy?

A. 1st, The Sunday, or the Lord's day, which we observe by apostolical tradition, instead of the Sabbath...

Q. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?

A. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolical 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, St. Matt. xviii. 17. St. 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...

[p. 211] 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, in which this work was completely finished, was more worthy [of] her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day.

1593. Sunday, Authority for—Faulty Argument (Gamble's "First of the Sabbaths") Debunked

SOURCE: Wilbur Fletcher Steele, "Must Syntax Die That the Sabbath May Live?" *Methodist Review*, 81 (May–June, 1899), 401, 402.

[p. 401] In the contest with the tireless seventh-day Sabbatarians increasingly are certain Methodist writers insisting that the resurrection of Christ upon the first day of the week recovered and reenacted the original, creational, and true Sabbath. With hearty sympathy does the writer view their every legitimate argument to establish the sanctity and foster the hallowing of the Lord's Day. But when a claim on its behalf is distinctly based upon, or forcibly corroborated by, a gross wresting of the Holy Scripture, suspicion as to its validity instinctively sets in, to say nothing of mortification and repugnance...

[p. 402] This widely heralded Klondike discovery as to μίαν ζαββάτων turns out to be only the glitter of fool's gold. It rests upon the profoundest ignoring or ignorance of a law of syntax fundamental to inflected speech, and especially of the usage and influence

of the Aramaic tongue which was the vernacular of Jesus and his apostles. Must syntax die that the Sabbath may live?

Let these affirmations be traversed: “4. No Greek word for ‘day’ occurs in any of the passages.” Made for simple readers of English, that statement lacks candor. Said word is there, latent, to a much greater degree than it is in our phrase, “The 25th of the month.” Upon being asked, “The 25th what?” the veriest child instantly replies, “day.” But stronger yet is the case in hand. The adjectival word μίαν is in the feminine gender, and an immutable law requires adjective modifiers to agree with their nouns in gender. Σάββαθον is of the neuter gender (Mark ii, 27, Θὸ ζάββαθον; iii, 2, Θεῖς ζάββαθον), and out of the question. What feminine Greek word is latent in this phrase, and yet so patent as to reflect upon this adjective [*sic*] numeral its feminine hue? Plainly the feminine word ἡμέρα, “day,” as analogously it is found in Mark xiv, 12, πρῶθῃ ἡμέρᾳ θῶν ἀζύμων, though latent in Matthew’s parallel (xxvi, 17), πρῶθῃ θῶν ἀζύμων, “the first day of unleavened bread.” Baldly to aver that “no Greek word for ‘day’ occurs in any of the passages,” is to blind the simple English reader to the fact that an inflected language, by its numerous genders and cases, can indicate the presence and force of latent words to an extent undreamed in English...

As a vital or corroboratory part of any argument for the sanctifying of the Lord’s Day this traversed exegesis, instead of being a monumental discovery, is but a monumental blunder. Thereby our foes will have us in derision.

Tell it not in Gath,

Publish it not in the streets of Battle Creek;

Lest the daughters of the Sabbatarians rejoice,

Lest the daughters of the Saturdarians triumph.

1594. Sunday, Authority for—New Testament Texts Not Sufficient

SOURCE: “Lord’s Day,” *Smith’s Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by Samuel W. Barnum (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1884), p. 560.

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these [NT “first-day”] passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above-mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice.

1595. Sunday, Authority for—Not Bible, but Church

SOURCE: “To Tell You The Truth,” *The Catholic Virginia*, 22 (Oct. 3, 1947), 9. [FRS No. 130.]

All of us believe many things in regard to religion that we do not find in the Bible. For example, nowhere in the Bible do we find that Christ or the Apostles ordered that the Sabbath be changed from Saturday to Sunday. We have the commandment of God given to Moses to keep holy the Sabbath Day, that is the 7th day of the week, Saturday. Today most Christians keep Sunday because it has been revealed to us by the Church outside the Bible.

1596. Sunday, Authority for—Not Bible but Church Tradition

SOURCE: John L. Stoddard, *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1826), p. 80. [FRS No. 56.]

Protestants often deride the authority of Church tradition, and claimed to be directed by the Bible only; yet they, too, have been guided by customs of the ancient Church, which find no warrant in the Bible, but rest on Church tradition only. A striking instance of this is the following:—The first positive command in the Decalogue is to “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy,” and this precept was enforced by the Jews for

thousands of years. But the Sabbath Day, the observance of which God commanded, was our Saturday. Yet who among either Catholics or Protestants, except a sect or two, like the “Seventh Day Baptists,” ever keep that commandment now? None. Why is this? The Bible, which Protestants claim to obey exclusively, gives no authorisation for the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh. On what authority, therefore, have they done so? Plainly on the authority of that very Catholic Church which they abandoned, and whose traditions they condemn.

1597, Sunday, Authority for, Not From the Bible, but From the Catholic Church

SOURCE: *The Christian Sabbath* (2d ed.; Baltimore: The Catholic Mirror, [1893]), pp. 5–7. [FRS No. 30; original editorials, FRS No. 125.]

[p. 5] The Israelite respects the authority of the Old Testa- [p. 6] ment only, but the Adventist, who is a Christian, accepts the New Testament on the same ground as the Old, viz: an inspired record also. He finds that the Bible, his teacher, is consistent in both parts; that the Redeemer, during His mortal life, never kept any other day than Saturday. The Gospels plainly evince to Him this fact; whilst, in the pages of the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse, not the vestige of an act canceling the Saturday arrangement can be found...

The Protestant world has been, from its infancy, in the Sixteenth century, in thorough accord with the Catholic Church, in keeping “holy” not Saturday, but Sunday... If, how- [p. 7] ever, on the other hand, the latter furnish the arguments, incontrovertible by the great mass of Protestants, both classes of litigants, appealing to their common teacher, the Bible, the great body of Protestants, so far from clamoring, as they do with vigorous pertinacity for the strict keeping of Sunday, have no other resource left than the admission that they have been teaching and practicing *what is Scripturally false for over three centuries*, by adopting the teaching and practice of what they have always pretended to believe an apostate church, contrary to every warrant and teaching of Sacred Scripture. To add to the intensity of this Scriptural and unpardonable blunder, it involves one of the most positive and emphatic commands of God to His servant, man: “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.”

[EDITORS’ NOTE: This extract came originally from *The Catholic Mirror* of Sept. 2, 1893. See No. 1437.]

1598. Sunday, Authority for—Not in Bible

SOURCE: Henry M. Taber, *Faith or Fact* (New York: Peter Eckler, Publisher, 1897), p. 114. [FRS No. 67.]

Why will not Christian people investigate and find out for themselves (which they easily can), that the keeping of Sunday as a “holy Sabbath day,” is wholly *without warrant*.

I challenge any priest or minister of the Christian religion, to show me the *slightest* authority for the religious observance of Sunday. And, if such cannot be shown by them, why is it that they are constantly preaching about Sunday as a *holy day*? Are they not open to the suspicion of *imposing* upon the confidence and credulity of their hearers? Surely they are deliberately and *knowingly* practicing deception upon those who look to them for candor and for truth, *unless* they can give satisfactory reasons for teaching that Sunday *is* a sacred day. There never was, and is not now, any such “satisfactory reasons.” No student of the Bible has ever brought to light a single verse, line or word, world, which can, by any possibility, be construed into a warrant for the religious observance of Sunday. Quotations from the writings of the “Church Fathers,” and others familiar with

Church history, support this statement, and include the names of Tertul[*I*]ian, Eusebius, Ireneus, Victorinus, Theodoretus, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, Luther, Melanc[h]thon, Zwingle, Knox, Tyndale, Grotius, Neander, Mosheim, Heylyn, Frith, Milton, Priestly, Domville. John Calvin had so little respect for the day that he could be found playing bowls most any Sunday.

The claim that Sunday takes the place of Saturday, and that because of the Jews were supposed to be commanded to keep the *seventh* day of the week holy, *therefore* that the *first* day of the week should be so kept by Christians, is so utterly absurd as to be hardly worth considering.

1599. Sunday, Authority for, Not in Bible, Yet Non-Catholics Observe It

SOURCE: Martin J. Scott, *Things Catholic Are Asked About*, p. 136. Copyright 1927 by P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 57.]

Some non-Catholics object to Purgatory because there is no specific mention of it in Scripture. There is no specific mention of the word Sunday in Scripture. The Sabbath is mentioned, but Sabbath means Saturday. Yet the Christians of almost all denominations worship on Sunday not on Saturday. The Jews observe Saturday. Nowhere in the Bible is it stated that worship should be changed from Saturday to Sunday.

1600. Sunday, Authority for, Not Scriptural

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers* (92d ed., rev.; Baltimore: John Murphy Company, [192–]), p. 89. [See FRS No. 25.]

Is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.

1601. Sunday, Authority for, Not the Fourth Commandment

SOURCE: John Milton, “A Posthumous Treatise on the Christian Doctrine,” bk. 2, chap. 7, trans. by Charles R. Sumner, in *The Prose Works of John Milton* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1877), Vol. 5, pp. 70, 71, 74.

[p. 70] It is impossible to extort such a sense from the words of the commandment; seeing that the reason for which the command itself was originally given, namely, as a memorial of God’s having rested from the creation of the world, cannot be transferred from the seventh day to the first; nor can any new motive be substituted in its place, whether the resurrection of our Lord or any other, without [p. 71] the sanction of a divine commandment...

[p. 74] For if we under the gospel are to regulate the time of our public worship by the prescriptions of the decalogue, it will surely be far safer to observe the seventh day, according to the express commandment of God, than on the authority of mere human conjecture to adopt the first.

1602. Sunday, Authority for—“One Day in Seven” Theory (Presbyterian)

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 23 (originally 21), “Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day,” sec. 7, in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 161, 162.

[p. 161] 7. As it is of the law of nature that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in

seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end [p. 162] of the world as the Christian Sabbath.

1603. Sunday, Authority for, Same as for Purgatory

SOURCE: Martin J. Scott, *Things Catholics Are Asked About*, p. 136. Copyright 1927 by P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 57.]

Now the Church ... instituted, by God's authority, Sunday as the day of worship. This same Church, by the same divine authority, taught the doctrine of Purgatory... We have, therefore, the same authority for Purgatory as we have for Sunday.

1604. Sunday, Authority for —Tradition

SOURCE: John Milner, Letter 11, To James Brown, Esq., in his *The End of Religious Controversy, in a Friendly Correspondence Between a Religious Society of Protestants, and a Roman Catholic Divine* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 89. [FRS No. 105.]

The first precept in the Bible, is that of sanctifying the seventh day: *God blessed the SEVENTH DAY, and sanctified it.* Gen. ii. 3. This precept was confirmed by God, in the Ten Commandments: *Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The SEVENTH DAY is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.* Exod. xx. On the other hand Christ declares that he is *not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it.* Mat. v. 17. He himself observed the Sabbath: *and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day:* Luke iv. 16. His disciples likewise observed it, after his death: *They rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment.* Luke xxiii. 56. Yet, with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the *Sabbath* or *seventh day* holy, Protestants, of all denominations, make this a *profane day* and transfer the obligation of it to the *first day of the week*, or the *Sunday*. Now what authority have they for doing this? None at all, but the *unwritten Word*, or *tradition* of the Catholic church, which declares that the apostles made the change in honour of Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.

1605. Sunday, Authority for—Tradition, Not Bible Ordinance, Clergy Say

SOURCE: New Items, *Toronto (Canada) Daily Star*, Oct. 26, 1949, p. 3. Used by permission.

Sunday is kept holy by Christians, not because there is any Scriptural injunction but because there are religious traditions associated with that day among Christians, Protestant and Catholic spokesmen for St. Augustine's, the Roman Catholic seminary for the diocese of Toronto, said today. They were commenting on a statement of Most Rev. Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, that there is no commandment which states Sunday must be kept holy [see No. 1589].

Rabbi's Recollections

A rabbi recalled that the first Christians were Jews and celebrated the Sabbath on the last day of the week and it was not until the reign of the Emperor Constantine that the day was changed by Christians.

At a service commemorating the 400th anniversary of the Church of England prayer book, Archbishop Carrington recalled that "the Bible commandment says on the seventh day thou shalt rest. That is Saturday. Nowhere in the Bible is it laid down that worship should be done on Sunday." Tradition, he said, had made it a day of worship.

A spokesman for St. Augustine's, the Roman Catholic seminar for the diocese of Toronto, said: "Strictly speaking, that archbishop is correct. There is no scriptural rule for the observance of Sunday. But he doesn't go far enough.

Evidence in the Bible

"In the Bible, there is evidence that Christ established a church, to carry on his work. He gave that Church authority to carry out God's rule on earth. Because of the resurrection occurred on Sunday, and because of the general acceptance today of Sunday as a day of rest, it's fitting that now Sunday should be observed instead of Saturday, as under the old rule."

The Church has a specific church commandment stating Sunday should be observed.

Protestants observed Sunday because for many centuries they had been part of the Roman Catholic Church, and had observed the church commandment, he said.

"There is no specific command in the New Testament about which day shall be kept holy," said Rev. G. H. Dowker of Grace Church-on-the-Hill. "The simple fact is, we keep holy the first day of the week because it was the day of the resurrection of Christ."

Rev. Northcote Burke of Christ church, Deer Park, said he thought the archbishop used the statement merely to illustrate church tradition. "Certainly the tradition of the Sabbath has always been to keep the Lord's day on the first day of the week. The early Christians used it because it was the day Christ arose again."

Jesuit Gives His View

"Our Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week," said Father Hourigan of the Jesuit Seminary. "That is why the church changed the day of obligation from the seventh day to the first day of the week. The Anglicans and other denominations retained that tradition when the Reformation came along."

Rabbi David Monson, of Beth Sholom synagogue, said the change was made because of Emperor Constantine. "He changed the Christian Sabbath to Sunday," he said. "The original Christians were all Jews. They celebrated the Sabbath on Saturday.' [']

Rev. W. H. Grotheer of First Seventh Day Adventists church, Awde St., said he agreed with Archbishop Carrington's statement. He explained Adventists still observe Saturday as the sabbath, in harmony with the fourth commandment which says "Six days shalt thou labor but the seventh day is the Sabbath." Mr. Grotheer recalled "Jesus rose on the first day (of the week) according to Mark 16.9 and in Luke 23.56 it definitely states the day before the resurrection is the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment."

Rev. Herbert Delaney, speaking for the chancery of the Roman Catholic diocese of Toronto, agreed that under the old rule of the Scriptures, the Sabbath was the holy day. But he said Sunday was observed under a specific commandment of the Church, after the coming of Christ, in an interpretation of the original commandment.

Father Delaney said the reason for the change from Saturday to Sunday under the new rules was that Christ had risen on Sunday.

Not Only Tradition

Dr. E. Crossley Hunter of Trinity United church said the explanation lies not only in tradition, but also in records of the New Testament.

"Again and again in the New Testament we find reference to the Lord's day as the first day of the week whereas in the Old Testament it refers to the seventh day," he said. "However, the archbishop is quite right in the literal meaning of the commandment." ...

One minister remarked: “We’ve become so accustomed to keeping Sunday as our holy day that it isn’t likely this belated discovery is going to change our attitude overnight. Certainly not in Toronto.”

1606. Sunday—Development—at First Supplemental to the Sabbath

SOURCE: L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, trans. from the 3d French edition by M. L. McClure (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), p. 47.

From a very early period the Christians adopted the Sunday. It is possible that, at the very outset, the choice of this day was not suggested by any hostility towards Jewish customs, but that they observed it merely in order to have side by side with the ancient Sabbath, which they celebrated with their Israelite brethren, a day set apart for exclusively Christian assemblies... The observance of the Sunday was at first supplemental to that of the Sabbath, but in proportion as the gulf between the Church and the synagogue widened, the Sabbath became less and less important, and ended at length in being entirely neglected.

1607. Sunday—Development Gradual

SOURCE: A[ntoine] Villien, *A History of the Commandments of the Church* (St. Louis: Herder, 1915), pp. 23–26, 30, 32. Copyright 1915 by Joseph Gummersbach. Used by permission. [FRS No. 63.]

[p. 23] *In the Time of the Apostles*. The sanctification of Sunday is of Apostolic origin, but it would be an error to attribute it to a definite decision of the Apostles. There is no such decision mentioned in the Apostolic documents. This law was evolved by the force of circumstances. After the death of [p. 24] our Lord the Apostles continued to attend the Jewish liturgical gatherings. The Acts show that they frequented the Temple, and visited the synagogues. On arriving in a city, they put themselves in contact with the Jewish colony, faithfully assisted at the gatherings of the synagogue, and partook in its worship. Paul and Barnabas, entering the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia on the day of the Sabbath, take their place among the other Jews. After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the elders of the synagogue send one of their assistants to tell them: “Brethren, if you have any exhortation to give the people, speak.” Paul stands up and addresses the assembly, preaching Christ, His coming, His death, and His resurrection. His discourse stirs up some emotion and he is asked to come again on the following Sabbath. The same thing occurs at Iconium, at Thessalonica, where St. Paul, “according to his custom,” enters the synagogue on three successive Sabbaths and preaches the Gospel; thus also at Athens and at Corinth. The Apostles and their first disciples therefore continued to frequent the Temple and the synagogues and to take part in the sabbatic gatherings.

[p. 25] However this common worship could not suffice them; as disciples of Jesus they felt the need of adoring among themselves alone that Messiah whom the majority of their compatriots refused to recognize. For that worship they needed private gatherings, which became more and more necessary when the first Gentiles, absolute strangers to Judaism, were added to the number of the faithful. Sunday, already mentioned once in the Acts and once in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, was soon joined to the Sabbath. This addition probably occurred as follows: After having assisted at the services in the synagogue, the Apostles and their disciples came together apart from the Jews to partake of the Eucharistic meal “in memory” of Christ. Their gathering began towards evening and lasted till daybreak. This must have been the usual order, especially at the time when the Christians were scattered in small communities, each of which could not have an Apostle or priest, and were consequently obliged to travel a longer distance than was allowed on the Sabbath if they wished to partake of the Last Supper in common. Thus the

first day of the week was added to the Sabbath... [p. 26] In being substituted for the Sabbath, as a more perfect form of worship, Sunday assumed those of its obligations that were reconcilable with the law of the Gospel...

[p. 30] In the meantime [by the fourth century] the practice of the Christian populace and the teaching of the bishops had inspired Constantine to take measures which were destined to exercise a wholesome influence. Eusebius in his Life of Constantine tells us that the first Christian Emperor desired that one day be consecrated to prayer, and chose Sunday. He not only encouraged the observance of this practice by his example but also made use of various means to enable others to do likewise. All Christian soldiers were free to obey the precept of the Church on that day and gathered together in an appointed place to address to God a prayer which the Emperor himself had composed...

[p. 32] "Come to church every Sunday," says Caesarius [of Arles (470?–543?)]; "on Sunday Christians must occupy themselves only with God and must gather in church for the salvation of their souls. He affirms that Sunday is reserved to Divine worship by Divine institution: "The apostles and Apostolic men have decided that Sunday should be consecrated to acts of religion, and on that day Divine worship only should be attended to. To that day they transferred the glory of the Jewish Sabbath. Let us therefore observe the Sunday, my dear brethren, and let us sanctify it as the Divine Legislator commanded the ancients to observe the Sabbath. From Saturday night to Sunday night let us give ourselves up entirely to divine worship."

1608. Sunday—Development Gradual—Church Authority and Custom

SOURCE: "Sunday in Place of Sabbath," *The Sign*, 21 (August, 1941), 47, 48. Copyright 1941 by The Passionist Missions, Inc., Union City, N.J. Used by permission. [FRS No. 52.]

[p. 47] *The Seventh Day Adventists say that the Apostles had no right nor power to change the Sabbath into the Sunday. Christ, they say, came to fulfill the Law of God, and not one iota has been broken. They maintain that the resurrection of Christ on a Sunday and the descent of the Holy Ghost on a Sunday are no reasons to change the Law.—*

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

The Apostles did not change the Sabbath into the Sunday; they remain distinct days of the week. But what the Apostles and their successors did was to transfer the obligations attaching to the Sabbath, divine worship and cessation from servile work, to the Sunday. This was done gradually. It was not until about the second century of the Christian era that the observance of the Sunday in place of the Sabbath became universal. Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches that the observance of Sunday in the New Law succeeds to the observance of the Sabbath in the Old Law, not by virtue of a divine precept, but from the authority of the Church and the custom of Christians. The introduction of this change by the Church must have had the sanction of Christ, Who is the Lord of the Sabbath, and Who promised to be "with" the Church even to the consummation of the world.

The Seventh Day Adventist tenet is an instance of individualism and private judgment against the custom of the whole Christian Church (though it is logical for those who maintain the "Bible and the Bible only" theory). They insist that divine worship and bodily rest must be observed on the seventh day of the week, instead of the first. In this they agree with the Jews. In the Old Law the Sabbath was a figure of things to come, while in the New Law the Sunday is a symbol of the accomplishment of the prophecies in the Redeemer. By continuing the Sabbath observance, the Adventist, though they call themselves Christians, not only associate themselves with the Jews, who are still hoping

for the Redeemer, but they also contradict the [p. 48] practice of the whole Christian Church. Is it not presumptuous for them to decide what the Apostles could not do? The Apostles were given the power to bind and loose, and their decisions were ratified in heaven (Matt. 18:18).

The sanctification of one day in the week is of divine law, but the determination of the day in the New Law was left to the authority of the Church. Since the ceremonial and judicial precepts of the Old Law were abolished by the New Law, the Church determined that the first day of the week was to be devoted to divine worship and bodily rest, in order to distinguish the true religion from the Mosaic, which was supplanted by Christianity.

1609. Sunday—Development Gradual, Conclusions of a Modern Catholic Writer on

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 203. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of the America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

After this study of the matter of the negative part of the Sunday precept, the conclusions reached are:

- (1) That the Sunday was in the beginning not looked on as a day of bodily repose; nor was an analogy drawn between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, except as days of worship.
- (2) The application rest of the Jewish Sabbath norms of a bodily rest to the Sunday was really due to the erroneous idea that the Sunday was but a continuation of the Sabbath.
- (3) The keeping of the Sunday rest arose from the custom of the people and the constitution of the Church.
- (4) Through the years the insistence [*sic*] on and the observance of the Sunday repose has varied greatly. It was most strict when the sabbatarian spirit was most strong.
- (5) Tertullian was probably the first to refer to a cessation of worldly affairs on the Sunday; the Council of Laodicea issued the first conciliar legislation for that day; Constantine I issued the first civil legislation. St. Martin of Braga was probably the first to use the term “servile work” in its present theological sense.
- (6) The term “servile work” was originally used by Christian writers to designate sin. It was probably not until the sixth century that it was used to signify bodily work. For a long while after its adoption it was generally identified with rural works.

1610. Sunday, Established as Soon as Persecution Ceased (4th Century)

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 369. [FRS No. 73.]

St. Paul denounces distinctions in meat and drink, the observance of Sabbaths and holydays, and of ordinances, and the worship of Angels; yet Christians, from the first, were rigid in their stated fastings, venerated, as St. Justin tells us, the Angelic intelligences, and established the observance of the Lord’s day as soon as persecution ceased.

1611. Sunday, Establishment of, Based on Need for Holy Days

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 373. [FRS No. 73.]

The same reason, the need of holydays for the multitude, is assigned by Origen, St. Gregory’s master, to explain the establishment of the Lord’s Day also, and the Paschal and the Pentecostal festivals.

1612. Sunday, Establishment of, by Council of Laodicea

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Joseph Torrey (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1851), pp. 424, 425. [FRS No. 98.]

[p. 424] As to the celebration of Sunday, the custom, which had long prevailed in the church, of consecrating this day in a special manner to religious employments, and of abstaining from all worldly business [see No. 1638] was established by a synodal law, the twenty-ninth canon of the council of Laodicea, yet with this restriction, that all Christians should abstain from their worldly business if they were able. A collision betwixt this ecclesiastical ordinance and the relations to the state, which must have arisen in the earlier situation of the church, could now be easily removed, when the state itself recognized the church as such, and endeavoured to uphold her in the prosecution of her principles and the attainment of her ends. We have already said, that the emperor Constantine, in a law enacted previous to the year 321, commanded the suspension of all suits and courts of justice on Sunday. It was a beautiful exception, wholly in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, by which he provided that the emancipation of slaves, after the usual forms, should be permitted to take place on Sunday. As Eusebius, in his life of Constantine, relates, he also forbade all military exercises on this day. 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.

1613. Sunday, Evening to Evening, in 8th Century

SOURCE: Charlemagne, *Capitularia* (Capitularies [Laws]), in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Leges*, Vol. 1 (reprint; Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1925), pp. 57, 71. Latin.

a. Capitulare Ecclesiarum [sic] 789 (Ecclesiastical Capitulary for the year 789), sec. 15

[p. 57] 15. Likewise in the same council [Laodicea], that from evening (*vespera*) until evening shall the Lord's day (*dies dominica*) be kept.

b. Capitulare Francofurtense (Frankfurt Capitulary), sec. 21

[p. 71] 21. That the Lord's day (*dies dominica*) is to be kept from evening until evening.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Actually, the Council of Laodicea (see Canon 29) does not mention the beginning or ending of the day.]

1614. Sunday — Ignatius' Statement (Magnesians ix) Explained

SOURCE: Baden Powell, "Lord's Day," in John Kitto, ed., *A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature* (New York: Mark H. Newman, [1846]), Vol. 2, p. 270. [FRS No. 120.]

But we must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's Day, though it certainly contains no mention of it. It occurs in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about A.D. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. It has, however, been understood in a totally different sense, and as referring to a distinct subject; and such we confess appears to us to be the most obvious and natural construction of it.

The passage is as follows:—'Εἰ οὐ οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πφάγμασιν ἀαστφαφένθεις, εἰς χαινότητα ἐλπίδοι ἦθον—μηχέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ χατά χυριαχὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες—(ἐ ἦ χαὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡὼν ἀτέιλεν δι αὐτοῦ, χαὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [ὄν τινες ἀροῦνται], δι οὐ

μυστηρίου ἐλάβομεν ... &c.), πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι κωρὶς αὐτοῦ; ...,' &c. (Ignatius, *ad Magnesios*, § ix.; Jacobson's *Patres Apost.* ii. 322. Oxford, 1840).

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

Dr. Neander, in his *History of Christianity*, translated by Mr. Rose (i. 336), refers to this passage adopting this supposition, on which the translator remarks (in a note) very truly, though somewhat laconically, that he can only find 'something of the kind' in the passage. The meaning of Neander's version is altogether very confused, but seems to represent the Lord's day as a sort of emblem of the new life of a Christian.

Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of a substantive to which *ἡμέρα* can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring by the introduction of *ἡμέρα*. Now if we take *χυριαχὴ ζωὴ* as simply 'the life of the Lord,' having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to αὐτοῦ. Again, ἐν ἡ may well refer to *ζωή*, and *χυριαχὴ ζωὴ*, meaning our Lord's *life*, as emphatically including his *resurrection* (as in Rom. v. 10, &c.), presents precisely the same analogy to the spiritual life of the Christian as is conveyed both in Rom. v.; Coloss. iii. 3, 4, and many other passages. Thus upon the whole the meaning might be given thus:—

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

In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view the passage does not refer at all to the Lord's day; but even on the opposite supposition it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term 'Lord's day' (for which it is often cited), since the material word *ἡμέρα* is purely conjectural. It however offers an instance of that species of contrast which the early fathers were so fond of drawing between the Christian and Jewish dispensations, and between the new life of the Christian and the ceremonial spirit of the law, to which the Lord's day (if it be imagined to be referred to) is represented as opposed.

To return, however, to the nature of this observance in the Christian church, we will merely remark that though in later times we find considerable reference to a sort of *consecration of the day*, it does not seem at any period of the ancient church to have assumed the form of such an observance as some modern religious communities have contended for. Nor do these writers in any instance pretend to allege *any divine command, or even apostolic practice*, in support of it.

In the laws of Constantine (A.D. 300), cessation from ordinary work on the Lord's day was first enjoined, but with an express exception in favour of the labours of agriculture. (See Jortin's *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* iii. 236.)

Chrysostom (A.D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest (ζκολλάζειν) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 24), and various later enactments from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the uncertainty of the date of the Council of Laodicea, see No. 1435n.]

1615. Sunday, No Correlation of, With Jewish Sabbath

SOURCE: Lawrence L. McReavy, "Sabbatarianism and the Decalogue," *The Clergy Review*, 20 (June, 1941), 498. Used by permission.

There can be few popular misconceptions more deeply rooted among Christians, Catholic as well as Protestant, than that correlation of the Christian Sunday to the Jewish Sabbath (resulting normally in Sunday observance according to sabbatical precedents) which we call "sabbatarianism"... The Catechism, like the average manual of Moral Theology, by its treatment of Sunday observance under the Third, or Sabbath Commandment of the Decalogue, rather than under the First, or Festal Commandment of the Church, goes a long way to confirm the prevailing impression that Sabbath and Sunday are but two names for the same thing.

This mistaken impression is either based upon, or else leads to ..., a false view of the Decalogue.

1616. Sunday, Not Continuation of Seventh-day Sabbath

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. xi, 2. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. xi] This association of the law with the Third [Fourth] Commandment has indeed been one of the difficult features to explain away. In fact, those who admit the erroneousness of such a foundation, very frequently find themselves quoting Sabbatical texts when they strive to emphasize the proper observance of the Sunday. However by attempting to correct this false notion of the Sunday as a mere continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, we do not intend or wish to say that there is no strict obligation to observe the Sunday repose. We must never forget that the Church has the power to bind under sin, and there has never been a doubt of the obligation of the Church's law of Sunday repose...

[p. 2] Some theologians have held that God likewise directly determined the Sunday as the day of worship in the New Law, that He Himself has explicitly substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath. But this theory is now entirely abandoned. It is now commonly held that God simply gave His Church the power to set aside whatever day or days, she would deem suitable as Holy Days. The Church chose Sunday, the first day of the week, and in the course of time added other days, as holy days.

1617. Sunday, Not Substitute for the Sabbath

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 49, 52, 54. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 49] There was never any formal or authoritative change from the Jewish Seventh Day Sabbath to the Christian First Day observance. The early Christians leave no evidence that they thought of their day of worship as a substitution for the pre-Christian Sabbath, or as continuing that Sabbath. Jewish Christians at first seem to have continued to observe the Sabbath as Jews. As their independent Christian consciousness grew and

incorporated the whole of their religious experience, life and program, under their own ideals and forms, they more and more left the Jewish Sabbath out of their thought...

[p. 52] There are in the New Testament no commands, no prescriptions, no rules, no liturgies applying to the observance of the Lord's Day...

[p. 54] There is no organic connection between the Hebrew Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day. Jewish Christians naturally brought over their Hebrew consciousness with reference to the day. It was only a short while until gentiles predominated in the Christian movement. They brought over the consciousness of various observances in the pagan religions, pre-eminently the worship of the sun—a sort of Sunday consciousness. Both groups subordinated and reinterpreted their previous ideas to conform to the characteristic Christian concept...

There is consequently no proper question of "change of the day."

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as "the Christian's Lord's Day."]

1618. Sunday, Not the Sabbath

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 14–17, 41. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] In the Scriptures these two days are never confounded [the seventh day and the first day], nor are they in any way exchanged the one for the other. On the contrary they are set in contrast, and are kept as distinct as the two general dispensations to which they respectively belong. The one is set apart and sanctified by divine commandment; the other is set apart and sanctified only as men sanctify the Lord Christ in their hearts...

[p. 15] In current usage these two days have two secular names. The seventh is called Saturday, and the first is called Sunday. In no case are these names used interchangeably. The seventh day is never called Sunday, nor is the first called Saturday...

[p. 16] The sacred name of the seventh day is Sabbath. This fact is too clear to require argument. The truth is stated in concise terms: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This utterance is repeated in Exodus 16:26, 23:12, 31:15, 35:2, Leviticus 23:3, and [p. 17] Deuteronomy 5:14. On this point the plain teaching of the word has been admitted in all ages. Except to certain special sabbaths appointed in Levitical law, and these invariably governed by the month rather than the week, the Bible in all its utterances never, no, not once, applies the name Sabbath to any other day.

The sacred name of the first day of the week is Lord's Day. Between it and the Sabbath the distinction is made very clear: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." ...

[p. 41] Not once did they [the disciples] apply the Sabbath law to the first day of the week,—that folly was left for a later age, nor did they pretend that the first day supplanted the seventh.

1619. Sunday, Not the Sabbath—Names Never Confused by Ancient Writers

SOURCE: Translator's footnote in *The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1874), p. 289 (on bk. 5, chap. 22).

That is, upon the Saturday. It should be observed, that Sunday is never called "the Sabbath" (τὸ ζάββατον) by the ancient Fathers and historians... The Latins kept the sabbath as a fast, the Greeks as a feast; and the 64th of the Apostolical Canons forbids any of the clergy to fast on the sabbath (Saturday) under pain of being deposed, and likewise a layman under the penalty of ex-communication.

1620. Sunday, Not the Sabbath, Says Roger Williams

SOURCE: Roger Williams, Letter to Major John Mason of Connecticut, June 22, 1670, in *Letters of Roger Williams*, ed. by John Russell Bartlett (*Publications of the Narragansett Club*, 1st series, Vol. 6. Providence: The Narragansett Club, 1874), pp. 333, 346, 347. [FRS No. 62.]

[p. 333] PROVIDENCE, June 22, 1670, (*ut vulgo*.)

MAJOR MASON,—My honored, dear and ancient friend, my due respects and earnest desires to God, for your eternal peace, &c. ...

- [p. 346; 1.] Some of yours [i.e., Connecticut Puritans], as I heard lately, told tales to the Archbishop of Canterbury, viz.: that we [in Rhode Island] are a profane people, and do not keep the Sabbath, but some do plough, &c. But, first, you told him not how we suffer freely all other persuasions, yea, the common prayer, which yourselves will not suffer. If you say you will, you confess you must suffer more, as we do.
2. You know this is but a color to your design, for, first, you know that all England itself (after the formality and superstition of morning and evening prayer) play away their Sabbath. 2d. You know yourselves do not keep the Sabbath, that is the seventh day, &c.
 3. You know that famous Calvin and thousands more [p. 347] held it but ceremonial and figurative from Colossians 2, &c., and vanished; and that the day of worship was alterable at the churches' pleasure. Thus also all the Romanists confess, saying, viz.: that there is no express scripture, first, for infants' baptism; nor, second, for abolishing the seventh day, and instituting of the eighth day worship, but that it is at the churches' pleasure.
 4. You know, that generally, all this whole colony observe the first day, only here and there one out of conscience, another out of covetousness, make no conscience of it.
 5. You know the greatest part of the world make no conscience of a seventh day. The next part of the world, Turks, Jews and Christians, keep three different days, Friday, Saturday, Sunday for their Sabbath and day of worship, and every one maintains his own by the longest sword.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Those mentioned in sec. 4, who "out of conscience" did not keep Sunday, were Seventh Day Baptists, or "Sabbatarian Baptists," as these English witnesses to God's Sabbath were first called in those times. In 1664 Stephen Mumford, of one of these London congregations, was sent over to New England. He settled in Rhode Island, where the Baptist pioneer of religious liberty, Roger Williams, had founded his colony. In 1671 the first Sabbatarian church in America was formed in Rhode Island. Evidently this movement created a stir; for the report went over to England that the Rhode Island colony did not keep the Sabbath—meaning Sunday. Roger Williams wrote this letter denying the report, but calling attention to the fact that there was no Scripture for "abolishing the seventh day," and remarking: "You know yourselves do not keep the Sabbath, that is the seventh day."

Williams' toleration of Sabbathkeepers contrasted with the intolerance in other New England colonies, such as Connecticut (which, as he points out in sec. 1, did not allow "the common prayer," that is, Anglican worship), and in England. In 1684 Francis Bampfield—formerly an influential minister of the Church of England, but later pastor of a Sabbathkeeping congregation meeting in Pinner's Hall, London—died of hardships in Newgate prison, for the Sabbath of the Lord.

Williams himself, though friendly to the Seventh Day Baptists, wrote to one of them that after reading on the subject of the seventh day he still held that "all those sabbaths of seven days were figures, types and shadows, and fore-runners of the Son of God, and that the change is made from the remembrance of the first creation, and that (figurative) rest on the seventh day, to the remembrance of the second creation on the first [day], on which our Lord arose conqueror from the dead" (Letter to Samuel Hubbard, 1672, in Isaac Backus, *History of New England, With Particular Reference to ... Baptists* [2d ed.; Newton, Mass.: The Backus Society, 1871], Vol. 1, p. 411).]

1621. Sunday, Observance of, Catholic Teaching on

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 404, 405. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 404] *Thou shalt do no work on it, says the Lord, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.*

These words teach us, in the first place, to avoid whatever may interfere with the worship of God. Hence it is not difficult to perceive that all servile works are forbidden, not because they are improper or evil in themselves, but because they withdraw the attention from the worship of God, which is the great end of the Commandment.

The faithful should be still more careful to avoid sin, which not only withdraws the mind from the contemplation of divine things, but entirely alienates us from the love of God...

[p. 405] The pastor should also not omit carefully to teach what works and actions Christians should perform on festival days. These are: to go to church, and there, with heartfelt piety and devotion, to assist at the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; and to approach frequently the Sacraments of the Church, instituted for our salvation in order to obtain a remedy for the wounds of the soul...

The faithful should also listen with attention and reverence to sermons. Nothing is more intolerable, nothing more unworthy than to despise the words of Christ, or hear them with indifference.

Likewise the faithful should give themselves to frequent prayer and the praises of God; and an object of their special attention should be to learn those things which pertain to a Christian life, and to practice with care the duties of piety, such as giving alms to the poor and needy, visiting the sick, and administering consolation to the sorrowful and afflicted. *Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father is this, says St. James, to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation.*

1622. Sunday, Observance of, Claimed as Sign That Americans Are a Christian People

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic," in John Gilmary Shea and others, *The Cross and The Flag, Our Church and Country* (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25. [FRS No. 104.]

[p. 24] The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the authority of the Church [p. 25] from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, has always been revered in this country, has entered into our legislation and customs, and is one of the most patent signs that we are a Christian people.

The neglect and abandonment of this observance would be sure evidence of a departure from the Christian spirit in which our past national life has been moulded. In our times, as in all times past, the enemies of religion are the opponents, secret or avowed, of the Christian Sabbath. A close observer cannot fail to note the dangerous inroads that have been made on the Lord's Day in this country within the last quarter of a century. He renders a service to his country who tries to check this dangerous tendency to desecration.

It would not be difficult to show that the observance of Sunday is fraught with the greatest social blessing; as proof, look at the social ills that have befallen those Christian nations that have lost respect for it. Solicitous to avert from the United States those

disastrous consequences, the Catholic Church has been a strenuous upholder of the sacred character of the Lord's Day.

1623. Sunday, Observance of, in Pius XII's Program of Action

SOURCE: "Pope Calls for Moral and Religious Action, Not Just Planning" (by the Associated Press), *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., Sept. 8, 1947, p. A-12. Used by permission of Wide World Photo, Inc., New York.

VATICAN CITY, Sept. 8.—Pope Pius XII told a throng of 250,000 Catholic worshippers gathered in St. Peter's Square yesterday that "the time for reflection and planning is past," in religious and moral fields and the "time for action" has arrived...

The Pope ... declared that the battle in religious and moral fields hinged on five points:

Religious culture, the sanctifying of Sunday, the savings [*sic*] of the Christian family, social justice and loyalty and truthfulness in dealings.

1624. Sunday, Observance of, Pope John XXIII Sees as Social and Religious Obligation

SOURCE: Pope John XXIII, Encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (Mother and Teacher), 1961, translation released by the Vatican Press Office. Used by permission of the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service. (The same extract appears also on page 8B of the encyclical as printed in the supplement to *Our Sunday Visitor*, Aug. 6, 1961, also in versions published by the Paulist Press [pp. 75, 76] and by the American Press [p. 66.]

To safeguard the dignity of man as a creature endowed with a soul formed in the image and likeness of God, the Church has always demanded an exact observance of the third precept of the decalogue: "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." God has a right to demand of man that he dedicate a day of the week to worship, in which the spirit, free from material preoccupations, can lift itself up and open itself by thought and by love to heavenly things, examining in the secret of its conscience its obligatory and necessary relations towards its Creator.

In addition, man has the right and even the need to rest in order to renew the bodily strength used up by hard daily work, to give suitable recreation to the senses and to promote domestic unity, which requires frequent contact and a peaceful living together of all the members of the family.

Consequently, religion, morality and hygiene, all unite in the law of periodic repose which the Church has for centuries translated into the sanctification of Sunday through participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, a memorial and application of the redemptive work of Christ for souls.

It is with great grief that We must acknowledge and deplore the negligence of, if not the downright disrespect for, this sacred law and the consequent harmful results for the health of both body and soul of Our beloved workers.

In the name of God and for the material and spiritual interests of men, We call upon all, public authorities, employers and workers, to observe the precepts of God and His Church, and We remind each one of his grave responsibilities before God and society.

1625. Sunday—Protestant State's Inconsistency in Disowning Catholic Authority

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 139, 149, 152. [FRS No. 121.]

[p. 139] Strange as it may seem, the State, in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions.

The Sunday, as a day of the week set apart for the obligatory public worship of Almighty God, to be sanctified by a suspension of all servile labor, trade, and worldly avocations and by exercises of devotion, is purely a creation of the Catholic Church.

It is not the Jewish Sabbath; it is, in fact, entirely distinct from it, and not governed by the enactments of the Mosaic law. It is part and parcel of the system of the Catholic Church, as absolutely as Christian marriage is or any other of her sacraments, her festivals and fasts, her days of joy and mourning, her indulgences and her jubilees...

[p. 149] The Catholic Church created the Sunday and made the very regulations which have come down on the statute-books, and she still constantly, from her pulpits, her catechists' chairs, and the confessional, calls on her faithful to obey them, to sanctify the day, and refrain from all that desecrates it...

[p. 152] Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath, with the Jews and Seventh-Day Baptists. For their present practice Protestants in general have no authority but that of a Church which they disown, and there cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.

1626. Sunday, Protestants Follow Catholic Church in

SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 254, 255. Issued earlier by "The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York." [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 254] What Bible authority is there for changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week?

Who gave the Pope the authority to change a command of God?

If the Bible is the only guide for the Christian, then the Seventh Day Adventist is right in observing the Saturday with the Jew. But Catholics learn what to believe and do from the divine, infallible authority established by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church, which in Apostolic times made Sunday the day of rest to honor our Lord's resurrection on that day, [p. 255] and to mark off clearly the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin Martyr (Apol., c. 67) speaks of the early Christians meeting for the holy sacrifice of the Mass on Sunday.

Is it not strange that those who make the Bible their only teacher should inconsistently follow in this matter the tradition of the Church?

1627. Sunday, Protestants Have No Basis for

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8, (January 1883), 139, 152. [FRS No. 121.]

[p. 139] Sunday ... is purely a creation of the Catholic Church...

[p. 152] For ages all Christian nations looked to the Catholic Church, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath.

1628. Sunday, Protestants Taunted for Observance of, Against Clear Bible Command

SOURCE: Tract, "Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath-Day?" pp. 3-15, in *The Clifton Tracts*, Vol. 4 (New York: T. W. Strong, 1869). [FRS No. 53.]

[p. 3] I am going to propose a very plain and serious question, to which I would entreat all who profess to follow “the Bible and the Bible only” to give their most earnest attention. It is this: Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath-day?

The command of Almighty God stands clearly written in the Bible in these words: “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” (Exod. xx. 8, 9). And again, “Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire through out your habitations upon the Sabbath-day” (Exod. xxxv. 2, 3). How strict and precise is [p. 4] God’s commandment upon this head! No work whatever was to be done on the day which He had chosen to set apart for Himself and to make holy; He required of His people that they should not even light a fire upon that day. And accordingly, when the children of Israel “found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath-day,” “the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp” (Numbers xv. 35). Such being God’s command then, I ask again, Why do you not obey it? Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath-day?

You will answer me, perhaps, that you *do* keep holy the Sabbath-day; for that you abstain from all worldly business, and diligently go to church, and say your prayers, and read your Bible at home, every Sunday of your lives.

But *Sunday is not the Sabbath-day*. Sunday is the *first* day of the week; the Sabbath-day was the *seventh* day of the week. Almighty God did not give a commandment that men should keep holy *one day in seven*; but He named His own day, and said distinctly, “Thou shalt keep holy *the seventh day*,” and He assign- [p. 5] ed a reason for choosing this day rather than any other—a reason which belongs only to the seventh day of the week, and cannot be applied to the rest. He says, “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.” Almighty God ordered that all men should rest from their labor on the seventh day, because He too had rested on that day: He did not rest on Sunday, but on Saturday. On Sunday, which is the first day of the week, He *began* the work of creation, He did not finish it; it was on Saturday that He “*ended* His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made; 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. 2, 3). Nothing can be more plain and easy to understand than all this; and there is nobody who attempts to deny it; it is acknowledged by everybody that the day which Almighty God appointed to be kept holy was Saturday, not Sunday. Why do you then keep holy the Sunday, and not Saturday?

You will tell me that Saturday was the *Jew-* [p. 6] *ish* Sabbath, but that the *Christian* Sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or at least from which you may confidently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made. Let us see whether any such passages can be found. I will look for them in the writings of your own champions, who have attempted to defend your practice in this matter.

1. The first text which I find quoted upon the subject is this: "Let no man judge you in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days" (Col. ii. 16). I could understand a Bible Christian arguing from this passage, that we ought to make no difference between Saturday, Sunday, and every other day of the week; that under the Christian dispensation all such distinctions of days were done away with; one day was as good and as holy as another; there were to be no Sabbaths, no holy days at all. But not one syllable does it say about the obligation of the Sabbath being *transferred* from one day to another.
2. Secondly, the words of St. John are quoted, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Apoc. i. 10). Is it possible that anybody can for a moment imagine that here is a safe and clear rule for changing the weekly feast from the seventh to the first day? This passage is utterly silent upon such a subject; it does but give us Scriptural authority for calling some one day in particular (it does not even say *which* day) "the Lord's day."
3. Next we are reminded that St. Paul bade his Corinthian converts, "upon the first day of the week, lay by them in store, that there might be no gatherings" when he himself came (1 Cor. xvi. 2). How is this supposed to affect the law of the Jewish Sabbath? It commands a certain act of almsgiving to be done on the first day of the week. It says absolutely nothing about not doing certain other acts of prayer and public worship on the seventh day.
4. But it was "on the first day of the week" when the disciples were assembled with closed doors for fear of the Jews, and Jesus stood in the midst of them; and again, it was eight days afterwards (that is, on the first day of the following week) that "the disciples were within, and Thomas with them," and Jesus again came and stood in the midst (John xx. 19, 26): that is to say, it was on the evening of the day of the Resurrection that our Lord first showed Himself to many disciples gathered together; and after eight days He again showed Himself to the same company, with the further addition [p. 9] of St. Thomas. What is there in these facts to do away with the obligation of keeping holy the seventh day? Our Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week, and on the same day at evening He appears to many of His disciples; He appears again on that day week, and perhaps also on other days in the interval. Let Protestants, if they will, keep holy the first day of the week in grateful commemoration of that stupendous mystery, the Resurrection of Christ, and of the evidences which He vouchsafed to give of it to His doubting disciples; but this is no scriptural authority for ceasing to keep holy another day of the

week which God had expressly commanded to be kept holy for another and altogether different reason.

5. But lastly, we have the example of the Apostles themselves. “Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight” (Acts xx. 7). Here we have clear proof that the disciples came together for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and that they heard a sermon on a Sunday. But is there any proof that they had not done the [p. 10] same on the Saturday also? Is it not expressly written concerning those early Christians, that they “continued *daily* with one accord in the temple, breaking bread from house to house?” (Acts ii. 46). And as a matter of fact, do we not know from other sources that, in many parts of the Church, the ancient Christians were in the habit of meeting together for public worship, to receive Holy Communion, and to perform the other offices, on Saturdays just the same as on Sundays? Again, then, I say, let Protestants keep holy, if they will, the first day of the week, in order that they may resemble those Christians who were gathered together on that day in an upper chamber in Troas; but let them remember that this cannot possibly release them from the obligation of keeping holy *another* day which Almighty God has ordered to be kept holy, because on that day He “rested from all His work.”

I do not know of any other passages of holy Scripture which Protestants are in the habit of quoting to defend their practice of keeping holy the first day of the week instead of the seventh; yet surely those which I have quoted are not such as should satisfy any reasonable man, who looks upon the written word of God as *they* [p. 11] profess to look upon it, namely, as the *one only* appointed means of learning God’s will, and who really desires to learn and to obey that will in all things with humbleness and simplicity of heart. It is absolutely impossible that a reasonable and thoughtful person should be satisfied, by the texts that I have quoted, that Almighty God intended the obligation of Saturday under the old law to be transferred to Sunday under the new. And yet Protestants *do* so transfer it, and never seem to have the slightest misgivings lest, in doing so, they should be guilty of breaking one of God’s commandments. Why is this? Because, although they talk so largely about following the Bible and the Bible only, they are really guided in this matter by the voice of tradition. Yes, much as they may hate and denounce the word, they have in fact no other authority to allege for this most important change. The present generation of Protestants keep Sunday holy instead of Saturday, because they received it as part of the Christian religion from the last generation, and that generation received it from the generation before, and so on backwards from one generation to another, by a continual succession, until we come to the time of the (so- [p. 12] called) Reformation, when it so happened that those who conducted the change of religion in this country left this particular portion of Catholic faith and practice untouched.

But, had it happened otherwise,—had some one or other of the “Reformers” taken it into his head to denounce the observance of Sunday as a Popish corruption and superstition, and to insist upon it that Saturday was the day which God had appointed to be kept holy, and that He had never authorized the observance of any other,—all Protestants would have been obliged, in obedience to their professed principle of following the Bible and the Bible only, either to acknowledge this teaching as true, and to return to the observance of the ancient Jewish Sabbath, or else to deny that there is any

Sabbath at all. And so, in like manner, any one at the present day who should set about, honestly and without prejudice, to draw up for himself a form of religious belief and practice out of the written Word of God, must needs come to the same conclusion: he must either believe that the Jewish Sabbath is still binding upon men's consciences, because of the Divine command, "Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day;" or he must believe that non Sabbath at [p. 13] all is binding upon them, because of the Apostolic injunction, "Let no man judge you in respect of a festival day, or of the Sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's." Either one or the other of these conclusions he might honestly come to; but he would know nothing whatever of a *Christian* Sabbath distinct from the Jewish, celebrated on a different day, and observed in a different manner, simply because Holy Scripture itself nowhere speaks of such a thing.

Now, mind, in all this you would greatly misunderstand me if you supposed I was quarrelling with you for acting in this matter on a true and right principle, in other words, a Catholic principle, viz., the acceptance, without hesitation, of that which has been handed down to you by an unbroken tradition. I would not tear from you a single one of those shreds and fragments of Divine truth which you have retained. God forbid! They are the most precious things you possess, and by God's blessing may serve as clues to bring you out of that labyrinth of error in which you find yourselves involved, far more by the fault of your forefathers three centuries ago than by your own. What I do quarrel with you for is, not your inconsistency [p. 14] in occasionally acting on a true principle, but your adoption, as a general rule, of a false one. You keep the Sunday, and not the Saturday; and you do so rightly, for this was the practice of all Christians when Protestantism began; but you have abandoned other Catholic observances which were equally universal at that day, preferring the novelties introduced by the men who invented Protestantism, to the unvarying tradition of above 1500 years. We blame you not for making Sunday your weekly holiday instead of Saturday, but for rejecting tradition, which is the only safe and clear rule by which this observance can be justified. In outward act we do the same as yourselves in this matter; we too no longer observe the Jewish Sabbath, but Sunday in its stead; but then there is this important difference between us, that we do not pretend, as you do, to derive our authority for so doing from *a book*, but we derive it from *a living teacher*, and that teacher is the Church. Moreover, we believe that not every thing which God would have us to know and to do is written in the Bible, but that there is also an *unwritten* word of God, which we are bound to believe and to obey, just as we believe and obey the Bible itself, according to that saying of the Apostle, "Stand fast and hold the traditions which you have learned, *whether by word or by our epistle*" (2 Thess. ii. 14). We Catholics, then, have precisely the same authority for keeping Sunday holy instead of Saturday as we have for every other article of our creed, namely, the authority of "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); whereas you who are Protestants have really no authority for it whatever; for there *is* no authority for it in the Bible, and you will not allow that there *can be* authority for it anywhere else. Both you and we do, in fact, follow tradition in this matter; but *we* follow it, believing it to be a part of God's word, and the Church to be its divinely-appointed guardian and interpreter; *you* follow it, denouncing it all the time as a fallible and treacherous guide, which often "makes the commandment of God of none effect."

1629. Sunday, Protestants Taunted for Observance of—Only Seventh-day Adventists Consistent

SOURCE: “The Question Box,” *The Catholic Universe Bulletin*, 69 (Aug. 14, 1942), 4. [FRS No. 51.]

By what authority did the Church change the observance of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?

The Church changed the observance of the Sabbath to Sunday by right of the divine, infallible authority given to her by her Founder, Jesus Christ. The Protestant, claiming the Bible to be the only guide of faith, has no warrant for observing Sunday. In this matter the Seventh Day Adventist is the only consistent Protestant. Sunday as the day of rest to honor our Lord’s Resurrection dates to Apostolic times and was so established among other reasons, to mark off the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin the Martyr, speaks of it in his Apologies.

1630. Sunday—Protestants Taunted with Seventh-day Adventists’

Example

SOURCE: F. G. Lentz, *The Question Box* (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), pp. 98, 99. [FRS No. 54.]

[p. 98] Q. (a) The Bible says “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,” and we read in your literature that it is the only Bible Sabbath there is. Will you please explain how the Sunday observance originated? (b) Do you think the Seventh Day Adventists keep the right day?

A. (a) If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord. In keeping Sunday, [p. 99] non-Catholics are simply following the practise of the Catholic Church for 1800 years, a tradition, and not a Bible ordinance. What we would like to know is: Since they deny the authority of the Church, on what grounds can they base their faith of keeping Sunday. Those who keep Saturday, like the Seventh Day Adventists, unquestionably have them by the hip in this practice. And they cannot give them any sufficient answer which would satisfy an unprejudiced mind. With the Catholics there is no difficulty about the matter. For, since we deny that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, we can fall back upon the constant practise and tradition of the Church which, long before the reign of Constantine, even in the very days of the apostles themselves, were accustomed to keep the first day of the week instead of the last.

1631. Sunday, “Puritan Sabbath”

SOURCE: W. B. Selbie, “The Influence of the Old Testament on Puritanism,” in Edwyn R. Bevan and Charles Singer, eds., *The Legacy of Israel* (1928), pp. 421–423. Copyright 1927 Clarendon Press, Oxford. Used by permission.

[p. 421] Under the Church of Rome Sunday was kept as a festival. After early mass the day was given up to recreation and work was not forbidden [except “servile work”; see No. 1621]. The first indication of a stricter observance is found in a *Treatise on the Sabbath* issued by Dr. Richmond Bound in 1595. Its argument was to the effect that for the proper regulation of the Christian [p. 422] Sunday we must look to the Old Testament precepts regarding the Jewish Sabbath. These precepts were meant for all time and the command to keep holy the Sabbath day was one which Christians were bound to obey. Any form of work or recreation on Sunday was therefore unlawful. God meant man to give up to Him a seventh of his time and this was to determine his use of every day. This doctrine was not altogether new. In England the Jewish name Sabbath had been used for Sunday in a public proclamation in 1580 and in an Act of Parliament in 1585, but it was

not until Puritanism had attained a measure of strength that strict Sabbatarianism was enjoined upon all Christian people. The injunction resulted in reducing Sunday to a day of gloom and idleness and in the creation of a number of artificial sins. It was in Scotland ... that Sabbatarianism was carried to extremes... The following are typical: ‘Cite Isobell Balfort, servant to William Gordone tayleor, beeing found sleeping at the Loche syde on the Lord’s Day in tyme of Sermon,’ ‘It was reported that Margaret Brotherstone did water her kaill upon the Sabbath day, and was thairupon ordained to be cited.’ ‘Complained Margaret Brotherstone, and confessed her breach of Sabbath in watering of her kaill and thairupon ordained to give evidence in public of her repentance the next Lord’s Day.’ There is a very curious parallel in all this to Rabbinical regulations about the Sabbath which became so great a feature in later Judaism. We see the spirit of Old Testament legalism working itself out to the same ends under very different people. In this respect, [p. 423] among others, the Puritan influence has been very persistent. In many sections of the Christian Church to-day the attitude towards Sunday observance savours far more of the spirit of Puritanism than of the teaching of Him who said: ‘The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.’ A good example of the temper of the Scottish Presbyterians is to be found in their treatment of Quaker doctrine at the time of the visit of George Fox in 1647. The ministers were so much alarmed at the spread of his teaching that they drew up a number of curses which were to be read aloud in the churches and to which the people were called to say ‘Amen’ after the manner of the Israelites on Mount Ebal, e.g. ‘Cursed is he that saith, “Every man hath a light within him sufficient to lead him into salvation;” and let all the people say Amen. Cursed is he that denieth the Sabbath Day, and let all the people say Amen.’ Though it is not necessary for our argument it should perhaps be pointed out that the Sabbath as observed by the Jews themselves is not what the Puritans conceived it to be. To the Jews it is a day of happiness. The synagogue liturgy of the Sabbath is full of the joyous note. It is marked by gay dress, sumptuous meals, and a general sense of exhilaration. The Puritans knew little or nothing of synagogue worship or of Jewish homes. They had no experience of ‘the joy of the commandment’—a phrase often on Jewish lips and in Jewish hearts. They interpreted the Scripture injunctions in their own dour spirit.

1632. Sunday—“Puritan Sabbath” Established by a Backward Somersault and as an Insult to the Jews

SOURCE: Conrad Henry Moehlman, *The Wall of Separation Between Church and State*, pp. 172–174. Copyright 1951 by The Beacon Press, Boston. Used by permission.

[p. 172] Let us briefly review how the “Christian Sabbath” became a secular day of rest.

The early Protestant reformers were practically unanimous in concluding that the Sabbath was abrogated by the founding of Christianity...

[p. 173] The Protestant confessions of faith adopted in the sixteenth century fail to identify Sabbath and first day.

It was in 1595 A.D. that Nicholas Bownde published *The Doctrine of the Sabbath Plainly Laid Forth and Soundly Proven*. Bownde argued that the Sabbath existed from creation, that the first seventh day had been sanctified, that every seventh day since the first seventh day had likewise been sanctified, and that the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath was eternally obligatory. At this point he turned a backward somersault and

transformed the eternally valid seventh day into “Christian Sabbath.” He thus, as Calvin puts it, “insulted the Jews.”

The English Baptists in 1611 still called the first day of the week the “Lord’s day” and regarded it as a day of worship.

In 1647, the *Westminster Confession of Faith* accepted the curious transformation of Bownde, and in Chapter XXI affirmed: . . .

[God] appointed one day in seven for a sabbath to be kept holy unto him; which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection [p. 174] of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in turn is called the Lord’s day, and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian sabbath. . .

This new theology Calvinistic Protestantism soon generally endorsed. “Christian sabbath,” a sixteenth-century coinage, was thereupon read back into the documents of the New Testament. By the twentieth century the earlier distinctions had been so obscured that the common man is today “sure” that the fourth commandment is concerned with Sunday—an identification utterly foreign to Moses, Jesus and Paul, to say nothing of the entire Christian church prior to the sixteenth century. Moreover, the leading Christian ministers of all denominations are unaware of the fact that the New Testament nowhere changes the last day of the week into the first. The Bible has often been made to say what its authors never dreamed of saying.

1633. Sunday, Puritan Theory of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 6 (2d ed. rev.; New York: Scribner, 1901), pp. 493, 494.

[p. 493] The Anglo-American theory of the Lord’s Day, which is based on the perpetual essential obligation of the Fourth Commandment, as a part of the moral law to be observed with Christian freedom in the light of Christ’s res- [p. 494] urrection, is of Puritan origin at the close of the sixteenth century, and was first symbolically sanctioned by the Westminster standards in 1647, but has worked itself into the flesh and blood of all English-speaking Christendom.

1634. Sunday, Puritan View of

SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England* (reprint; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1930), chap. 7, Vol. 1, p. 367.

The founders of the English reformation, after abolishing most of the festivals kept before that time, had made little or no change as to the mode of observance of those they retained. Sundays and holidays stood much on the same footing as days on which no work except for good cause was to be performed, the service of the church was to be attended, and any lawful amusement might be indulged in. A just distinction, however, soon grew up; an industrious people could spare time for very few holidays; and the more scrupulous party, while they slighted the church festivals as of human appointment, prescribed a stricter observance of the Lord’s day. But it was not till about 1595 that they [the English Puritans] began to place it very nearly on the footing of the Jewish sabbath, interdicting not only the slightest action of worldly business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation.

1635. Sunday, Puritans Use the Word “Sabbath” Instead of

SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England* (reprint; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1930), chap. 7, Vol. 1, pp. 370, 371.

[p. 370] The House of Commons displayed their attachment to the puritan maxims, or their dislike of the prelatical clergy, by bringing in bills to enforce a greater strictness in this respect. A circumstance that occurred in the session of 1621 will serve to prove their

fanatical violence. A bill having been brought in “for the better observance of the Sabbath, usually called Sunday,” one Mr. Shepherd, sneering at the puritans, remarked that, as Saturday was dies Sabbati, this might be entitled a bill for the observance of Saturday, commonly called Sunday. This witticism brought on his head the wrath of that dangerous assembly... The use of the word Sabbath [p. 371] instead of Sunday became in that age a distinctive mark of the puritan party.

1636. Sunday, Reformers’ View of (Ordained by Church, Not Based on Decalogue)

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (Lutheran, 1530), part 2, art. 7, “Of Ecclesiastical Power,” trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 68, 69.

[p. 68] What is, then, to be thought of the Lord’s day, and of like rites of temples? Hereunto they [ours] answer, that it is lawful for Bishops or Pastors to make ordinances, whereby things may be done in order in the Church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men’s consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, and think that they sin when they violate them, without the offense of others. So Paul ordained, ‘that women should cover their heads in the congregation’ (1 Cor. xi. 6); ‘that the interpreters of Scripture should be heard in order in the Church’ (1 Cor. xiv. 27), etc...

Such is the observation of the [p. 69] Lord’s day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and like holidays and rites. For they that think that the observation of the Lord’s day was appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. The Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the [Christian] Church did for that purpose appoint the Lord’s day: which for this cause also seemed to have been pleasing, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the Sabbath, nor of another day, was of necessity.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Schaff in his footnote rejects “this view of the Christian Sabbath, which was held by all the Reformers,” and still prevails on the Continent of Europe. It overlooks, he says, the fact that “the Sabbath has a moral as well as a ceremonial aspect, and is a part of the *Decalogue*, which the Lord did not come ‘to destroy, but to fulfill’ (Matt. v. 17, 18; comp. xxii. 37–40; Rom. iii. 31; x. 4). As a periodical day of rest for the body, and worship for the soul, the Sabbath is founded in the physical and moral constitution of man, and reflects the rest of God after the work of creation (Gen. ii. 3). Under this view it is of primitive origin, like the institution of marriage, and of perpetual obligation, like the other commandments of the *Decalogue*. A lax theory of the Sabbath naturally leads to a lax practice, and tends to destroy the blessing of this holy day. The Anglo-American churches have an unspeakable advantage over those of the Continent of Europe in their higher theory and practice of Sabbath observance, which dates from the close of the sixteenth century. Even Puritan rigor is better than the opposite extreme.”]

1637. Sunday, Rest on—Constantine’s Law and Later Legislation

SOURCE: George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribner, 1900), p. 118. [FRS No. 99.]

From earlier times it had been the custom of the Church to observe Sunday by special religious exercises and by an increasing abstinence from the pursuits of secular life. This custom was made a [church] law by the Council of Laodicea...

Constantine legally recognized it, in 321, by forbidding the courts of justice to hold their sessions on that day, except for the humane purpose of manumitting slaves. He also commanded his soldiers to refrain from their customary military exercises. The public

games, however, still continued to attract many from the proper observance of Sunday and of the Church festivals. But in 425 a law was passed forbidding all games on such days.

1638. Sunday, Rest on, Council of Laodicea Represents First Church Legislation on

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 30, 31. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 30] The first important conciliar decree in the history of the Sunday observance is that contained in the 29th canon of the Council of Laodicea [4th century]... The Christians of Phrygia had fallen into the Jewish practice of abstaining from work on Saturdays and were insisting that others do likewise. Against these “Judaizers,” the Council acted, warning the faithful that they should work on Saturday and not rest like the Jews. However, the council adds, let them as Christians rest on Sunday in memory of the Resurrection, “if that be possible” [see No. 1416]. Suarez explains this phrase “if that be possible” (*si modo possunt*) in his treatise on Sunday observance. The remarkable feature about this canon was its extreme moderation, for it enjoined Sunday rest only *as far as possible*—[p. 31] *sible*—a clear proof that as yet there was none of the strictness that characterized the later Sunday law.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Sunday observance had already long existed, and Sabbath church services and private observance lasted long afterwards, but this council took the first step in a series of church enactments on the subject, and it included, along with an exhortation to rest on Sunday, a clear-cut prohibition of Sabbath rest, under anathema.]

1639. Sunday, Rest on, Councils of the Church Enforce

SOURCE: M. G. Glazebrook, “Sunday,” in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 12, pp. 105, 106. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner’s Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 105] The Council of Orleans (538), while protesting [p. 106] against an excessive Sabbatarianism, forbade all field work under pain of censure; and the Council of Macon (585) laid down that the Lord’s Day ‘is the day of perpetual rest, which is suggested to us by the type of the seventh day in the law and the prophets,’ and ordered a complete cessation of all kinds of business. How far the movement had gone by the end of the 6th cent. is shown by a letter of Gregory the Great (pope 590–604) protesting against the prohibition of baths on Sunday.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: For the first church council that legislated on Sunday observance, see No. 1638.]

1640. Sunday, Rest on, Not Obligatory in Jerome’s Day

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 31, 32. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 31] The writings of St. Jerome should be one of the first places in which one would search and hope for light on the relation of the Sunday to the Sabbath. However, one thing which one promptly notices in the writings of this great Scriptural writer in his references to the Sunday is his spiritual interpretation of the Sunday repose, and the absence of an insistence on a legal and sabbatical observance of the day. Two references to a corporal Sunday rest are met, in one of which such rest seems to be pictured as the practice, while the other seems to indicate the contrary. In a letter to Eustochium, he described the lives of some monks of the desert, and mentioned that on Sunday they devoted their time entirely to prayer and to reading, thus implying a rest from the labors of the week. However, in [p. 32] a later letter (incidentally to the same lady), he described the life of a certain community of nuns of Bethlehem, who went to church on Sunday

only, and on their return went to their allotted tasks and made garments either for themselves or for others. Surely if there had been any universal obligation of Sunday rest, this practice of the nuns would have drawn some criticism from the Saint. However, from the tone of the letter, he seemed rather to be praising the diligence of the nuns. From these references one may infer that the Sunday rest was a matter of local custom.

1641. Sunday, Rest on, Not Obligatory on Nuns in Jerome's Day

SOURCE: *The Letters of St. Jerome*, Letter 108, To Eustochium, sec. 20, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 6, p. 206.

On the Lord's day only they [nuns in Bethlehem] proceeded to the church beside which they lived, each company following its own mother-superior. Returning home in the same order, they then devoted themselves to their allotted tasks, and made garments either for themselves or else for others.

1642. Sunday Law, First (March, 321), City Business Closed by

SOURCE: *Codex Justinianus*, lib. 3, tit. 12, 3; trans. in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 380, note 1. [See *FRS* No. 39.]

On the venerable Day of the Sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of heaven should be lost. (Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time [A.D. 321].)

1643. Sunday Law, First (March, 321), Civil, Not Christian

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 379, 380.

[p. 379] So long as Christianity was not recognized and protected by the state, the observance of Sunday was purely religious, a strictly voluntary service, but exposed to continual interruption from the bustle of the world and a hostile community...

Constantine is the founder, in part at least, of the *civil* observance of Sunday, by which alone the religious observance of it in the church could be made universal and could be properly secured... [p. 380] But the Sunday law of Constantine must not be overrated... There is no reference whatever in his law either to the fourth commandment or to the resurrection of Christ. Besides he expressly exempted the country districts, where paganism still prevailed, from the prohibition of labor... Christians and pagans had been accustomed to festival rests; Constantine made these rests to synchronize, and gave the preference to Sunday.

1644. Sunday Law, First—Constantine's Attempt to Unite Pagans and Christians

SOURCE: H. G. Heggveit, *Illustreret Kirkehistorie* (Christiania: Cammermeyers Boghandel, 1891–95), p. 202.

Constantine labored at this time untiringly to unite the worshipers of the old and the new faith in one religion. All his laws and contrivances are aimed at promoting this amalgamation of religions. He would by all lawful and peaceable means melt together a purified heathenism and a moderated Christianity... His injunction that the "Day of the Sun" should be a general rest day was characteristic of his standpoint... Of all his blending and melting together of Christianity and heathenism none is more easy to see

through than this making of his Sunday law. “The Christians worshiped their Christ, the heathen their sun-god; according to the opinion of the Emperor, the objects for worship in both religions were essentially the same.”

1645. Sunday Law, First, Pagan and Christian in Scope

SOURCE: Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity*, pp. 236, 237. Copyright 1928 by G. P. Putnam’s Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

[p. 236] In the year 321 the Emperor Constantine, who was not yet a declared Christian, but was still hovering between paganism and Christianity, issued a decree making Sunday a compulsory day of rest; but the fact that he speaks of Sunday as “the venerable day of the Sun” shows that he was thinking of it as a traditional sun-festival at the same time that he thought of it as a Christian holy-day... Sunday came to be observed throughout Europe as it is still observed [p. 237] by Roman Catholics, namely, as a day on which, like our Christmas, people went to church in the morning and then gave themselves over to rest or to holiday-making and sports.

1646. Sunday Law, First, “Parent” of Sunday Laws of Church and State

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 261. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

This [Constantine’s decree of March, 321] is the “parent” Sunday law making it a day of rest and release from labor. For from this day to the present there have been decrees about the observance of Sunday which have profoundly influenced European and American society. When the Church became a part of State under the Christian emperors Sunday observance was enforced by civil statutes and later, when the Empire was past, the Church in the hands of the papacy enforced it by ecclesiastical, and also influenced it by civil enactments.

1647. Sunday Law, of Constantine (July, 321), Permitting Manumission of Slaves on Sunday

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 2. 8. 1, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 44. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

Just as it appears to Us most unseemly that the Day of the Sun (Sunday), which is celebrated on account of its own veneration, should be occupied with legal altercations and with noxious controversies of the litigation of contending parties, so it is pleasant and fitting that those acts which are especially desired shall be accomplished on that day. I. Therefore all men shall have the right to emancipate and to manumit on this festive day, and the legal formalities thereof are not forbidden. [July 3, 321.]

1648. Sunday Laws, After Constantine

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 29. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

Constantine’s decree marked the beginning of a long, though intermittent series of imperial decrees in support of Sunday rest.

1649. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Change From Pagan Ordinance to Christian Regulation

SOURCE: Hutton Webster, *Rest Days*, pp. 122, 123, 270. Copyright 1916 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 122] This legislation by Constantine probably bore no relation to Christianity; it appears, on the contrary, that the emperor, in his capacity of Pontifex Maximus, was only adding the day of the Sun, the worship of which was then firmly [p. 123] established in the Roman Empire, to the other ferial days of the sacred calendar...

[p. 270] What began, however, as a pagan ordinance, ended as a Christian regulation; and a long series of imperial decrees, during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, enjoined with increasing stringency abstinence from labour on Sunday.

1650. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Increased Strictness

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 261. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The emperors after Constantine made Sunday observance more stringent but in no case was their legislation based on the Old Testament... At the Third Synod of Aureliani (Orléans) in 538 rural work was forbidden but the restriction against preparing meals and similar work on Sunday was regarded as a superstition. After Justinian's death in 565 various *epistolae decretales* were passed by the popes about Sunday. One of Gregory I (590–604) forbade men “to yoke oxen or to perform any other work, except for approved reasons,” while another of Gregory II (715–731) said: “We decree that all Sundays be observed from vespers to vespers and that all unlawful work be abstained from.” ...

Charlemagne at Aquisgranum (Aachen) in 788 decreed that all ordinary labor on the Lord's Day be forbidden since it was against the Fourth Commandment, especially labor in the field or vineyard which Constantine had exempted.

1651. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Theodosius I and Colleagues Forbid Litigation on the “Lord's Day”

SOURCE: Law of Gratian Valentinian, and Theodosius, Nov. 3, 386, in *Theodosian Code* 11. 7. 13, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 300. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

On the Day of the Sun (Sunday), which our ancestors rightly called the Lord's Day, the prosecution of all litigation and actions shall entirely cease. No person shall demand payment of either a public or a private debt. There shall be no cognizance of any contention, even before arbitrators, whether these arbitrators be demanded in court or voluntarily chosen. If any person should turn aside from the inspiration and ritual of holy religion, he shall be adjudged not only infamous but also sacrilegious.

1652. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Theodosius II Forbids Circus and Theater on Sunday

SOURCE: Law of Theodosius II, Feb. 1, 425, in *Theodosian Code* 15. 5. 5, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 433. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

On the following occasions all amusements of the theaters and the circuses shall be denied throughout all cities to the people thereof, and the minds of Christians and of the faithful shall be wholly occupied in the worship of God: namely, on the Lord's day, which is the first day of the whole week, on the Natal Day and Epiphany of Christ, and on the day of Easter and of Pentecost, as long as the vestments that imitate the light of the celestial font attest to the new light of holy baptism; at the time also when the commemoration of the Apostolic Passion, the teacher of all Christianity, is duly celebrated by everyone. If any persons even now are enslaved by the madness of the Jewish impiety or the error and insanity of stupid paganism, they must know that there is a time for prayer and a time for pleasure. No man shall suppose that in the case of spectacles in honor of Our Divine Majesty he is, as it were, under some major compulsion by reason of the necessity in his duty to the Emperor, and that he will incur for himself the displeasure of Our Serenity unless he should neglect the divine religion and should give attention to such spectacles and if he should show less devotion to Us

than customary. Let no one doubt that then especially is devotion paid to Our Clemency by humankind, when the reverence of the whole earth is paid to the virtues and merits of the omnipotent God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3, p. 106) shows that the Council of Carthage (399 or 401) had insisted upon this legislation. The bishops wished to find a way of compelling church attendance.]

1653. Sunday Laws, After Fall of Western Rome, Charlemagne, 789

SOURCE: Charlemagne, *Capitularia* (Capitularies [Laws]), *Capitulare Ecclesias[t]icum a[nno] 789* (Ecclesiastical Capitulary for the year 789), sec. 81, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Leges*, Vol. 1 (reprint; Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1925), p. 66. Latin.

To the Bishops, to All: And we decree according to what the Lord commanded also in the law, that servile work shall not be done on the Lord's days, and just as my father of blessed memory commanded in his synodal edicts, that is, that men shall not carry on rural work, neither in cultivating the vine, nor in plowing in the fields [etc.]... Likewise the women shall not do weaving [etc.] ... in order that in every way the honor and rest of the Lord's day may be kept. But let them come together from everywhere to the church to the celebration of the mass, and praise God in all the good things which He has done for us on that day.

1654. Sunday Laws, American Colonial (New Haven Colony)

SOURCE: Charles J. Hoadly, *Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven, From May, 1653, to the Union, Together With the New Haven Code of 1656* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Company, 1858), p. 605.

Whosoever shall prophane the Lords day, or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, Recreation, or otherwise, whether wilfully, or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally according to the nature, and measure of the sinn, and offence. But if the Court upon examination, by clear, and satisfying evidence find That the sin was proudly, presumptuously, & with a high hand committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death, That all others may feare and shun such provoking Rebellious courses.

1655. Sunday Laws, American Colonial (Virginia)

SOURCE: For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. *Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, c*, in Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Colonies in North America* (Washington: William Q. Force, 1844), Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 11.

Every man and woman shall reparaire in the morning to the divine service, and Sermons preached upon the Sabbath both day, and in the afternoon to divine service, and Catechising, vpon paine for the first fault to lose their provision, and allowance for the whole weeke following, for the second to lose the said allowance, and also to be whiptt, and for the third to suffer death.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This was not a law enacted by the Colony of Virginia, but was part of a set of harsh laws imposed by an English governor. It was never actually enforced.]

1656. Sunday Laws, British—Charles II's Law, Model for American Laws

SOURCE: 29 Charles II, chap. 7, in [British] *Statutes at Large* (1763), Vol. 3, p. 388.

Be it enacted ... that all and every Person and Persons whatsoever, shall on every Lord's Day apply themselves to the Observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the Duties of Piety and true Religion, publickly and privately; (4) and that no ... Person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly Labour, Business or Work of

their ordinary Callings, upon the Lord's Day, or any Part thereof (Works of Necessity and Charity only excepted;) . . . (6) and that no Person or Persons whatsoever, shall publicly cry, shew forth, or expose to Sale, any Wares, Merchandizes, Fruit, Herbs, Goods or Chattels whatsoever.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This law of the 29th year of Charles II, valid in England for nearly two centuries, became the model for many American colonial laws, hence of our State Sunday laws.]

1657. Sunday Laws—Canada (Lord's Day Act, 1952)

SOURCE: The Revised Statutes of Canada 1952, chap. 171; Vol. 3, pp. 3709–3713.

[p. 3709] CHAPTER 171.

An Act respecting the Lord's Day.

Short Title.

1. This Act may be cited as the *Lord's Day Act*. R.S., c. 123, s. 1.

Interpretation.

2. In this Act,

- (a) "employer" includes every person to whose orders or directions any other person is by his employment bound to conform;
- (b) "Lord's Day" means the period of time that begins at twelve o'clock on Saturday afternoon and ends at twelve o'clock on the following afternoon;
- (c) "performance" includes any game, match, sport, contest, exhibition or entertainment;
- (d) "person" has the meaning that it has in the *Criminal Code*;
- (e) "provincial Act" means the charter of any municipality, or any public Act of any province, whether passed before or since Confederation;
- (f) "railway" includes steam railway, electric railway, street railway and tramway; and
- (g) "vessel" includes any kind of vessel or boat used for conveying passengers or freight by water. R.S., c. 123, s. 2.

3. (1) Nothing herein prevents the operation on the Lord's Day for passenger traffic by any railway company incorporated by or subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada of its railway where such operation is not otherwise prohibited.

(2) Nothing herein prevents the operation on the Lord's Day for passenger traffic of any railway subject to the legislative authority of any province, unless such railway is prohibited by provincial authority from so operating. R.S., c. 123, s. 3.

[p. 3710] Prohibitions.

4. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided herein, or in any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to sell or offer for sale or purchase any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate, or to carry on or transact any business of his ordinary calling, or in connection with such calling, or for gain to do, or employ any other person to do, on that day, any work, business, or labour, R.S., c. 123, s. 4.

5. Except in cases of emergency, it is not lawful for any person to require any employee engaged in any work of receiving, transmitting or delivering telegraph or telephone messages, or in the work of any industrial process, or in connection with transportation, to do on the Lord's Day the usual work of his ordinary calling, unless such employee is allowed during the next six days of such week, twenty-four consecutive hours without labour. R.S., c. 123, s. 5.

6. (1) It is not lawful for any person, on the Lord's Day, except as provided in any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to engage in any public game or contest for gain, or for any prize or reward, or to be present thereat, or to provide, engage in, or

be present at any performance or public meeting, elsewhere than in a church, at which any fee is charged, directly or indirectly, either for admission to such performance or meeting, or to any place within which the same is provided, or for any service or privilege thereat.

(2) When any performance at which an admission fee or any other fee is so charged is provided in any building or place to which persons are conveyed for hire by the proprietors or managers of such performance or by any one acting as their agent or under their control, the charge for such conveyance shall be deemed an indirect payment of such fee within the meaning of this section. R.S., c. 123, s. 6.

7. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided by any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to run, conduct, or convey by any mode of conveyance any excursion on which passengers are conveyed for hire, and having for its principal or only object the carriage on that day of such passengers for amusement or pleasure, and passengers so conveyed shall not be deemed to be travellers within the meaning of this Act. R.S., c. 123, s. 7.

[p. 3711] 8. (1) It is not lawful for any person to advertise in any manner whatsoever any performance or other thing prohibited by this Act.

(2) It is not lawful for any person to advertise in Canada in any manner whatsoever any performance or other thing that if given or done in Canada would be a violation of this Act. R.S., c. 123, s. 8.

9. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day to shoot with or use any gun, rifle or other similar engine, either for gain, or in such a manner or in such places as to disturb other persons in attendance at public worship or in the observance of that day. R.S., c. 123, s. 9.

10. It is not lawful for any person to bring into Canada for sale or distribution, or to sell or distribute within Canada, on the Lord's Day, any foreign newspaper or publication classified as a newspaper. R.S., c. 123, s. 10.

Works of Necessity and Mercy Excepted.

11. Notwithstanding anything herein contained, any person may on the Lord's Day do any work of necessity or mercy, and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the ordinary meaning of the expression "work of necessity or mercy," it is hereby declared that it shall be deemed to include the following classes of work:

- (a) any necessary or customary work in connection with divine worship;
- (b) work for the relief of sickness and suffering, including the sale of drugs, medicines and surgical appliances by retail;
- (c) receiving, transmitting, or delivering telegraph or telephone messages;
- (d) starting or maintaining fires, making repairs to furnaces and repairs in cases of emergency, and doing any other work, when such fires, repairs or work are essential to any industry or industrial process of such a continuous nature that it cannot be stopped without serious injury to such industry, or its product, or to the plant or property used in such process;
- (e) starting or maintaining fires, and ventilating, pumping out and inspecting mines, when any such work is essential to the protection of property, life or health;
- (f) any work without the doing of which on the Lord's Day, electric current, light, heat, cold air, water or gas cannot be continuously supplied for lawful purposes;
- [p. 3712] (g) the conveying of travelers and work incidental thereto;

- (h) the continuance to their destination of trains and vessels in transit when the Lord's Day begins, and work incidental thereto;
- (i) loading and unloading merchandise, at intermediate points, on or from passenger boats or passenger trains;
- (j) keeping railway tracks clear of snow or ice, making repairs in cases of emergency, or doing any other work of a like incidental character necessary to keep the lines and tracks open on the Lord's Day;
- (k) work before six o'clock in the forenoon and after eight o'clock in the afternoon of yard crews in handling cars in railway yards;
- (l) loading, unloading and operating any ocean-going vessel that otherwise would be unduly delayed after her scheduled time of sailing, or any vessel that otherwise would be in imminent danger of being stopped by the closing of navigation; or loading or unloading before seven o'clock in the morning or after eight o'clock in the afternoon any grain, coal or ore-carrying vessel after the 15th of September;
- (m) the caring for milk, cheese, and live animals, and the unloading of and caring for perishable products and live animals, arriving at any point during the Lord's Day;
- (n) the operation of any toll or draw-bridge, or any ferry or boat authorized by competent authority to carry passengers on the Lord's Day;
- (o) the hiring of horses and carriages or small boats for the personal use of the hirer or his family for any purpose not prohibited by this Act;
- (p) any unavoidable work after six o'clock in the afternoon of the Lord's Day, in the preparation of the regular Monday morning edition of a daily newspaper;
- (q) the conveying Her Majesty's mails and work incidental thereto;
- (r) the delivery of milk for domestic use, and the work of domestic servants and watchmen;
- (s) the operation by any Canadian electric street railway company, whose line is interprovincial or international, of its cars, for passenger traffic, on the Lord's Day, on any line or branch that is, on the day of the coming into force of this Act, regularly so operated;
- (t) work done by any person in the public service of Her Majesty while acting therein under any regulation or direction of any department of the Government;
- [p. 3713] (u) any unavoidable work by fishermen after six o'clock in the afternoon of the Lord's Day, in the taking of fish;
- (v) all operations connected with the making of maple sugar and maple syrup in the maple grove;
- (w) any unavoidable work on the Lord's Day to save property in cases of emergency, or where such property is in imminent danger of destruction or serious injury; and
- (x) any work that the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, having regard to the object of this Act, and with the object of preventing undue delay, deems necessary to permit in connection with the freight traffic of any railway. R.S., c. 123, s. 11; 1938, c. 53, s. 3.

1658. Sunday Laws, Catholic Church New Champion of

SOURCE: Richard Cohen, "Blue Sunday," *The Christian Century*, 78 (Jan. 4, 1961), 11. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

For three centuries Protestantism was the sole guardian in America of the Christian Sabbath. To police enforcement of Sunday statutes and to resist efforts to liberalize the laws, the Lord's Day Alliance was founded, just as the Anti-Saloon League, the Society

for the Suppression of Vice and the Watch and Ward Society were established to meet other threats to the Protestant moral code.

In recent years, however, organized Protestantism seems to have yielded primary responsibility for guarding the Christian Sabbath to the Roman Catholic Church. Interest in Sunday laws and their enforcement is no longer of major importance in the Protestant hierarchy of values, and the Lord's Day Alliance has become something of a stepchild of American Protestantism. The Catholic Church has become the new champion of the Sabbath [Sunday].

1659. Sunday Laws, a Catholic Program Includes

SOURCE: Louis [François] Veuillot, *Illusion Libérale* ("The Liberal Illusion"), first printed 1866, in his *Oeuvres Complètes* ("Complete Works"), Vol. 10 (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1929), pp. 347, 348. [See [FRS No 27.](#)]

[p. 347] Error has no divine right to teach; it has no divine right to increase and multiply. Truth may tolerate error [if it so desires]; error owes it freedom.

Second, partisans of error having taken the upper hand and enthroned in the world so-called principles which are the negation of truth, and consequently are an element of destruction of order, we leave to them these false principles until they become disillusioned or die because of them, and we keep our truths, by which we live.

Third, when the time comes, when proof has been made and it will be necessary to rebuild the social edifice according to eternal rules, whether it be tomorrow or [p. 348] centuries from now, Catholics will arrange things to suit themselves. Without thought for those who would remain in death, they will establish laws of life. They will put Jesus Christ in His place, at the top, and He will no longer be insulted. They will bring up their children to know God and to honor their fathers. They will enforce the indissolubility of marriage and, if the dissenters do not approve, their sons will approve. They will impose religious observance of Sunday in behalf and for the good of society as a whole, even though forced to let free-thinkers and Jews observe, on their own, *incognito*, Monday or Saturday. Those whom this law might inconvenience, will be inconvenienced. No longer will respect be refused to the Creator, nor rest to the human being, for the sole purpose of giving satisfaction to certain maniacs whose frenzy so stupidly and so insolently lead a whole people into sin. Moreover, their houses, like ours, will thus be made stronger, and their fields more fertile.

1660. Sunday Laws, Catholic Support of, Earlier Position Reversed

SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 71. Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

One of the oddities of the situation is that—in the North, at least—the Catholic Church, which was once the chief opponent of Sunday laws, has now become one of their chief defenders in the commercial sphere. Only ten years ago Canon Stokes was able to say that “the Roman Catholic Church as distinct from Protestantism is not much interested in Sunday laws.” Today, while the Protestant-dominated Lord's Day Alliance has declined in power, Catholicism has begun to place new emphasis on a non-commercial Sunday. Both Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Stritch issued special statements in 1956 championing Sunday laws. Cardinal Cushing, in 1959, severely criticized a three-judge federal court in Massachusetts for declaring the Sunday law of that state unconstitutional in a kosher market case. He said: “Let us ourselves eliminate

from Sunday the unrestrained commercialism which the courts, in deference to what they interpret to be our own wishes, are attempting to legalize.”

1661. Sunday Laws—Coercion by Statute Useless

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 75, 76. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 75] The nature of the day [Sunday] indicates the absurdity of human legislation to enforce its observance. Church membership, baptism, the breaking of bread in memory of the Lord, the assembling of disciples in the church, the bringing of gifts for the work of the kingdom,—all these are clearly recognized in the New Testament as belonging to Christian life; but in every case the obligation is left with the enlightened conscience, and any effort to coerce men by statutory enactment is repudiated by all liberty loving states. The same principle applies with equal force to the Lord’s Day.

All men ought to honor the Lord, who loved them, and gave himself for them; but if they do not, nothing is gained for him or for them by legal compulsion. As well compel men to observe the ordinances of the Lord’s house as to observe the sanctities of the Lord’s Day. A form of godliness without the power thereof [p. 76] counts for nothing in the conflicts of life.

1662. Sunday Laws, Contrary to the Gospel (Alexander Campbell)

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, quoted in Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868), p. 528.

The gospel commands no duty which can be performed without faith in the Son of God. “Whatever is not of faith is sin.”

But to compel men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institution, such as the Lord’s day, is commanding duty to be performed without faith in God.

Therefore, to command unbelievers or natural men to observe, in any sense, the Lord’s day, is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel.

1663. Sunday Laws, Enactment of, an Unwitting Acknowledgment of Catholic Authority

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, “The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement,” *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 139. [FRS No. 121.]

Strange as it may seem, the State [of New York], in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions. [See No. 1624.]

1664. Sunday Laws, Evil of

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, p. 67. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

In any form Sunday legislation is either religious or secular. If religious, it violates the principle of separation between church and state. If secular, it tends to secularize the Lord’s Day and to obliterate the distinction between the righteous and the wicked by having the same human rule for each. In either case it works mischief, and ought to be expunged from the statute books of every enlightened state.

1665. Sunday Laws, Not Sabbath Laws

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 51, 52. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 51] On the baseless assumption that the seventh day, set apart and established in the law, has been in some way superseded by the first day, recognized in the gospel, a good deal of hurtful legislation has been enacted on the pretext of sanctifying the Sabbath

and honoring God. Men who really do know better are willing to wrest the Scriptures and appeal to popular ignorance in order to gain a point. Such conduct is unworthy of any good cause.

[p. 52] This error had its origin in the iniquitous union of church and state, and is a relic of that oppressive system. Early Christians never confounded the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. For five hundred years after Christ the distinction between the two, so clearly marked in the Scriptures, was strictly maintained.

1666. Sunday Laws, Principle of Church-State Separation Often Overlooked in

SOURCE: Ronald Goetz, "An Eschatological Manifesto," *The Christian Century*, 76 (Nov. 2, 1960), 1274. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Often the Protestants who argue most militantly against government aid to church-sponsored institutions, such as parochial schools, see no contradiction of the principle of separation of church and state in their advocacy of blue laws, Sunday closing laws or prohibition—which are in the last analysis nothing but the legislation of what such Protestants take to be Christian morality. Nor are such Protestants embarrassed in accepting patronage from the state: tax advantages, special mail rates and the like.

1667. Sunday Laws—Underlying Assumption Is Vicious

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, p. 58. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

In current usage the so-called Sabbath legislation does not apply to the Bible Sabbath at all, but to the first day of the week. The practical effect of such legislation generally is to annul the divine commandment, and to put in its place a human statute. The vicious assumption underlying such legislation is that divine law may be changed or amended by human enactment. In thousands of minds to-day the law of God concerning the Sabbath day is rendered of none effect by the so-called Sabbath legislation enacted by civil governments. Such legislation belittles the authority of Jehovah.

1668. Sunday Laws, a Union of Church and State

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 152. [FRS No. 121.]

For ages all Christian nations looked to the Catholic Church, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church has no good reason for its Sunday theory... There cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.

If it be a mere state holiday, most of the legislative provisions are a mere tyrannical interference with the liberty of a citizen...

It is not a mere legal holiday; it is the Lord's day, set apart by the Catholic Church. It is a religious holiday, and so long as it is maintained by law it is therefore only a sorry farce to tell us that in this country there is no union of Church and State.

1669. Sunday Laws — U.S. Supreme Court Approves Maryland Law

SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court, opinion of the Court, rendered by Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *McGowan v. Maryland*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 431–434, 444, 445, 449–453.

[p. 431] The essence of appellants' "establishment" argument is that Sunday is the Sabbath day of the predominant Christian sects; that the purpose of the enforced stoppage of labor on that day is to facilitate and encourage church attendance; that the purpose of

setting Sunday as a day of universal rest is to induce people with no religion or people with marginal religious beliefs to join the predominant Christian sects; that the purpose of the atmosphere of tranquility created by Sunday closing is to aid the conduct of church services and religious observance of the sacred day. In substantiating their “establishment” argument, appellants rely on the wording of the present Maryland statutes, on earlier versions of the current Sunday laws and on prior judicial characterizations of these laws by the Maryland Court of Appeals. Although only the constitutionality of § 521, the section under which appellants have been convicted, is immediately before us in this litigation, inquiry into the history of Sunday Closing Laws in our country, in addition to an examination of the Maryland Sunday closing statutes in their entirety and of their history, is relevant to the decision of whether the Maryland Sunday law in question is one respecting an establishment of religion. There is no dispute that the original laws which dealt with Sunday labor were motivated by religious forces. But what we must decide is whether present Sunday legislation, having undergone extensive changes from the earliest forms, still retains its religious character.

Sunday Closing Laws go far back into American history, having been brought to the colonies with a background of English legislation dating to the thirteenth century. In 1237, Henry III forbade the frequenting of markets on [p. 432] Sunday; the Sunday showing of wools at the staple was banned by Edward III in 1354; in 1409, Henry IV prohibited the playing of unlawful games on Sunday; Henry VI proscribed Sunday fairs in churchyards in 1444 and, four years later, made unlawful all fairs and markets and all showings of any goods or merchandise; Edward VI disallowed Sunday bodily labor by several injunctions in the mid-sixteenth century; various Sunday sports and amusements were restricted in 1625 by Charles I. Lewis, *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation*, 82–108; Johnson and Yost, *Separation of Church and State*, 221. The law of the colonies to the time of the Revolution and the basis of the Sunday laws in the States was 29 Charles II, c. 7 (1677). It provided, in part:

“For the better observation and keeping holy the Lord’s day, commonly called Sunday: be it enacted ... that all the laws enacted and in force concerning the observation of the day, *and repairing to the church thereon*, be carefully put in execution; and that all and every person and persons whatsoever shall upon every Lord’s day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately; and that no tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer, or other person whatsoever, *shall do or exercise any worldly labor or business or work* of their ordinary callings upon the Lord’s day, or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted); ... and that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose for sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels, whatsoever, upon the Lord’s day, or any part thereof...” (Emphasis added.)

[p. 433] Observation of the above language, and of that of the prior mandates, reveals clearly that the English Sunday legislation was in aid of the established church.

The American colonial Sunday restrictions arose soon after settlement. Starting in 1650, the Plymouth Colony proscribed servile work, unnecessary travelling, sports, and the sale of alcoholic beverages on the Lord’s day and enacted laws concerning church attendance. The Massachusetts Bay Colony and the Connecticut and New Haven Colonies enacted similar prohibitions, some even earlier in the seventeenth century. The religious orientation of the colonial statutes was equally apparent. For example, a 1629 Massachusetts Bay instruction began, “And to the end the Sabbath may be celebrated in a religious manner...” A 1653 enactment spoke of Sunday activities “which things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, and the profanation of his holy

Sabbath, the sanctification whereof is sometimes put for all duties immediately respecting the service of God...” Lewis, *op. cit., supra*, at pp. 160–195, particularly at 167, 169. These laws persevered after the Revolution and, at about the time of the First Amendment’s adoption, each of the colonies had laws of some sort restricting Sunday labor. See note, 73 Harv. L. Rev. 729–730, 739–740; Johnson and Yost, *op. cit., supra*, at pp. 222–223.

But, despite the strongly religious origin of these laws, beginning before the eighteenth century, nonreligious [p. 434] arguments for Sunday closing began to be heard more distinctly...

[p. 444] In light of the evolution of our Sunday Closing Laws through the centuries, and of their more or less recent emphasis upon secular considerations, it is not difficult to discern that as presently written and administered, most of them, at least, are of a secular rather than of a religious character, and that presently they bear no relationship to establishment of religion as those words are used in the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout this century and longer, both the federal and state governments have oriented their activities very largely toward improvement of the health, safety, recreation and general well-being of our citizens. Numerous laws affecting public health, safety factors in industry, laws affecting hours and conditions of labor of women and children, week-end diversion at parks and beaches, and cultural activities of various kinds, now point the way toward the good life for all. Sunday Closing Laws, like those before us, have become part and parcel of this great governmental concern wholly apart from their original purposes or connotations. The present purpose and effect of most of them is to provide a uniform day of rest for all citizens; the fact that this day is Sunday, a day of particular significance for the dominant Christian sects, does not bar the State from achieving its secular goals. To say that the States cannot prescribe Sunday as a day of rest for these purposes solely because centuries ago such laws had their genesis in religion would give a constitutional interpretation of hostility to the public welfare rather than one of mere separation of church and State...

[p. 449] After engaging in the close scrutiny demanded of us when First Amendment liberties are at issue, we accept the State Supreme Court’s determination that the statutes’ present purpose and effect is not to aid religion but to set aside a day of rest and recreation.

But, this does not answer all of appellant’s contentions. We are told that the State has other means at its disposal [p. 450] to accomplish its secular purpose, other courses that would not even remotely or incidentally give state aid to religion. On this basis, we are asked to hold these statutes invalid on the ground that the State’s power to regulate conduct in the public interest may only be executed in a way that does not unduly or unnecessarily infringe upon the religious provisions of the First Amendment. See *Cantwell v. Connecticut, supra*, at pp. 304–305. However relevant this argument may be, we believe that the factual basis on which it rests is not supportable. It is true that if the State’s interest were simply to provide for its citizens a periodic respite from work, a regulation demanding that everyone rest one day in seven, leaving the choice of the day to the individual, would suffice.

However, the State’s purpose is not merely to provide a one-day-in-seven work stoppage. In addition to this, the State seeks to set one day apart from all others as a day of rest, repose, recreation and tranquility—a day which all members of the family and

community have the opportunity to spend and enjoy together, a day on which there exists relative quiet and disassociation from the everyday intensity of commercial activities, a day on which people may visit friends and relatives who are not available during working days.

[p. 451] Obviously, a State is empowered to determine that a rest-one-day-in-seven statute would not accomplish this purpose; that it would not provide for a general cessation of activity, a special atmosphere of tranquility, a day which all members of the family or friends and relatives might spend together. Furthermore, it seems plain that the problems involved in enforcing such a provision would be exceedingly more difficult than those in enforcing a common-day-of-rest provision.

Moreover, it is common knowledge that the first day of the week has come to have special significance as a rest day in this country. People of all religions and [p. 452] people with no religion regard Sunday as a time for family activity, for visiting friends and relatives, for late sleeping, for passive and active entertainments, for dining out, and the like. “Vast masses of our people, in fact, literally millions, go out into the countryside on fine Sunday afternoons in the Summer...” 308 Parliamentary Debates, Commons 2159. Sunday is a day apart from all others. The cause is irrelevant; the fact exists. It would seem unrealistic for enforcement purposes and perhaps detrimental to the general welfare to require a State to choose a common day of rest other than which most persons would select of their own accord. For these reasons, we hold that the Maryland statutes are not laws respecting an establishment of religion...

[p. 453] Finally, we should make clear that this case deals only with the constitutionality of § 521 of the Maryland statute before us. We do not hold that Sunday legislation may not be a violation of the “Establishment” Clause if it can be demonstrated that its purpose—evidenced either on the face of the legislation, in conjunction with its legislative history, or in its operative effect—is to use the State’s coercive power to aid religion.

Accordingly, the decision is *Affirmed*.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: This is the longest of the opinions rendered May 29, 1961, upholding the constitutionality of State Sunday laws in four cases: *McGowan v. Maryland*, *Gallagher v. Crown Kosher Market*, *Two Guys From Harrison v. McGinley*, and *Braunfeld v. Brown*. On these four cases Justice Frankfurter, joined by Justice Harlan, wrote an 86-page separate (concurring) opinion. On one or another of them three Justices wrote four dissenting opinions (see Nos. 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674).]

1670. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Approves Pennsylvania Law

SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court, opinion of the Court, rendered by Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *Braunfeld v. Brown*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at pp. 603–610.

[p. 603] Concededly, appellants [orthodox Jews] and all others persons who wish to work on Sunday will be burdened economically by the State’s day of rest mandate; and appellants point out that their religion requires them to refrain from work on Saturday as well. Our inquiry then is whether, in these circumstances, the First and Fourteenth Amendments forbid application of the Sunday Closing Law to appellants.

Certain aspects of religious exercise cannot, in any way, be restricted or burdened by either federal or state legislation. Compulsion by law of the acceptance of any creed or the practice of any form of worship is strictly forbidden. The freedom to hold religious beliefs and opinions is absolute...

However, the freedom to act, even when the action is in accord with one’s religious convictions, is not totally free from legislative restriction. *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, *supra*,

at pp. 303–304, 306. As pointed out in *Reynolds v. United States, supra*, at p. 164, legislative power over mere opinion is forbidden but it may reach people's actions when they are found to be in violation of important social duties or subversive of good order, even when [p. 604] the actions are demanded by one's religion...

[p. 605] Thus, in *Reynolds v. United States*, this Court upheld the polygamy conviction of a member of the Mormon faith despite the fact that an accepted doctrine of his church then imposed upon its male members the *duty* to practice polygamy. And, in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158, this Court upheld a statute making it a crime for a girl under eighteen years of age to sell any newspapers, periodicals or merchandise in public places despite the fact that a child of the Jehovah's Witnesses faith believed that it was her religious *duty* to perform this work.

It is to be noted that, in the two cases just mentioned, the religious practices themselves conflicted with the public interest. In such cases, to make accommodation between the religious action and an exercise of state authority is a particularly delicate task, *id.*, at 165, because resolution in favor of the State results in the choice to the individual of either abandoning his religious principle or facing criminal prosecution.

But, again, this is not the case before us because the statute at bar does not make unlawful any religious practices of appellants; the Sunday law simply regulates a secular activity and, as applied to appellants, operates so as to make the practice of their religious beliefs more expensive. Furthermore, the law's effect does not inconvenience all members of the Orthodox Jewish faith but only those who believe it necessary to work on Sunday. And even these are not faced with as serious a choice as forsaking their religious practices or subjecting themselves to criminal prosecution. Fully recognizing that he alters [p. 606] natives open to appellants and others similarly situated—retaining their present occupations and incurring economic disadvantage or engaging in some other commercial activity which does not call for either Saturday or Sunday labor—may well result in some financial sacrifice in order to observe their religious beliefs, still the opinion is wholly different than when the legislation attempts to make a religious practice itself unlawful.

To strike down, without the most critical scrutiny, legislation which imposes only an indirect burden on the exercise of religion, *i. e.*, legislation which does not make unlawful the religious practice itself, would radically restrict the operating latitude of the legislature. Statutes which tax income and limit the amount which may be deducted for religious contributions impose an indirect economic burden on the observance of the religion of the citizen whose religion requires him to donate a greater amount to his church; statutes which require the courts to be closed on Saturday and Sunday impose a similar indirect burden on the observance of the religion of the trial lawyer whose religion requires him to rest on a weekday. The list of legislation of this nature is nearly limitless.

Needless to say, when entering the area of religious freedom, we must be fully cognizant of the particular protection that the Constitution has accorded it. Abhorrence of religious persecution and intolerance is a basic part of our heritage. But we are a cosmopolitan nation made up of people of almost every conceivable religious preference. These denominations number almost three hundred. Year Book of present Churches for 1958, 257 *et seq.* Consequently, it cannot be expected, much less required, that legislators enact no law regulating conduct that may in some way result in an economic

disadvantage to some religious sects and not to others because of the special practices of the various religions. We do not believe that such an effect is an absolute test [p. 607] the determining whether the legislation violates the freedom of religion protected by the First Amendment.

Of course, to hold unassailable all legislation regulating conduct which imposes solely indirect burden on the observance of religion would be a gross oversimplification. If the purpose or effect of a law is to impede the observance of one or all religions or is to discriminate invidiously between religions, that law is constitutionally invalid even though the burden may be characterized as being only indirect. But if the State regulates conduct by enacting a general law within its power, the purpose and effect of which is to advance the State's secular goals, the statute is valid despite its indirect burden on religious observance unless the State may accomplish its purpose by means which do not impose such a burden. See *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, *supra*, at pp. 304–305.

As we pointed out in *McGowan v. Maryland*, *supra*, at pp. 444–445, we cannot find a State without power to provide a weekly respite from all labor and, at the same time, to set one day of the week apart from the others as a day of rest, repose, recreation and tranquillity—a day when the hectic tempo of everyday existence ceases and a more pleasant atmosphere is created, a day which all members of the family and community have the opportunity to spend and enjoy together, a day on which people may visit friends and relatives who are not available during working days, a day when the weekly laborer may best regenerate himself. . .

[p. 608] A number of States provide such an exemption [for observers of another rest day], and this may well be the wiser solution to the problem. But our concern is not with the wisdom of legislation but with its constitutional limitation. Thus, reason and experience teach that to permit the exemption might well undermine the State's goal of providing a day that, as best possible, eliminates the atmosphere of commercial noise and activity. Although not dispositive of the issue, enforcement problems would be more difficult since there would be two or more days to police rather than one and it would be more difficult to observe whether violations were occurring.

Additional problems might also be presented by a regulation of this sort. To allow only people who rest on a day other than Sunday to keep their businesses open on that day might well provide these people with an economic advantage over their competitors who must [p. 609] remain closed on that day; this might cause the Sunday-observers to complain that their religions are being discriminated against. With this competitive advantage existing, there could well be the temptation for some, in order to keep their businesses open on Sunday, to assert that they have religious convictions which compel them to close their businesses on what had formerly been their least profitable day. This might make necessary a state-conducted inquiry into the sincerity of the individual's religious beliefs, a practice which a State might believe would itself run afoul of the spirit of constitutionally protected religious guarantees. Finally, in order to keep the disruption of the day at a minimum, exempted employers would probably have to hire employees who themselves qualified for the exemption because of their own religious beliefs, a practice which a State might feel to be opposed to its general policy prohibiting religious discrimination in hiring. For all of these reasons, we cannot say that the Pennsylvania statute before us is invalid, either on its face or as applied. . .

[p. 610] Accordingly, the decision is *Affirmed*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For dissenting opinions in this case see Nos. 1671, 1672, 1673.]

1671. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents as to “Free Exercise” of Religion

SOURCE: Justice [William J.] Brennan, Concurring and dissenting opinion in *Braunfeld v. Brown*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at pp. 610–616.

[p. 610] I agree with THE CHIEF JUSTICE that there is no merit in appellants’ establishment and equal-protection claims. I dissent, however, as to the claim that Pennsylvania has prohibited the free exercise of appellant’s religion.

The Court has demonstrated the public need for a weekly surcease from worldly labor, and set forth the considerations of convenience which have led the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to fix Sunday as the time for that respite. I would approach this case differently, from the point of view of the individuals whose liberty is—concededly—curtailed by these enactments. For the values of the First Amendment, as embodied in the Fourteenth, look primarily towards the preservation of personal liberty, rather than towards the fulfillment of collective goals.

The appellants are small retail merchants, faithful practitioners of the Orthodox Jewish faith. They allege—and the allegation must be taken as true, since the case comes to us on a motion to dismiss the complaint—that “... one who does not observe the Sabbath [by refraining from labor] ... cannot be an Orthodox Jew.” [p. 611] In appellants’ business area Friday night and Saturday are busy times; yet appellants, true to their faith, close during the Jewish Sabbath, and make up some, but not all, of the business thus lost by opening on Sunday. “Each of the plaintiffs,” the complaint continues, “does a substantial amount of business on Sundays, and the ability of the plaintiffs to earn a livelihood will be greatly impaired by closing their business establishment on Sundays.” Consequences even more drastic are alleged: “Plaintiff, Abraham Braunfeld, will be unable to continue in his business if he may not stay open on Sunday and he will thereby lose his capital investment.” In other words, the issue in this case—and we do not understand either appellees or the Court to contend otherwise—is whether a State may put an individual to a choice between his business and his religion. The Court today holds that it may. But I dissent, believing that such a law prohibits the free exercise of religion.

The first question to be resolved, however, is somewhat broader than the facts of this case. That question concerns the appropriate standard of constitutional adjudication in cases in which a statute is assertedly in conflict with the First Amendment, whether that limitation applies of its own force, or as absorbed through the less definite words of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court in such cases is not confined to the narrow inquiry whether the challenged law is rationally related to some legitimate legislative end. Nor is the case decided by a finding that the State’s interest is substantial and important, as well as rationally justifiable. This canon of adjudication was clearly stated by Mr. Justice Jackson, speaking for the Court in *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 639 (1943):

“In weighing arguments of the parties it is important to distinguish between the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as an instrument for [p. 612] transmitting the principles of the First Amendment and those cases in which it is applied for its own sake. The test of legislation which collides with the Fourteenth Amendment, because it also collides with the principles of the First, is much more definite than the test when only the Fourteenth is involved. Much of the vagueness of the due process clause disappears when the specific prohibitions of the First become its standard. The right of a State to regulate, for example, a public utility may well include, so far as the due process test is concerned, power to impose all of the restrictions which a legislature may have a ‘rational basis’ for adopting. But freedoms of

speech and of press, of assembly, and of worship may not be infringed on such slender grounds. They are susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the State may lawfully protect. It is important to note that while it is the Fourteenth Amendment which bears directly upon the State it is the more specific limiting principles of the First Amendment that finally govern this case.”

This exacting standard has been consistently applied by this Court as the test of legislation under all clauses of the First Amendment, not only those specifically dealing with freedom of speech and of the press. For religious freedom—the freedom to believe and to practice strange and, it may be, foreign creeds—has classically been one of the highest values of our society. See, *e. g.*, *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, 115 (1943); *Jones v. City of Opelicka*, 319 U. S. 103 (1943); *Martin v. City of Struthers*, 319 U. S. 141 (1943); *Follet v. Town of McCormick*, 321 U. S. 573 (1944); *Marsh v. Alabama*, 326 U. s. 501, 510 (1946). Even the most concentrated and fully articulated attack on this high standard has seemingly admitted its validity in principle, while [p. 613] deploring some incidental phraseology. See *Kovacs v. Cooper*, 336 U. s. 77, 89, 95–96 (1949) (concurring opinion); but cf. *Ullmann v. United States*, 350 U. S. 422 (1956). The honored place of religious freedom in our constitutional hierarchy, suggested long ago by the argument of counsel in *Permolli v. Municipality No. 1 of the City of New Orleans*, 3 How. 589, 600 (1845), and foreshadowed by a prescient footnote in *United States v. Carolene Products Co.*, 304 U. S. 144, 152, n. 4 (1938), must now be taken to be settled. Or at least so it appeared until today. For in this case the Court seems to say, without so much as a deferential nod towards that high place which we have accorded religious freedom in the past, that any substantial state interest will justify encroachments on religious practice, at least if those encroachments are cloaked in the guise of some nonreligious public purpose.

Admittedly, these laws do not compel overt affirmation of a repugnant belief, as in *Barnette*, nor do they prohibit outright any of appellants’ religious practices, as did the federal law upheld in *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U. S. 145 (1878), cited by the Court. That is, the laws do not say that appellants must work on Saturday. But their effect is that appellants may not simultaneously practice their religion and their trade, without being hampered by a substantial competitive disadvantage. Their effect is that no one may at one and the same time be an Orthodox Jew and compete effectively with his Sunday-observing fellow tradesmen. This clog upon the exercise of religion, this state-imposed burden on Orthodox Judaism, has exactly the same economic effect as a tax levied upon the sale of religious literature. And yet, such a tax, when applied in the form of an excise or license fee, was held invalid in *Follet v. Town of McCormick*, *supra*. All this the Court, as I read its opinion, concedes.

What, the, is the compelling state interest which impels the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to impede [p. 614] appellants’ freedom of worship? What overbalancing need is so weighty in the constitutional scale that it justifies this substantial, though indirect, limitation of appellants’ freedom? It is not the desire to stamp out a practice deeply abhorred by society, such as polygamy, as in *Reynolds*, for the custom of resting one day a week is universally honored, as the Court has amply shown. Now is it the State’s traditional protection of children, as in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158 (1944), for appellants are reasoning and fully autonomous adults. It is not even the interest in seeing that everyone rests one day a week, for appellants’ religion requires that they take such a rest. It is the mere convenience of having everyone rest on the same day.

It is to defend this interest that the Court holds that a State need to follow the alternative route of granting an exemption for those who in good faith observe a day of rest other than Sunday.

It is true, I suppose, that the granting of such an exemption would make Sundays a little noisier, and the task of police and prosecutor a little more difficult. It is also true that a majority—21—of the 34 States which have general Sunday regulations have exemptions of this kind. We are not told that those States are significantly noisier, or that their police are significantly more burdened, than [p. 615] Pennsylvania's. Even England, not under the compulsion of a written constitution, but simply influenced by considerations of fairness, has such an exemption for some activities. The Court conjures up several difficulties with such a system which seem to me more fanciful than real. Non-Sunday observers might get an unfair advantage, it is said. A similar contention against the draft exemption for conscientious objectors (another example of the exemption technique) was rejected with the observation that "its unsoundness is too apparent to require" discussion. *Selective Draft Law Cases*, 245 U. S. 366, 390 (1918). However widespread the complaint, it is legally baseless, and the State's reliance upon it cannot withstand a First Amendment claim. We are told that an official inquiry into the good faith with which religious beliefs are held might be itself unconstitutional. But this Court indicated otherwise in *United States v. Ballard*, 322 U. S. 78 (1944). Such an inquiry is no more an infringement of religious freedom than the requirement imposed by the Court itself in *McGowan v. Maryland*, ante, p. 420, decided this day, that a plaintiff show that his good-faith religious beliefs are hampered before he acquires standing to attack a statute under the Free-Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. Finally, I find the Court's mention of a problem under state antidiscrimination statutes almost chimerical. Most such statutes provide that hiring may be made on a religious basis if religion is a *bona fide* occupational qualification. It happens, moreover, that Pennsylvania's statute has such a provision.

In fine, the Court, in my view, has exalted administrative convenience to a constitutional level high enough to [p. 616] justify making one religion economically disadvantageous. The Court would justify this result on the ground that the effect on religion, though substantial, is indirect. The Court forgets, I think, a warning uttered during the congressional discussion of the First Amendment itself: "... the rights of conscience are, in their nature, of peculiar delicacy, and will little bear the gentlest touch of governmental hand..."

I would reverse this judgment and remand for a trial of appellants' allegations, limited to the free-exercise-of-religion issue.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Justice [Potter] Stewart joined in this dissent (see No. 1673).

1672. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents in Four Cases

SOURCE: Justice [William O.] Douglas, Dissenting opinion in *McGowan v. Maryland* [see No. 1669] and three other cases, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S., 420, at pp. 561–581.

[p. 561] The question is not whether one day out of seven can be imposed by a State as a day of rest. The question is not whether Sunday can by force of custom and habit be retained as a day of rest. The question is whether a State can impose criminal sanctions on those who, unlike the Christian majority that makes up our society, worship on a different day or do not share the religious scruples of the majority.

If the “free exercise” of religion were subject to reasonable regulations, as it is under some constitutions, or if all laws “respecting the establishment of religion” were not proscribed, I could understand how rational men, representing a predominantly Christian civilization, might think these Sunday laws did not unreasonably interfere with anyone’s free exercise of religion and took no step toward a burdensome establishment of any religion.

But that is not the premise from which we start, as there is agreement that the fact that a State, and not the Federal Government, has promulgated these Sunday laws does not change the scope of the power asserted. For the classic view is that the First Amendment should be applied to the States with the same firmness as it is enforced against the Federal Government. See *Lovell v. Griffin*, 303 U. S. 444, 450; *Minersville District v. Gobitis*, 310 U. S. 586, 593; *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, 108; *Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 639; *Staub v. City of Baxley*, 355 U. S. 313, 321; *Talley v. [p. 562] California*, 362 U. S. 60. The most explicit statement perhaps was in *Board of Education v. Barnette, supra*, 639 [quoted in No. 1671]...

With that as my starting point I do not see how a State can make protesting citizens refrain from doing innocent acts on Sunday because the doing of those acts offends sentiments of their Christian neighbors.

The institutions of our society are founded on the belief that there is an authority higher than the authority of the State; that there is a moral law which the State is powerless to alter; that the individual possesses rights, conferred by the Creator, which government must respect. [p. 563] The Declaration of Independence stated the now familiar theme:

“We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

And the body of the Constitution as well as the Bill of Rights enshrined those principles.

The Puritan influence helped shape our constitutional law and our common law as Dean Pound has said: The Puritan “put individual conscience and individual judgment in the first place.” *The Spirit of the Common Law* (1921), p. 42. For these reasons we stated in *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U. S. 306, 313, “We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.”

But those who fashioned the Constitution decided that if and when God is to be served, His service will not be motivated by coercive measures of government. “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”—such is the command of the First Amendment made applicable to the State by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth. This means, as I understand it, that if a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government. This necessarily means, *first*, that the dogma, creed, scruples, or practices of no religious group or sect are to be preferred over those of any others; *second*, that no one shall be interfered with by government for practicing the religion of his choice; *third*, that the State may not require anyone to practice a religion or even any religion; and *fourth*, that the State cannot compel one so to conduct himself as not to offend the religious scruples of another. The idea, as I understand it, was to limit the power of government to act in religious matters (*Board of Education v. [p. 564] Barnette, supra; McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U. S. 203),

not to limit the freedom of religious men to act religiously nor to restrict the freedom of atheists or agnostics.

The First Amendment commands government to have no interest in theology or ritual; it admonishes government to be interested in allowing religious freedom to flourish—whether the result is to produce Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, or to turn the people toward the path of Buddha, or to end in a predominantly Moslem nation, or to produce in the long run atheists or agnostics. On matters of this kind government must be neutral. This freedom plainly includes freedom *from* religion with the right to believe, speak, write, publish and advocate antireligious programs. *Board of Education v. Barnette, supra*, 641. Certainly the “free exercise” clause does not require that everyone embrace the theology of some church or of some faith, or observe the religious practices of any majority or minority sect. The First Amendment by its “establishment” clause prevents, of course, the selection by government of an “official” church. Yet the ban plainly extends farther than that. We said in *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U. S. 1, 16, that it would be an “establishment” of a religion if the Government financed one church or several churches. For what better way to “establish” an institution than to find the fund that will support it? The “establishment” clause protects citizens also against any law which selects any religious custom, practice, or ritual, puts the force of government behind it, and fines, imprisons, or otherwise penalizes a person for not observing it. The Government plainly could not join forces with one religious group and decree a universal and symbolic circumcision. Nor could it require all children to be baptized or give tax exemptions only to those whose children were baptized.

Could it require a fast from sunrise to sunset throughout the Moslem month of Ramadan? I should think not. [p. 565] Yet why then can it make criminal the doing of other acts, as innocent as eating, during the day that Christians revere?

Sunday is a word heavily overlaid with connotations and traditions deriving from the Christian roots of our civilization that color all judgments concerning it. This is what the philosophers call “word magic.”

“For most judges, for most lawyers, for most human beings, we are as unconscious of our value patterns as we are of the oxygen that we breathe.” Cohen, *Legal Conscience* (1960), p. 169.

The issue of these cases would therefore be in better focus if we imagined that a state legislature, controlled by orthodox Jews and Seventh Day Adventists, passed a law making it a crime to keep a shop open on Saturdays. Would a Baptist, Catholic, Methodist, or Presbyterian be compelled to obey that law or go to jail or pay a fine? Or suppose Moslems grew in political strength here and got a law through a state legislature making it a crime to keep a shop open on Fridays [see No. 778]. Would the rest of us have to submit under the fear of criminal sanctions?

Dr. John Cogley recently summed up ¹ [Note 1: The Problems of Pluralism, Dansforth Lectures, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio (1960)...] the dominance of the three-religion influence in our affairs:

“For the foreseeable future, it seems, the United States is going to be a three-religion nation. At the present time all three are characteristically ‘Amer- [p. 566] ican,’ some think flavorlessly so. For religion in America is almost uniformly ‘respectable,’ bourgeois, and prosperous. In the Protestant world the ‘church’ mentality has triumphed over the more venturesome spirit of the ‘sect.’ In the Catholic world, the mystical is muted in favor of booming organization and efficiently administered good works. And in the Jewish world the prophet is too frequently without honor, while the synagogue emphasis is focused on suburban togetherness. There are exceptions to these rules, of course; each of the religious communities continues to cast up its prophets, its rebels and radicals. But a Jeremiah, one fears, would be positively embarrassing to

the present position of the Jews; a Francis of Assisi upsetting the complacency of American Catholics would be rudely dismissed as a fanatic; and a Kierkegaard, speaking with an American accent, would be considerably less welcome than Norman Vincent Peale in most Protestant pulpits.”

This religious influence has extended far, far back of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Every Sunday School student knows the Fourth Commandment:

“Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

“Six days shalt thou labour, 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 manservant, nor thy [p. 567] maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

“For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth.” ... [Exodus 20:8–11](#)

This religious mandate for observance of the Seventh Day became, under Emperor Constantine, a mandate for observance of the First Day “in conformity with the practice of the Christian Church.” See *Richardson v. Goddard*, 23 How. 28, 41. This religious mandate has had a checkered history, but in general its command, enforced now by the ecclesiastical authorities, now by the civil authorities, and now by both, has held good down through the centuries. The general pattern of these laws in the United States was set in the eighteenth century and derives, most directly, from a seventeenth century English statute. 29 Charles II, c. 7. Judicial comment on the [p. 568] Sunday laws has always been a mixed bag. Some judges have asserted that the statutes have a “purely” civil aim, *i. e.*, limitation of work time and provision for a common and universal leisure. But other judges have recognized the religious significance of Sunday and that the laws existed to enforce the maintenance of that significance. In general, both threads of argument have continued to interweave in the case law on the subject. Prior to the time when the First Amendment was held applicable to the States by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth, the Court at least by *obiter dictum* approved State Sunday laws on three occasions: *Soon Hing v. Crowley*, 113 U. S. 703, in 1885; *Hennington v. Georgia*, 163 U. S. 299, in 1896; *Petit v. Minnesota*, 177 U. S. 164, in 1900. And in *Friedman v. New York*, 341 U. S. 907, the Court, by a divided vote, dismissed “for want of a substantial federal question” an appeal from a New York decision upholding the validity of a Sunday law against an attack based on the First Amendment.

The *Soon Hing*, *Hennington*, and *Petit* cases all rested on the police power of the State—the right to safeguard the health of the people by requiring the cessation of normal activities one day out of seven. The Court in the *Soon Hing* case rejected the idea that Sunday laws rested on the power of government “to legislate for the promotion of religious observances.” 113 U. S., at 710. The New York Court of Appeals in the *Friedman* case followed the reasoning of the earlier cases, 302 N. Y. 75, 80, 96 N. E. 2d 184, 186.

[p. 569] The Massachusetts Sunday law involved in one of these appeals was once characterized by the Massachusetts court as merely a civil regulation providing for a “fixed period of rest.” *Commonwealth v. Has*, 122 Mass. 40, 42. That decision was, according to the District Court in the *Gallagher* case, “an *ad hoc* improvisation” made “because of the realization that the Sunday law would be more vulnerable to constitutional attack under the state Constitution if the religious motivation of the statute were more explicitly avowed.” 176 F. Supp. 466, 473. Certainly prior to the *Has* case, the Massachusetts courts had indicated that the aim of the Sunday law was religious. See *Pearce v. Atwood*, 13 Mass. 324, 345–346; *Bennett v. Brooks*, 91 Mass. 118, 121. After

the *Has* case the Massachusetts court construed the Sunday law as a religious measure. In *Davis v. Somerville*, 128 Mass. 594, 596, 35 Am. Rep. 399, 400, it was said:

“Our Puritan ancestors intended that the day should be not merely a day of rest from labor, but also a day devoted to public and private worship and to religious meditation and repose, undisturbed by secular cares or amusements. They saw fit to enforce the observance of the day by penal legislation, and the statute regulations which they devised for that purpose have continued in force, without any substantial modification, to the present time.”

And see *Commonwealth v. Dextra*, 143 Mass. 28, 8 N. E. 756. In *Commonwealth v. White*, 190 Mass. 578, 581, 177 N. E. 636, 637, the court refused to liberalize its construction of an exception in its Sunday law for works of “necessity.” That word, it said, “was originally inserted to secure the observance of the Lord’s day in accordance with [p. 570] the views of our ancestors, and it ever since has stood and still stands for the same purpose.” In *Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, 244 Mass. 484, 486, 138 N. E. 835, 836, the court reiterated that the aim of the law was “to secure respect and reverence for the Lord’s day.”

The Pennsylvania Sunday laws before us in Nos. 36 and 67 have received the same construction. “Rest and quiet, on the Sabbath day, with the right and privilege [*sic*] of public and private worship, undisturbed by any mere wor[*l*]dly employment, are exactly what the statute was passed to protect.” *Sparhawk v. Union Passenger R. Co.*, 54 Pa. 401, 423. And see *Commonwealth v. Nesbit*, 34 Pa. 398, 405, 406–408. A recent pronouncement by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is found in *Commonwealth v. America Baseball Club*, 290 Pa. 136, 143, 138 A. 497, 499: “Christianity is part of the common law of Pennsylvania ... and its people are christian people. Sunday is the holy day among christians.”

The Maryland court, in sustaining the challenged law in No. 8, relied on *Judefind v. State*, 78 Md. 510, 28 A. 405, and *Levering v. Park Commissioner*, 134 Md. 48, 106 A. 176. In the former the court said:

“It is undoubtedly true that rest from secular employment on Sunday does have a tendency to foster and encourage the Christian religion—of all sects and denominations that observe that day—as rest from work and ordinary occupation enables many to engage in public worship who probably would not otherwise do so. But it would scarcely be asked of a Court, in what professes to be a Christian land, to declare a law unconstitutional because it requires rest from bodily labor on Sunday, (except works of necessity and charity,) and *thereby* promotes the [p. 571] cause of Christianity. If the Christian religion is, incidentally or otherwise, benefited or fostered by having this day of rest, as it undoubtedly is, there is all the more reason for the enforcement of laws that help to preserve it.” 78 Md., at 515–516, 128 A., at 407. In the *Levering* case the court relied on the excerpt from the *Judefind* decision just quoted. 134 Md., at 54–55, 106 A., at 178.

We have then in each of the four cases Sunday laws that find their source in Exodus, that were brought here by the Virginians and by the Puritans, and that are today maintained, construed, and justified because they respect the views of our dominant religious groups and provide a needed day of rest.

The history was accurately summarized a century ago by Chief Justice Terry of the Supreme Court of California in *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal. 502, 509.

4

⁴Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

“The truth is, however much it may be disguised, that this one day of rest is a purely religious idea. Derived from the Sabbatical institutions of the ancient Hebrew, it has been adopted into all the creeds of succeeding religious sects throughout the civilized world; and whether it be the Friday of the Mohammedan, the Saturday of the Israelite, or the Sunday of the Christian, it is alike fixed in the affections of its followers, beyond the power of eradication, and in most of the States of our Confederacy, the aid of the law to enforce its observance has been given under the pretence of a civil, municipal, or police regulation.”

That case involved the validity of a Sunday law under a provision of the California Constitution guaranteeing the “free exercise” of religion. Calif. Const., 1849, Art. 1, § 4. Justice Burnett stated why he concluded that the [p. 572] Sunday law, there sought to be enforced against a man selling clothing on Sunday, infringed California’s constitution:

“Had the act made Monday, instead of Sunday, a day of compulsory rest, the constitutional question would have been the same. The fact that the Christian *voluntarily* keeps holy the first day of the week, does not authorize the Legislature to make that observance *compulsory*. The Legislature can not compel the citizen to do that which the Constitution leaves him free to do or omit, at his election. The act violates as much the religious freedom of the Christian as of the Jew. Because the conscientious views of the Christian compel him to keep Sunday as a Sabbath, he has the right to object, when the Legislature invades his freedom of religious worship, and assumes the power to compel him to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same, whether the act of the Legislature *compels* us to do that which we wish to do, or not to do...

“Under the Constitution of this State, the Legislature can not pass any act, the legitimate effect of which is *forcibly* to establish any merely religious truth, or enforce any merely religious observances. The Legislature has no power over such a subject. When, therefore, the citizen is sought to be compelled by the Legislature to do any affirmative religious act, or to refrain from doing anything, because it violates simply a religious principle or observance, the act is unconstitutional.” *Id.*, at 513–515.

The Court picks and chooses language from various decisions to bolster its conclusion that these Sunday laws in the modern setting are “civil regulations.” No matter how much is written, no matter what is said, the parentage of these laws is the Fourth Commandment; and they [p. 573] serve and satisfy the religious predispositions of our Christian communities.⁶ After all, the labels a State places on its laws are not binding on us when we are confronted with a constitutional decision. We reach our own conclusion as to the character, effect, and practical operation of the regulation in determining its constitutionality. *Carpenter v. Shaw*, 280 U. S. 363, 367–368; *Dyer v. Sims*, 341 U. S. 22, 29; *Memphis Steam Laundry v. Stone*, 342 U. S. 389, 392; *Society for Savings v. Bowers*, 349 U. S. 143, 151; *Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, 364 U. S. 339, 341–342.

[Note 6: Today we retreat from that jealous regard for religious freedom which struck down a statute because it was “a handy implement for disguised religious persecution.” *Board of Education v. Barnette*, *supra*, 644 (concurring opinion). It does not do to say, as does the majority, “Sunday is a day apart from all others. The cause is irrelevant; the fact exists.” The cause of Sunday’s being a day apart is determinative; that cause should not be swept aside by a declaration of parochial experience.

The judgment the Court is called upon to make is a delicate one. But *in the light of our society’s religious history* it cannot be avoided by arguing that a hypothetical lawgiver could find nonreligious reasons for fixing Sunday as a day of rest. The effect of that history is, indeed, still with us. Sabbath is no less Sabbath because it is now less severe in its strictures, or because it has come to be expedient for some nonreligious purposes. The Constitution must guard against “sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes” of violation. *Lane v. Wilson*, 307 U. S. 268, 275.]

It seems to me plain that by these laws the States compel one, under sanction of law, to refrain from work or recreation on Sunday because of the majority’s religious views about that day. The State by law makes Sunday a symbol of respect or adherence. Refraining from work or recreation in deference to the majority’s religious feelings about Sunday is within every person’s choice. By what authority can government compel it?

Cases are put where acts that are immoral by our standards but not by the standards of other religious [p. 574] groups are made criminal. That category of cases, until today, has been a very restricted one confined to polygamy (*Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U. S. 145) and other extreme situations. The latest example is *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158, which upheld a statute making it criminal for a child under twelve to sell papers, periodicals, or merchandise on a street or in any public place. It was sustained in spite of the finding that the child thought it was her religious duty to perform the act. But that was a narrow holding which turned on the effect which street solicitation might have on the child-solicitor:

“The state’s authority over children’s activities is broader than over like actions of adults. This is peculiarly true of public activities and in matters of employment. A democratic society rests, for its continuance, upon the healthy, well-rounded growth of young people into full maturity as citizens, with all that implies. It may secure this against impeding restraints and dangers within a broad range of selection. Among evils most appropriate for such action are the crippling effects of child employment, more especially in public places, and the possible harms arising from other activities subject to all the diverse influences of the street. It is too late now to doubt that legislation appropriately designed to reach such evils is within the state’s police power, whether against the parent’s claim to control of the child or one that religious scruples dictate contrary action.” *Id.*, 168–169.

None of the acts involved here implicates minors. None of the actions made constitutionally criminal today involves the doing of any act that any society has deemed to be immoral.

The conduct held constitutionally criminal today embraces the selling of pure, not impure, food; wholesome, [p. 575] not noxious, articles. Adults, not minors, are involved. The innocent acts, now constitutionally classified as criminal, emphasize the drastic break we make with tradition.

These laws are sustained because, it is said, the First Amendment is concerned with religious convictions or opinion, not with conduct. But it is a strange Bill of Rights that makes it possible for the dominant religious group to bring the minority to heel because the minority, in the doing of acts which intrinsically are wholesome and not antisocial, does not defer to the majority’s religious beliefs. Some have religious scruples against eating pork. Those scruples, no matter how bizarre they might seem to some, are within the ambit of the First Amendment. See *United States v. Ballard*, 322 U. S. 78, 87. Is it possible that a majority of a state legislature having those religious scruples could make it criminal for the nonbeliever to sell pork? Some have religious scruples against slaughtering cattle. Could a state legislature, dominated by that group, make it criminal to run an abattoir?

The Court balances the need of the people for rest, recreation, late sleeping, family visiting and the like against the command of the First Amendment that no one need bow to the religious beliefs of another. There is in this realm no room for balancing. I see no place for it in the constitutional scheme. A legislature of Christians can no more make minorities conform to their weekly regime than a legislature of Moslems, or a legislature of Hindus. The religious regime of every group must be respected—unless it crosses the line of criminal conduct. But no one can be forced to come to a halt before it, or refrain from doing things that would offend it. That is my reading of the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause. Any other reading imports, I fear, an element common in other societies but foreign to us. Thus Nigeria in Article 23 of her Constitution, after [p. 576] guaranteeing religious freedom, adds, “Nothing in this section shall invalidate any law that is reasonably justified in a democratic society in the interest of defence, public

safety, public order, public morality, or public health.” And see Article 25 of the Indian Constitution. That may be a desirable provision. But when the Court adds it to our First Amendment, as it does today, we make a sharp break with the American ideal of religious liberty as enshrined in the First Amendment.

The State can of course require one day of rest a week: one day when every shop or factory is closed. Quite a few States make that requirement. Then the “day of rest” becomes purely and simply a health measure. But the Sunday laws operate differently. They force minorities to obey the majority’s religious feelings of what is due and proper for a Christian community; they provide a coercive spur to the “weaker brethren,” to those who are indifferent to the claims of a Sabbath through apathy or scruple. Can there be any doubt that Christians, now aligned vigorously in favor of these laws, would be as strongly opposed if they were prosecuted under a Moslem law that forbade them from engaging in secular activities on days that violated Moslem scruples?

There is an “establishment” of religion in the constitutional sense if any sense if any practice of any religious group has the sanction of law behind it. There is an interference with the “free exercise” of religion if what in conscience one [p. 577] can do or omit doing is required because of the religious scruples of the community. Hence I would declare each of those laws unconstitutional as applied to the complaining parties, whether or not they are members of a sect which observes as its Sabbath a day other than Sunday.

When these laws are applied to Orthodox Jews, as they are in No. 11 and in No. 67, or to Sabbatarians their vice is accentuated. If the Sunday laws are constitutional, Kosher markets are on a five-day week. Thus those laws put an economic penalty on those who observe Saturday rather than Sunday as the Sabbath. For the economic pressures on these minorities, created by the fact that our communities are predominantly Sunday-minded, there is no recourse. When, however, the State uses its coercive powers—here the criminal law—to compel minorities to observe a second Sabbath, not their own, the State undertakes to aid and “prefer one religion over another”—contrary to the command of the Constitution. See *Everson v. Board of Education, supra*, 15.

In large measure the history of the religious clause of the First Amendment was a struggle to be free of economic sanctions for adherence to one’s religion. *Everson v. Board of Education, supra*, 11–14. A small tax was imposed in Virginia for religious education. Jefferson and Madison led the fight against the tax, Madison writing his famous Memorial and Remonstrance against that law. *Id.*, 12. As a result, the tax measure was defeated and instead Virginia’s famous “Bill for Religious Liberty,” written by Jefferson, was enacted. *Id.*, 12. That Act provided: ⁸ [Note 8: 12 Hening, Stat. Va. (1823), p. 86.]

“That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall other- [p. 578] wise suffer on account of his religious opinion or belief...”

The reverse side of an “establishment” is a burden on the “free exercise” of religion. Receipt of funds from the State benefits the established church directly; laying an extra tax on nonmembers benefits the established church indirectly. Certainly the present Sunday laws place Orthodox Jews and Sabbatarians under extra burdens because of their religious opinions or beliefs. Requiring them to abstain from their trade or business on Sunday reduces their work-week to five days, unless they violate their religious scruples. This places them at a competitive disadvantage and penalizes them for adhering to their religious beliefs.

“The sanction imposed by the state for observing a day other than Sunday as holy time is certainly more serious economically than the imposition of a license tax for preaching,”⁹ [Note 9: Pfeffer, Church, State, and Freedom (1953), p. 235] which we struck down in *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, and in *Follett v. McCormick*, 321 U. S. 573. The special protection which Sunday laws give the dominant religious groups and the penalty they place on minorities whose holy day is Saturday constitute in my view state interference with the “free exercise” of religion.

[p. 579] I dissent from applying criminal sanctions against any of these complainants since to do so implicates the States in religious matters contrary to the constitutional mandate. Reverend Allan C. Parker, Jr., Pastor of the [p. 580] South Park Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington, has stated my views:

“We forget that, though Sunday-worshipping Christians are in the majority in this country among religious people, we do not have the right to force our practice upon the minority. Only a Church which deems itself without error and intolerant of error can justify its intolerance of the minority.

“A Jewish friend of mine runs a small business establishment. Because my friend is a Jew his business is closed each Saturday. He respects my right to worship on Sunday and I respect his right to worship on Saturday. But there is a difference. As a Jew he closes his store voluntarily so that he will be able to worship his God in his fashion. Fine! But, as a Jew living under Christian inspired Sunday closing laws, he is required to close his store on Sunday so that I will be able to worship my God in my fashion.

“Around the corner from my church there is a small Seventh Day Baptist church. I disagree with the Seventh Day Baptists on many points of doctrine. Among the tenets of their faith with which I disagree is the ‘seventh day worship.’ But they are good neighbors and fellow Christians, and while we disagree we respect one another. The good people of my congregation set aside their jobs on the first of the week and gather in God’s house for worship. Of course, it is easy for them to set aside their jobs since Sunday closing laws—inspired by the Church—keep them from their work. At the Seventh Day Baptist church the people set aside their jobs on Saturday to worship God. This takes real sacrifice because Saturday is a good day for business. But that is not all—they are required by law to set aside [p. 581] their jobs on Sunday their jobs on Sunday while more orthodox Christians worship.

“... I do not believe that because I have set aside Sunday as a holy day I have the right to force all men to set aside that day also. Why should my faith be favored by the State over any other man’s faith?”¹² [Note 12: 1 Liberty, January–February 1961, No. 56, pp. 21–22.]

With all deference, none of the opinions filed today in support of the Sunday laws has answered that question.

1673. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents; Says Rights Violated

SOURCE: Justice [Potter] Stewart, Dissenting opinion in *Braunfeld v. Brown*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at p. 616.

I agree with substantially all that MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN has written [see No. 1671]. Pennsylvania has passed a law which compels an Orthodox Jew to choose between his religious faith and his economic survival. That is a cruel choice. It is a choice which I think no State can constitutionally demand. For me this is not something that can be swept under the rug and forgotten in the interest of enforced Sunday togetherness. I think the impact of this law upon these appellants grossly violates their constitutional right to the free exercise of their religion.

1674. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justices Join in Dissent

SOURCE: Justices [William J.] Brennan and [Potter] Stewart, Dissenting opinion in *Gallagher v. Crown Koshier Market*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 617, at p. 642.

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN and MR. JUSTICE STEWART dissent. They are of the opinion that the Massachusetts statute, as applied to the appellees in this case, prohibits the free

exercise of religion. See their dissenting opinions in *Braunfeld v. Brown* [see Nos. 1671, 1673].

1675. Symbolism, in Christian Church, History of

SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

[p. 21] SINCE EARLY TIMES, Christian symbolic art and ritual have been very closely connected . . . During the past quarter century, in the non-liturgical churches in America, there has been manifest a remarkable movement towards the adoption of enriched forms of worship and a more liberal use of symbolical decorations and equipment.

The various Catholic, Episcopal and Lutheran churches are professedly liturgical and make extensive use of the traditional forms and symbolism inherited from the early Christian Church, or developed in the period of magnificent flowering of medieval religious art which preceded the Reformation. During the early stages of the Calvinistic Reformation, much of this heritage was thrown into the discard by wrathful reformers, who wrought havoc on priceless treasures of religious art in Scotland, England and other parts of Europe. Of three hundred sixty Celtic crosses, said to exist in Scotland prior to the Reformation, only two exist today. John Calvin permitted gratification of the ear through poetry and music, but denied gratification of the eye. Genesis [p. 22] 1:31 was overlooked. In attempting to uproot "superstitious" and "idolatrous" usages, the Calvinists committed many destructive excesses and, for the sake of stark contrast to Roman Catholic custom, kept their churches almost completely bare of everything that might appeal to the imagination and the esthetic sense of the worshipers. Every candid student of history will admit that they had much provocation. Nevertheless, it now appears that the catharsis was too severe.

The iconoclastic spirit was vigorously expressed among the American pioneers and is not yet moribund. It seems that by many of us the loss of goods by fire may be suffered more easily than the cancelation of inherited notions and prejudices. Moreover, only the philosophic few believe in a "golden mean." Human beings quite generally tend to indulge in excess, especially in regard to persons and things to which they are opposed. Puritans, like Richard Braith-white who hanged his cat on Monday because it killed a mouse on Sunday, were capable of great severity in the exercise of what they genuinely conceived to be righteous indignation. Even in our own day genuine piety is sometimes manifested in very queer and fanatical forms, and one does not have to be a cynic to observe that the human mind is capable of extraordinary folly with perfect sincerity.

5

⁵Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.